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FOREWORD

In 1967 the principal author of this report had more than twenty years' experience in participation in a variety of organizations dedicated to the improvement of housing and living conditions in Canadian cities. The absence of legislation in the early post-war period had been remedied by fundamental amendments to the National Housing Act in 1949, 1954 and 1964. Participation in the development of public housing as the vehicle whereby low-income individuals and family groups could obtain adequate housing at rentals they could afford had become a most frustrating experience by the early 1960s, and many of the assumptions of the first fifteen years following World War Two had had to be discarded. Such concepts as "slum clearance" and "blighted areas" were no longer either socially desirable or politically palatable. Moreover, resistance to public intervention in the housing market on behalf of low-income groups was almost as strong as it had been during the early post-war period.

In 1964 the government of Canada introduced a new Part III in the National Housing Act entitled "Urban Renewal". This fundamental change in the legislation appeared to offer great promise for the improvement of neighbourhoods through the provision of the widest possible spectrum of opportunities for change and development that had been provided since the National Housing Act which was passed in 1944, two decades earlier. It appeared possible for the first time to introduce systematically in Canadian cities such techniques as "Conservation of Neighbourhoods", "Rehabilitation of Housing", as well as clearance and redevelopment. The major feature of the new approach to be
implemented in the second half of the 1960s was the broad opportunity provided to utilize every technique, and to examine a variety of approaches to the improvement of older neighbourhoods in downtown urban areas threatened by what was traditionally called "blight" and "slum". A bright new era had apparently appeared.

If this were the expectation, its sweet prospect soured very quickly. Within a year or two the resistance to urban renewal programmes in many communities in Canada, but particularly in downtown Toronto, was not merely strong but "shrill". A new phenomenon appeared on the scene, born of citizen resistance to the process of urban planning and urban development. Resistance was focused in a variety of new and old citizens' organizations which were dedicated to opposing the plans of administrative commissions such as planning boards and housing authorities, and of elected representatives.

The great fear was that both homeowners and tenants would be "turfed out" in one of those phases of the chronic housing shortage which Canada has always and will always face, namely, that of the period of economic recession of the years 1958-63. Private building operations had dropped off, particularly in the form of single detached houses. The prices of such housing had risen rapidly and a new phenomenon had appeared on the housing scene in the form of the apartment house industry. Within a few years more than half of all the housing starts in Canada and more than 60% of all the housing starts in Metropolitan Toronto were in the form of multiple dwellings, usually in high-rise apartments. Those who continued to live in the older homes near the centre of the City rightly feared that apartment developers would soon move towards the acquisition, clearance and redevelopment of their neighbourhoods. In hindsight the
impact of the building of St. James Town was tremendous.

In the academic year 1967-68 this writer proposed to a group of graduate students in social work that they undertake their research requirement in this new field of special interest. During that first year a research design emerged which involved personal interviews with approximately 100 reasonably well informed "players on the scene". Some were leaders of citizen organizations; some were professional persons working in six older neighbourhoods which the research team chose to study; some were elected representatives, professional planners and architects; and, finally, some were persons well known for their interest and influence in urban affairs and prominent in the community, in voluntary work and in universities.

As this preliminary research was in process an application was forwarded through the Centre for Urban and Community Studies of the University to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. A research grant was later made under Part V of the National Housing Act to enable the proposed study to be continued, in the expectation that a substantial analysis of the new phenomenon would be forthcoming within three years. In 1969 the author assumed senior administrative duties within his university and, while the research continued actively for more than a year-and-a-half, the process of multiple responsibilities has delayed publication of this report until now.

In the meantime, by 1970 the process of urban renewal had been virtually stopped throughout Canada following publication of the Report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development in March 1969 (the Hellyer Report). Moreover, the creation of a Ministry of State for Urban Affairs shortly thereafter was not the occasion for the
resumption of the urban renewal programmes underway in many cities, including Toronto. The first Minister, Robert A Andras, expressed the view that the process of urban renewal required careful examination before the Government of Canada would resume neighbourhood improvement programmes. While some funds were made available to complete certain projects, scant resources were provided to continue with already planned operations in downtown Toronto.

The vast attention paid to citizen participation as a social phenomenon was not continued into the early 1970s and it appeared to this author that the subject had lost much of its impact on governmental and voluntary organizations. This proved not to be true and, as this report appears early in 1974, the entire matter of the appropriate role that citizens might or should play in neighbourhood improvement programmes (the 1972 and 1973 Amendments to the NHA have changed the former concept of urban renewal to that of Neighbourhood Improvement Programmes) has not been determined.

Although the data gathered in the years 1968-70 might appear to some readers to be out of date, they are qualitative data which continue to be relevant. Not only are the views, attitudes and responses gathered from intensive research interviewing in those years relevant to the new N.I.P. activity in Metropolitan Toronto, but this study should be particularly relevant to many other Canadian cities wherein urban renewal of the 1960s did not appear. The decision-makers of the 1970s are beginning to put forward proposals under master agreements reached by their respective provincial governments and the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs.

In the course of this research 19 students completed an individual research requirement for the degree of Master of Social Work. Two doctoral students served as teaching
assistants and one, Robert U. Doyle, submitted his dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Social Work on the theme of "Perceived Effectiveness of Community Development Organizations in Three Canadian Communities" (1972). From the point of view of the University of Toronto the research project has provided an additional "spin off" in full measure.

The author wishes to record his appreciation to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for its financial support; the Centre for Urban and Community Studies and the Office of Research Administration of the University of Toronto for administrative and supervisory assistance; Dr. Larry L. Lundy who served as the author's first research assistant and prepared a conceptual model for the second phase of the research, and wrote Chapters VII-X. I am also grateful to my secretary, Mrs. Gwen T. Collins, who has been as anxious as I have been to see the completion of this report.

University of Toronto
February 1st, 1974

Albert Rose, Ph.D., Dean
Principal Investigator
Faculty of Social Work
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These early experiments in the removal of slum conditions were paralleled in the United Kingdom where, in 1931, the National Government passed legislation requiring every urban borough to draw up a master plan for the removal of its slum housing within a period of five years. In Canada the first significant federal housing legislation, the Dominion Housing Act, was passed in 1935; the first United States Housing Act was passed in 1937.

All this legislation was designed to demonstrate that individuals and families would benefit both physically and emotionally from improved habitation. Moreover, it was firmly believed that "slum areas" were centres of infection in the urban fabric, not only because they recorded statistics of infectious diseases far exceeding those of more adequate neighbourhoods but because slum conditions could and would spread to other neighbourhoods in the central cities of rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.

The second social and economic trend which made the greatest impact in redefining public policy in urban affairs in both Western Europe and North America was the inexorable fact that the existing large- and medium-sized urban areas were quickly running out of land upon which to erect housing for a rapidly expanding population. Once the central city had become completely built up it was inevitable that new municipalities would develop on the fringes of older established urban areas. Thus the modern metropolis evolved and by the 1950s there was great concern throughout Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, France, and many other nations with respect to the deterioration of the heart or core of the central cities of these new metropolitan agglomerations.

Competition for the scarce land within the city increased and it was no longer a certainty that a substantial majority of the residents of any metropolis in Western industrial nations
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Chapter I

The Problem of Understanding and the Difficulty of Definition

For more than half-a-century it has been recognized that any important change in the urban environment would be staunchly defended by certain persons and groups and strongly resisted by others. As long as there appeared to be a good deal of land available for the continued expansion of housing stock within our towns and cities the concern over change in the form of redevelopment or renewal was relatively moderate. People did in fact live in the heart of urban centres—next to the gasworks, close by the steel mills, adjacent to the factories—and most people appeared to believe that this was the normal way of life.

Public and private concern over the shape and form of the urban environment changed radically as a consequence of many isolated events in various communities, but the principal change came as a result of two major socio-economic trends which shook our society to its foundations. In temporal sequence, the first major attempts at social change by means of alterations in urban living conditions in the United States and Canada came as a consequence of the depressed years following 1929. It was a basic tenet of the Roosevelt administration, which took office at the beginning of 1933, that poverty and environmental conditions were functionally related. The removal of uninhabitable dwelling places in the centre of major cities and the upgrading of a great many homes by renovation were integral parts of the New Deal legislation enacted during 1933-35.
of major legislation were designed to expand considerably the supply of public housing accommodation by comparison with the past, and to attempt to wrestle seriously with the problems of deterioration in urban centres.

The Problem of Understanding

Although the basic political, economic and social factors involved in the development of the modern metropolitan area were increasingly understandable to social scientists, public officials and elected representatives, the impact of these tendencies upon those directly affected was by no means comprehensible or acceptable. From the very first attempts at "slum clearance" there was some resistance, some questioning of the public or private activity involved, and of course a good deal of social disruption and heartache.

Despite the fact that many persons residing in the heart of the central cities were relatively mobile, the majority of the residents were long-established families who were often descendants of immigrants who came from other countries or who had migrated from rural to urban areas as long ago as the late nineteenth century. These families, who viewed the centre of the city as their home, objected strongly to the designation of "slum area" ascribed to their neighbourhoods and questioned not only the desirability of public policy but, more poignantly, wondered about their future. The original concepts of "slum clearance", therefore, included provisions for the rehousing of the residents of dwellings considered unfit for human habitation within the new public housing accommodation.

In the course of this process a great many tenant families became occupants of public housing accommodation but, at the same time, a substantial proportion of former homeowners lost their dwellings as a consequence of public urban renewal activity and became tenants for the first time in their lives. Their failure to understand the process which engulfed them and radically altered their way of life has been one of the most
would, in fact, reside within the borders of their central cities. After 1946 throughout North America hundreds of thousands of families who had the necessary resources began to move to the new fringe areas in search of open space, cleaner air, newer schools and generally better living conditions for their growing families. They left behind, for the most part, persons and families quite unlike themselves: the elderly, both single persons and couples; other single persons, both young and middle-aged, who were not members of established families. They left behind the poor families, families of minority groups, families who were the most recent arrivals in the central cities; and families who, by virtue of racial or other forms of discrimination, were prohibited from moving to newer districts whether or not they possessed or had access to the resources required.

It is in the light of these major social and economic changes of the past half-century that the overall problem of "urban renewal" emerged in our society and with it the very real question of the role that might or might not be played in this process by those who resided in the areas concerned. The changes were most likely to be physical: from older deteriorated dwellings to new public housing accommodation; or in the basic land use, that is, from residential to commercial or institutional use. In either case--and the number of variations on the theme is almost unlimited--the impact upon the residents of the area to be changed was potentially powerful.

In the view of social scientists these changes hit the most vulnerable people in our society: those with the least physical and emotional resources to withstand change or to adapt to it. It is in this context that the whole question of "citizen participation in urban renewal" emerged strongly in Canada following the 1949 amendments to the National Housing Act 1944; and in the United States with the National Housing Act of 1949. As these two nations entered the 1950s both pieces
replaced by some entirely different form of land use.

Under these circumstances it is not difficult to understand the gradual development during the 1950s of strong resistance to urban renewal programmes throughout North America. In 1954 the U.S. Housing Act was amended to incorporate a new title in which urban renewal was more clearly defined and more deliberately circumscribed with a set of procedures known as "The Workable Program". A great deal was learned from Canadian experience during the next decade but it was not until 1964 that the National Housing Act was amended so that Part III was clearly designated as "Urban Renewal".

A "workable program" was nothing more than a series of seven significant areas of concern requiring careful planning, careful attention and deliberate evidence before the Urban Renewal Administration would issue a certificate confirming that the community had observed all the specifications in its plans for renewal. Two of the most important areas of concern were simply described as "citizen participation" and "relocation". Those who sought to change the urban environment by deliberate public policy were ordered by a strong central government to pay particular attention to the social and physical needs of those directly affected. Moreover, such persons were to have an opportunity to "participate" in the process and, while such participation was not specifically defined, it was assumed that there would be groups within the areas designated for renewal who would take an interest, would put forward ideas, would discuss plans, and make the views of the residents known.

There is thus a significant problem in the lack of understanding not only on the part of an occasional resident of an area to be developed, or on the part of an occasional politician representing a particular area planned for urban renewal, but on the part of a great many interests within our urban communities. The objectives of urban renewal are not clear to those persons who must give way, as either owners or tenants, to the march of a process described to them as
significant considerations facing all public policy in the fields of housing and urban development during the past quarter-century. It is not unfair to suggest, however, that if there were a failure of understanding on the part of those who might be termed the "affected residents" there was an equal and perhaps more serious lack of understanding on the part of those whose responsibility it was to legislate and implement public social policy.

The objectives of "slum clearance", which soon became known as "urban redevelopment" and later as "urban renewal", were never clearly explained to those most directly affected. In some jurisdictions this was the consequence of faulty legislation which did not provide that careful explanation must be given and devoted attention must be paid to the social and economic requirements of those for whom urban renewal was not community improvement but personal disruption and even disaster.

In other jurisdictions, as in Ontario, The Planning Act did provide that planning boards must divulge their plans by holding public meetings in particular neighbourhoods in the community, but the frequency and manner in which these meetings would be held were not laid down in the legislation or in the Regulations. Moreover, there was no experience in the communication of complicated physical and social plans to large groups of persons for whom the technical terminology of the planning process could only be described as "fantastic jargon".

Finally, in certain jurisdictions there was no stipulation whatsoever, in legislation or elsewhere, that the plans of local governments or local governments in conjunction with provincial or state governments needed to be divulged, discussed and explained, or adjusted by virtue of communication with those most directly affected. In short, it was possible in certain political jurisdictions to announce, almost as the bulldozers arrived, that the physical landscape as it had existed for perhaps half-a-century or more was to be completely removed and
be replaced by residential accommodation for those persons who had previously resided within the deteriorated or deteriorating accommodation. Slum clearance evolved into "urban redevelopment", a concept which made it possible for the physical planner to visualize a different public or private land-use in those areas designated as inadequate and in need of major clearance and rebuilding.

In this conceptual evolution "urban renewal" becomes the most sophisticated and flexible of all the possibilities because it rules out no reasonably intelligent approach to a solution for a particular street, neighbourhood or community. In urban renewal planning, whether the protagonists be private developers or public authorities, or a combination of both, there is no hard and fast rule that existing land uses be perpetuated in the form of newer and clearly more adequate structures, as in the case of public housing. Rather, urban renewal might take the form of abandonment of a previously residential neighbourhood to commercial or light industrial uses.

As an alternative, urban renewal planning might take a form in which many existing commercial and some light industrial structures are retained. For instance, in the case of Alexandra Park in downtown Toronto some deteriorated housing structures were cleared and replaced by public housing accommodation. Street patterns are often changed and rationalized by the local municipal authority; parks and playgrounds are expanded and recreational facilities are introduced; new municipal parking facilities draw off privately-parked automobiles from residential streets; and a group of homes worth saving by virtue of improvement and rehabilitation undergo treatment.

A clear understanding of "citizen participation" is much harder to arrive at. To participate is to take part, but in what part of the process? Although many appointed and elected officials have argued that the residents have not merely the right but the responsibility to participate in the urban renewal
"progress" by persons who are clearly concerned with interests other than their own.

On the other hand, the developers—those whose business it is, either in private entrepreneurial activity or as public servants, to assemble land for development and plan its re-use—clearly fail to understand the views, feelings and attitudes of persons and families who are satisfied with their familiar housing accommodation; in the view of the developing authorities the buildings are deteriorated, harmful, and represent decay.

The Difficulty of Definition

Lack of understanding and a failure of diverse interests to comprehend a variety of points of view emphasize very sharply the problem of defining exactly what "urban renewal" is or may become. Urban renewal may be easier to define because it has been conceptualized as an evolutionary process and written directly into legislation in a number of countries.

The process of change, originally described as "slum clearance" whose history extends over nearly a century, has evolved into a multi-faceted approach to physical, economic and social change within urban communities. The significance of such change has been sharply pointed up by demographic projections which reveal that as many as two-thirds of the entire population of some 25 to 26 million persons in Canada by 1980 will live in some two dozen metropolitan communities, each with a central city of at least 100,000 population and adjacent to it a number of municipalities with populations sometimes exceeding that of the urban centre itself. In the United States the proportions are more significant and the number of metropolitan areas is, of course, larger.

Urban renewal is a multi-faceted attack upon the problems of urban degeneration and physical blight. For most public servants and affected residents "slum clearance" implied that an old, inadequate, deteriorated, often unsafe community would
activity led to a reconsideration of the manner in which "citizen participation" should occur.

The research upon which this study is based was concerned with the concept, "citizen participation in urban renewal". It must be acknowledged that "citizen participation" is not confined to the process of physical and social change but has expanded during the past ten or fifteen years in many directions—in such governmental fields as health, education, welfare, recreation, correctional services, and the like. In this report, however, the concern is more narrowly focussed, although the difficulty of definition has not been solved in any other aspect of our societal endeavours so that the authorities can draw upon appropriate experience within the process of physical and social change in urban communities.

The first conceptual dilemma is really the definition of a "citizen", a matter that will be analysed more fully in the following material. If, however, we confine ourselves for the moment to an acceptance of the view that "citizen participation in urban renewal" means activity on the part of persons and families affected by the process of physical change—devised by private entrepreneurs, public authorities, or both groups working together to achieve some apparently desirable community improvement—a basis for understanding begins to emerge.

Nevertheless, the problem of how participation shall take place and the form it shall take remain unsolved. Moreover, participation implies that certain points of view will be put forward to influence or modify the plans and programmes under development by those charged with the responsibility of conceptualization. But at what point should those with such responsibilities take into account the viewpoints of so-called "citizens"? Is a physical planner obliged to learn the point of view with respect to the future physical appearance of a particular neighbourhood held by each person who lives in an urban renewal neighbourhood? Should the public authorities, as represented by the staffs of the planning board or the development
planning of their future neighbourhood or community, it is extremely difficult to determine how such participation shall be accomplished and what form it should take.

In its original form "citizen participation" was felt to be served by the appointment of public representatives to those authorities assigned the responsibility for either the supervision or implementation of physical and social change. Within the first decade after the end of the Second World War a Planning Board, Planning Commission, Urban Renewal Authority, or an Urban Redevelopment Authority had been established in most North American communities as a consequence of provincial or state legislation. In Ontario The Planning Act 1946 laid down a series of guidelines whereby both urban and rural communities, and often municipalities acting jointly, could create a Planning Board, the composition, duties and responsibilities of which were specified in the legislation.

Although special planning legislation was not enacted in all such jurisdictions, the responsibilities were discernible within appropriate legislation, such as a Municipal Act or other legislation governing the administrative responsibilities of local governments. So-called "public-spirited citizens" served as members, often without remuneration, of such authorities as planning boards, urban renewal authorities, housing authorities, conservation authorities, and the like; and this was viewed by social scientists and by members of elected bodies as an appropriate way of introducing public or citizen participation into the process of change.

By the 1960s, however, this form of participation was clearly outdated. The attention paid to the plight of multi-problem families in the second half of the 1950s, the discovery that very significant proportions of the population of Western industrial nations remained in poverty at a time of their greatest affluence, the rise of new "grass roots" organizations—all these and many other forms of small group
Chapter II
A Conceptual Cost-Benefit Analysis

"Participation" is a value firmly maintained and defended by many social scientists and social workers. This is true not only in the meaning of "value" in its philosophical sense as "any object or quality desirable as a means or as an end in itself", but in the sociological sense, in which values are defined as "the ideals, customs, institutions, etc. of a society towards which the people of the group have an affective regard". Moreover, participation is held to be a "positive" value in that the person who participates in the political system, the educational system, or in the process of urban development is held to derive beneficial effects.

On the contrary, it has been argued that the non-participant, the individual who does not take much part in any of the varied aspects of physical, social and economic change surrounding his life, may become alienated from the society. Alienation implies detachment and disinterest in the circumstances surrounding the life of a person and his family and suggests not merely a protective detachment but a serious loss in living. Such loss is revealed in the feeling of powerlessness which grips an individual in such circumstances, that is, a view that he could do nothing to influence those factors which directly and fundamentally affect his living arrangements and his life style.

The concept of "citizen participation", therefore, should apply to every person in the society, and those benefits alleged as a consequence of such participation should be available to all. In the expanding urbanization of the mid-twentieth century the word "citizen" has tended to have a

---

department of whatever local governmental group is assigned responsibility, accept the views of small demonstrative militant groups to the exclusion of the viewpoints of others who do not wish to take part in organized activities?

How large a proportion of those who reside in a neighbourhood slated for urban renewal should be represented in any group before appointed or elected officials are required to pay attention? What role should violence or the threat of violence play in the process of citizen participation? Should the viewpoints put forward by militant groups which invade City Hall or undertake a sit-down within civic structures be accepted or rejected out of hand? These are merely some of the dilemmas which the process of citizen participation in urban renewal has occasioned during the past two decades. By no means have these dilemmas been resolved.
Emphasis by social scientists upon the significance of participation on the one hand and the relevance of so-called "opportunity theory" on the other was clearly reflected in the legislation enacted in the United States after 1960 in such fields as housing and urban development, and particularly in the "War on Poverty". In the housing field stringent importance was attached to the reality of citizen participation in urban renewal planning and implementation by the new administration elected in 1960. The United States' National Housing Act was amended but it was in the certification of the "Workable Program" that governmental pressure could be brought to bear upon local communities to translate theory into practice. The most significant piece of legislation, however, was the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, in which the United States Congress accepted in its Bill the concept of participation by specifying that public and private approaches to the elimination of poverty were to be carried out with "the maximum feasible participation of the poor".

The first urban renewal projects in a great many Canadian and American cities were inevitably to be located within an area described as "the Central Business District". Depending upon the geographic dimensions of the CBD in any particular urban centre, there was likely to be a quantity of relatively poor residential dwellings in one form or another within its boundaries. Renewal of the CBD was often a matter of life or death for the central cities in that it was considered to be a major restraint upon the further deterioration of the urban core and the removal of commercial and industrial enterprise to the rapidly expanding suburbs.

In these circumstances the residences of the poor had to go. In the United States this very often meant that the urban ghetto would be bulldozed; hence the phrase, which became current in the later 1950s, that "urban renewal equals Negro removal". In Canada this fundamental racial fact was
special or narrower meaning than could be judged from the root of the word itself. During the past 20 years a citizen has been more often defined as a resident of a particular neighbourhood, especially the resident of a neighbourhood in which redevelopment or renewal is scheduled to occur, rather than as any member of the society. This is an unusual phenomenon and must be kept in mind in any examination of the concept, "citizen participation in urban renewal".

The fact is that all members of the society, particularly the citizens of a democratic society, should take part in the development of their political institutions, social institutions, educational institutions; in short, in the development and redevelopment of their total environment as opposed to only their residential environment.

As the Western industrial society became urbanized and affluent after World War II, the discovery that poverty had persisted in significant measure brought forward many theoretical formulations, several of which incorporated the notion of "participation". The connection between poverty and participation was developed into an interesting piece of social theory. Poor people in an affluent society were allegedly in the condition of poverty in large measure because they were alienated, that is, divorced from the mainstream of social and economic development. Alienation in turn was said to be a consequence of many factors, including "non-participation".

The argument that poverty was a function of alienation and alienation was a function of lack of participation was made again and again during the 1960s. The affluent member of the society, however, whether he participated or not in the development of the system, had the opportunity to do so by virtue of his education, occupation, social class and his income. The poor, on the other hand, lacked all these requirements. Man's failure to participate, often described as simple apathy, could not only be considered a fatalistic acceptance of his lot but was more closely related to a lack
in the private sector the St. James Town development programme constitutes the largest concentration of apartment development within any metropolitan area. In Toronto a further significant dimension is that by the mid-1960s at least four additional neighbourhoods were under active consideration for urban renewal treatment, namely, Don Vale, Trefann Court, Sackville-Dermott, and a substantial neighbourhood immediately to the south of St. James Town.

Since the late 1950s there has developed in the Spadina Planning District (to the west of the CBD) the Alexandra Park Urban Redevelopment Project, one of the few examples in Canada of a real attempt to combine intergovernmental programmes and public and private activities in the renewal of a specific neighbourhood. As the redevelopment of Alexandra Park was under active consideration in the mid-1960s, the residents and shopkeepers in the substantial neighbourhood immediately to the north (known as the Kensington Market Area) felt simultaneously the impact of continued congestion and deterioration and a rapidly increasing population of newcomers.

There were elected and appointed officials who believed that the entire Kensington neighbourhood should be redeveloped along fairly traditional urban renewal guidelines, as in the Alexandra Park Project. This approach was unacceptable to a number of thoughtful and active leaders within the area, and during the second half of the 1960s a powerful citizens' organization emerged which would develop a new pattern of public-private relationship in urban renewal in downtown Toronto by the early 1970s. Thus, Toronto offered and still offers the major laboratory for the study of urban renewal in Canadian society.

It was for this reason in 1968 that the author and his students in the graduate School of Social Work at the University of Toronto proposed to the Centre for Urban and Community Studies at the University that the Central Mortgage
not of significance but it was true that by the late 1950s many deteriorated neighbourhoods within a mile or a mile-and-a-half of the CBD were largely occupied by newcomers to Canadian society--former residents of southern Europe and the British West Indies. Although the racial overtones were not so evident, the implication that the "last arrivals were the first to be removed" could not be neglected. A major case in point was the Alexandra Park Urban Redevelopment Project in downtown Toronto.

By the mid-1960s the new practitioners in community development in North America were strongly of the view that the residents of neighbourhoods under consideration for urban renewal should be encouraged to resist the alleged march of urban redevelopment and public housing programmes, and that they should be encouraged to participate in the redevelopment of their own neighbourhoods. The theory has already been explicated but it is a practice about which we know very little. It became one major objective of the research to be described and evaluated in this report to examine the early experience of citizen organization and participation in urban renewal within several neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto.

Toronto has the great advantage for the researcher in urban development in that a very substantial proportion of all slum clearance, urban redevelopment and urban renewal activity which has occurred in Canada during the past 25 years has taken place within the major Planning Districts in the City of Toronto. On the one hand the Don Planning District (to the east of the CBD and extending to the Don River and just beyond) encompasses most of the major urban renewal programmes of the 1950s and 1960s, including Regent Park North, Regent Park South, Moss Park, and Don Mount Court. Moreover,

2 Albert Rose, "The Crisis in Urban Renewal in Metropolitan Toronto" (Habitat, XI, May-June 1968, 2-8).

cities, primarily because they preferred to live close to
downtown and near the cultural and educational facilities
within the urban core. These persons (lawyers, architects,
planners, university teachers, and other professionals)
found it relatively easy to organize a citizens' organization
for the purpose of demanding a participatory role in the
physical and social development of their newly found
neighbourhoods. When this occurred, as in Don Vale and
Kensington (in Toronto), a very different form of practice
in participation emerged. The new professionals had the
great advantage of status, income and all the attributes
usually ascribed to the well-to-do or affluent members of
the urban society. It is a moot point whether the activities
of such groups can be regarded in the same light as those of
other groups composed of long-term and less affluent residents.
and Housing Corporation be approached to fund a research programme. To repeat, the theory was well developed and widely promulgated if not well understood. The practice was in the process of emergence, not well developed and not well understood. This research must be regarded, therefore, as an early attempt to examine reality and to draw some early conclusions from a variety of efforts to stimulate citizen participation in urban renewal.

The reality of practice, it must be understood, takes many forms. In some neighbourhoods of several Canadian cities various citizens' organizations emerged more or less spontaneously in response to proposals put forward in municipal councils. In others they emerged in response to rumours of urban development and change, and in response to apparent threats concerning the expropriation of their residential location for one or another public or private purpose. In still other neighbourhoods the new breed of community worker, with few if any resources, actually moved into and settled down as a resident of a specific neighbourhood for the purpose of motivating the residents to organize and to resist the proposals for urban renewal. This was particularly the case in Trefann Court in Toronto. 3

In a situation not unrelated to this technique, but on a much more sophisticated scale, new groups of community workers and "social animators" secured substantial funds for much the same purpose, that is, the organization and development of citizen participation. Perhaps the best known example was the Urban Social Redevelopment Project adjacent to the University Settlement area in downtown Montreal. 4

A further dimension in the structure of practice was the tendency of many professional persons to purchase homes and to reside in old deteriorated neighbourhoods in central

3 The reference is to the Toronto Community Union Project (T-CUP), 1967.
by 1943 a number of groups coalesced to form the Citizens' Housing and Planning Association whose efforts to obtain requisite legislation and public action were finally rewarded in the Regent Park North Project, approved by the electors in the City of Toronto on January 1st, 1947.

Similar organizational developments were discernible in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Montreal and Halifax. In fact, in all the major metropolitan areas citizens were involved in many organizations with a variety of objectives but with one major goal in common, namely, planned urban growth and improvement in the quality of living accommodation. The Vancouver Housing Association, for example, was in existence and influential in these fields of interest towards the end of the Second World War and thereafter.

The record has not been studied in sufficient detail to enable the author to do more than acknowledge the activity and ferment which were everywhere in this country throughout the 1930s and the years of the Second World War. It would be very helpful, indeed, if case studies were undertaken not merely by university students working for advanced degrees but by journalists who appear today to be caught up in the notion that citizen participation is a phenomenon of only the past five, six, or ten years.

It must be admitted that the citizens who were active in most of these organizations were persons whom sociologists would term middle- or upper-middle-class in social status. These persons participated in their local Boards of Trade or Chambers of Commerce, the local Community Chest, the Boards of Directors of voluntary charitable organizations, the governing bodies of churches, the Home and School or Parent-Teacher Associations, and the like. In many of the working-class or still poorer neighbourhoods the only institution close to the people was the church, and it was a case of the ministers and priests, the deaconesses and nuns ministering to the residents. There were no Home and School Associations
Chapter III

The Reality of Participation in Canadian Urban Renewal

It is simply not true that Canadians have failed to participate in the political process or in the design of the urban environment as it was formed within the second-quarter of the twentieth century. Not only were there ratepayers' associations in a great many neighbourhoods in most towns and cities, but before World War II there were movements espousing more adequate planning within the city and the elimination of those neighbourhoods of poorest housing and least amenities.

These organizations often took the form of citizens' research bureaus or other groups seeking the attainment of a planning board or housing authority within a city. In Toronto the Bureau of Municipal Research was founded as early as 1914. By the early 1920s there were many groups in the community agitating actively for the appointment of a planning organization to develop guidelines for the growth of the city, which had already reached more than half-a-million people. 5

During the decade of the 1930s (which is still written about as a period in which most people barely survived the rigours of economic depression) the agitation for better housing, for low-rental housing for low-income families, and for the elimination of slums and blighted areas continued apace in many communities. The record for the City of Toronto has been outlined in some detail by the author. 6 By the time war broke out in September 1939 there were nearly two decades of experience in efforts by citizens' organizations in Toronto to influence the growth and development of the urban environment. In 1942 Toronto had a City Planning Board and

5 Albert Rose, Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1958), pp. 35-60.

6 ibid., 46-60.
of blighted neighbourhoods was, in the minds of many people, akin to the eradication of a tumorous growth; and the treatment of the ills of the residents of such neighbourhoods as an infusion of "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" was both understandable and politically acceptable.

In the early experiments, notably the Regent Park North Project in east-central Toronto, there was little or no objection on the part of the residents, and certainly no formal residents' or citizens' organization, to raise the question of the "voice of the people" in the planning of the renewal programme and in the re-planning of the neighbourhood. There were a few newspaper stories to the effect that some residents within this neighbourhood (which measured approximately three city blocks from east to west by two city blocks from north to south—a total of 42.5 acres) were upset by the politicians' acceptance of the view that Regent Park North was "a slum". They objected to the designation of "slum dwellers", despite the social scientists' assurance that the slums make the slum dwellers, not vice versa.

As early as 1949 the author pressed the case for a tenants' association within the expanding Regent Park North public housing programme, but the official view of the Housing Authority of Toronto was negative. Members of the Citizens' Housing and Planning Association and the newly developed Community Planning Association of Toronto pressed for the inclusion of a tenant on the Board of the Housing Authority and for an active tenants' association to develop a variety of social, recreational and educational programmes.

---

7 It was estimated that 80%-85% of the dwellings were tenant-occupied. Cf. Rose, op. cit., p. 16, fn. 10.
8 ibid., pp. 3-11.
to guide residents in their participation in activities; charitable organizations sent their workers into these districts from the outside.

In downtown Toronto, which was the setting for the research described in this report, ratepayers' associations were also, to a substantial degree, class oriented. In most of the poorer neighbourhoods they rarely existed for the obvious reason that the residents were, for the most part, tenants not ratepayers. The latter were often absentee owners, estates, companies or trusts, and even hospitals and churches, administering their properties through appointed managers. In short, citizens in poor neighbourhoods were unorganized. To this extent the emphasis in recent years upon citizen participation, as representing the organization of individuals and families of low-income in poor neighbourhoods, is a fairly recent phenomenon. The evidence demonstrates that individuals and families in such neighbourhoods generally lacked either the skill or the motivation to organize, and to that extent the efforts of outsiders or self-appointed organizers were justified.

The history of urban renewal in Canada began with an emphasis on slum clearance. The concept of slum clearance, with its justification rooted in medical analogies, was both essential and acceptable at the time, specifically the late 1930s and the war years. The years of depression brought a widespread recognition that the disabilities of those least able to cope with economic problems in our society were compounded by the physical and social inadequacy of the housing in which they resided, as well as the gross lack of amenities within their neighbourhoods.

Unfortunately, it was quite clear that it would be politically impossible to mount programmes for the purpose of creating socially-assisted housing without coupling the objective of re-housing with a prior objective— that of slum clearance and neighbourhood rehabilitation. The eradication
housing may be erected on any site which proves to be appropriate within the zoning regulations for the municipality. In many Canadian municipalities these sites were found on vacant land and thus the housing project created little or no dislocation for existing or surrounding residential neighbourhoods. In the major urban centres, however, urban renewal must be distinguished from public housing per se in that urban renewal, by definition, involves the acquisition, clearance and redevelopment of all or part of existing built-up areas, which may or may not include residential development.

Dislocation is bound to be involved in an urban renewal project, although such dislocation may be the disruption of commercial and industrial activities rather than the removal of residences and the relocation of their inhabitants. In summary, urban renewal projects may very often involve public housing programmes as a part of the redevelopment, but public housing per se does not necessarily involve urban renewal.

In the years 1964-67 the Community Planning Branch of the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs published a significant exposition on urban renewal, including an analysis of the components of this process:

Considered very broadly, urban renewal may be described as the total of all public and private action which must be taken to provide for the sound maintenance of built-up urban areas or for their redevelopment, whichever produces the most desirable results--socially, physically, economically, and visually.

Urban renewal as a planned program to utilize all available development resources provides the opportunity for correcting some of the errors of the past, for preventing the repetition or continuation of these errors, and for providing an urban area where people may live, work and play within a physical and social environment specifically planned to meet these needs. Such a program requires at the very least, municipal initiative and encouragement, guidance, co-ordination, and direction of private activities and it often involves the carrying out of public works, sometimes combined with the acquisition, clearance, and redevelopment of privately-owned land.

---

10 Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs, Urban Renewal in Ontario (Toronto, 1964, p.3).
The demand for a tenant representative on the Authority was fended off with the defensible argument that in the legislation the members of the Authority must be ratepayers within the City of Toronto; since the residents of the project were tenants, they could not at the same time be ratepayers. The demand for a tenants' association was equally maintained at arm's length by the paternalistic introduction to the area of a variety of programmes under the auspices of the City Department of Parks and Recreation. At no time in the history of Regent Park did the Housing Authority of Toronto encourage or commit a role for the residents in the planning, development, management and administration of Canada's largest urban renewal project.

Paradoxically, Regent Park North not only became the exception that proves the rule but was the very rule itself. The Housing Authority of Toronto was unique in the sense that it included some elected representatives from the City Council as well as some private citizens; and, moreover, all these persons received an honorarium. The federal-provincial Housing Authorities that were created after 1950 in such centres as St. John's (Newfoundland), St. John (New Brunswick), Halifax, and in Metropolitan Toronto on December 1st, 1955, followed one major policy set by the Housing Authority of Toronto, namely, their membership (non-remunerated) excluded private citizens who were also tenants of public housing projects or residents of neighbourhoods to be redeveloped. It was not until 1970 that the Minister responsible for the affairs of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation announced that the federal government would encourage the appointment of tenants to the boards of local public housing authorities.

The City of Toronto became the site of several of the most important (in the sense of acreage, population and investment involved) urban renewal projects in Canada. The distinction between an urban renewal project and a public housing project must be emphasized at this point. Public
neighbourhood settlement house (St. Christopher House) to come together and discuss with planning officials the possible redevelopment of their area. The first such meeting occurred in October 1957 but it was not until 1963 that a public meeting was called to expand the process of community education and participation.

A substantial proportion of the prime movers were, in fact, owners of their own accommodation. The Alexandra Park Residents Association exercised a strong influence upon local councillors and Members of Parliament to create the kind of communication which would permit people in the urban renewal area to plan ahead for their own future, whether that be in continued commercial activity or in the location of alternative residential accommodation.

In Trefann Court (some three miles to the east of Alexandra Park) not one but several organizations sprang into being and the confusion that resulted was compounded by the movement into the area of a group of self-appointed advisors known as the Toronto Community Union Project. There have been for almost a decade in Trefann Court at least two and sometimes three organizations of residents distinguished in part by their status as tenants, homeowners, or businessmen. The difficulties of this neighbourhood (bounded by Parliament Street on the west, Shuter Street on the north, River Street on the east, and Queen Street on the south) were increased enormously by the failure of the residents to speak as one voice in negotiations with the Development Department of the City of Toronto, the members of City Council, and the staff of the City of Toronto Planning Board.

Moss Park was a very different situation in that the City of Toronto Planning Board treated the matter of participation in the traditional manner and apparently succeeded in a difficult urban renewal programme without undue stress. The traditional approaches to citizen participation were simply the publication of information concerning the
The lessons of Regent Park North were not forgotten when further redevelopment was mooted or planned for other neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto. Completion of the first major Canadian study of its kind in 1956 was followed by draft proposals by the City of Toronto Planning Board for both the Don and the Spadina areas. These neighbourhoods, particularly designated in studies of the Planning Board, included Alexandra Park (about one-and-a-half miles west of the CBD), Moss Park (about one mile east of the CBD), and Trefann Court (about one-and-a-half miles due east of the CBD).

These three neighbourhoods were judged to be most seriously deteriorated and thus most in need of redevelopment. Unfortunately each included a substantial number of low-income families in poor to very poor housing accommodation occupied for the most part at relatively low rents. Each neighbourhood also included a large number of small stores and other commercial facilities; and in at least two, Moss Park and Alexandra Park, there were substantial industrial operations in the food industry which would require purchase and relocation.

The approaches to citizen participation in these neighbourhoods (and in others that were soon added to the Planning Board's list) were very different. These differences were part of the curiosity which impelled the research described in this report. In Alexandra Park (geographically bounded by Bathurst Street on the west, Dundas Street on the north, Spadina Avenue on the east, and Queen Street on the south) a group of residents became sufficiently concerned by the late 1950s to respond to an invitation extended by the local


12 City of Toronto Planning Board, Redevelopment Study Area No. 1, and Redevelopment Study Area No. 2 (Toronto, 1957).
Chapter IV

Recent Advances in Knowledge and Theory

In the late 1960s, as the research programme was in the process of conceptualization, there was relatively little literature dealing with the nature and processes of citizen participation. Scott Greer, for example, devotes one chapter to the subject in a major study of urban renewal. There was already a plethora of books and articles on urban renewal--some favourable, some strongly critical of such programmes--but little or no research had been undertaken in that aspect of the entire process which sought to fulfil the requirement of participation by those affected in the course of the renewal programme.

During the past few years, however, several major contributions dealing with both theory and practice have appeared. One deals with citizens' movements in Canada and was the first known survey of such organizations, their goals, techniques, and their particular state at the time of the study in 1969. In February 1970 Mario Carota submitted his report to the Department of National Health and Welfare which had supported his research. This document is not widely known throughout the country although it contains the only authentic roster of citizens' organizations as of mid-1969. Carota found, on the basis of his definition of such organizations, a total of 215 groups of low-income citizens in Canada. Members of his research team interviewed 125 of these groups with the following

13 Scott Greer, Urban Renewal and American Cities (New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), pp. 35-64.
15 ibid., p. 6.
future of the neighbourhood, the distribution of such information
as widely as possible throughout the neighbourhood, and the
holding of various meetings, usually in elementary schools,
to acquaint the residents with the future of the area as
visualized by the planners. All these tactics were undertaken
by the City of Toronto Planning Board in the early 1960s and,
with the help of the Housing Authority of Toronto in relocating
the residents of the housing accommodation to be demolished,
the Moss Park project was achieved with apparently little
anguish and public criticism.

As the urban renewal programme expanded into Don Mount
Court (at the intersection of Queen Street and Broadview
Avenue), into the Don Vale neighbourhood (about half-a-mile
to the north of Regent Park North), and into the Kensington
Area (immediately to the north of Alexandra Park), a variety
of other approaches to participation developed, some as a
consequence of the experience of official agencies, others
as a consequence of the personalities who assumed leadership
in citizens' organizations.

It was the task of this research programme in "citizen
participation in urban renewal" to develop methods whereby
the elusive concept of "participation" could be studied. The
first and major difficulty, and one that has not been resolved
by this research, was the determination of the questions to
be posed for objective study and the development of methods
to collect data appropriate to these questions.
"Women's", "Indian", and "Urban Renewal". A number of those described as "Community Improvement" and "Tenants" were concerned with urban renewal, but those specifically described as "Urban Renewal" numbered only ten. In addition, a number of groups described as "Tenants" were concerned with matters which are either part and parcel of or associated with urban renewal programmes. Some of the "Community Improvement" groups had as a major goal the education of neighbourhood residents ("Citizens") and the strengthening of their capacity for participation.

This study is important, not only because of its recent vintage but because it was at the time the only known attempt to identify specific organizations among low-income groups in Canada. The Carota study contains a reasonable breakdown of so-called "actions" and "goals" as well as "services wanted" by the various groups. It also lists each organization along with the name and address of the chief executive or secretary. Since any roster of citizens' organizations, whether low income or not, must include a substantial number of groups interested in economic conditions, women's rights, child care and recreational facilities, and the like, the concern with urban renewal falls into proper perspective, namely, that it is just one of many major areas of change in a rapidly evolving urban society which are a focus of concern for persons who feel a substantial lack of power in their capacity to deal with these situations.

In Urban Affairs Quarterly (June 1970) Robert Aleshire presented a comprehensive analysis of citizen participation and the planning process from a cost-benefit point of view.19 He insisted that citizen participation and planning can and must have a complementary relationship but that, in the first instance, there is confusion about the very definitions themselves.

objectives:

To locate and identify as many citizen groups as possible that have a substantial participation by low income citizens.

To interview the leaders of the most active of the identified citizen groups.

To determine the kinds of services needed and desired by the citizen groups to help them do their work and achieve their objectives.

To observe the pattern, trends and characteristics arising from the creation, the activities and the goals of low-income citizen groups.

To determine whether or not the recent phenomenon of citizen group organization is a movement of significance. 16

The Carota study appears to be an excellent survey on a relatively superficial base. The report contains a modicum of appeal to emotion and a number of genuflexions in the direction of so-called "revolutionary movements". For example:

The birth of a movement resembles nothing so much as the coming of spring. Suddenly, spontaneously, everywhere the sap is rising, the trees and buds are swelling...Like Spring, the phenomenon of low income citizen group organization has suddenly blossomed forth spontaneously in cities across Canada. The majority of these groups have sprung up in the past year; and the rest, for the most part, are only a year or two older. 17

An examination of Carota's detailed roster of organizations indicates that, among the 125 interviewed, a very small group were classified by type as "urban renewal". 18 Carota and his associates described the various organizations by type as, for example, "Welfare", "Youth", "Community Improvement", "Tenants",

16 ibid., p. 6
17 ibid., p. 6
18 idem.
Citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizen presently excluded from the political and economic processes to be deliberately included in the future.21

The definition of planning is equally significant. Aleshire pointed out that planning can be seen as:

(1) A logical and continuing process of rational decision making based on an unbiased and genuine quest for unknown answers.

(2) An arena for issue-oriented intergroup combat in which the best answer is the view of the winning group or coalition of groups.

(3) A justification for decisions already made or implied by conditions or constraints.

(4) A process by which immediate pressure for action can be forestalled, until other participants in the decision-making process have time to act.22

The author admitted that none of these definitions or viewpoints for either the term "planning" or "citizen participation" is completely accurate by itself, but that the definitions reflect a range of opinions existing in the minds of participants in the community development process, whether consciously or subconsciously.

The first part of the major analysis by Aleshire deals with the costs and benefits of participation. On the one side the following propositions elucidate the "cost of participation":

Citizen participation in the planning process will extend the period required and will heighten the negative connotation of planning...Meaningful citizen participation requires time and effort and will increase the consumption of salaries, extend the time period involved, and may heighten the negative connotation of the planning process...


22 Aleshire, op. cit., p. 371.
The definition of "citizen participation", according to the author, depends largely on one's view of the citizen and his role in society. Aleshire indicated that there are at least five different viewpoints:

(1) The citizens of a community, given the opportunity to work together to arrive at a consensus, have the clearest and perhaps the only accurate perception of the needs and proper priorities for their community. Planners act merely as organizers and accumulators of resources to fulfill the needs of the community as expressed, and to provide the necessary information to the community decision makers as to the constraints, in terms of resources and regulations, within which they must plan. This view may include the right of the citizen to make a wrong decision, a privilege extended to most other decision makers.

(2) The citizen can contribute to the process of community development in a kind of "Uncle Tom" way. He can say "yes" or "no" to various proposals and can possibly contribute a few bright ideas, but he cannot make a significant or specific contribution to the process.

(3) The citizen must be analyzed, surveyed, psychoanalyzed, and interpreted with great hypnotic skill. The citizen does not really know what he wants or what he needs but he is able to mumble a few meaningful words which, when interpreted correctly by well-trained social scientists, will unlock the key to solving his problems.

(4) The citizen is a shotgun behind the door. The technician has the right to proceed in a scientific fashion and to assume that he is representing the best interests of the citizen unless he hears otherwise.

(5) Finally, there is the "elite" view. The citizen basically has nothing to contribute, else the problem would not exist. Community problem-solving is a scientific pursuit and is the prerogative of technicians.20

Arnstein, who developed a "ladder" of citizen participation, provided the following basic definition:

20 ibid., pp. 369-370.
technical assistance being provided. The level of training and technical assistance required initially is almost as much as is needed for planning itself, and is seldom provided...

Finally, the available choices in any situation are seldom clear or unilateral. Citizen participation may result in the development of clear decisions or demands which may be in conflict with current conditions...

In summary, citizen participation in planning does make the process more complex and more difficult, perhaps more costly and time consuming. It involves some conflicts and dilemmas which are not easily solved and with which few planners have sufficient insight or background to deal effectively. The planning process itself involves some factors which are not consistent with a thoroughly efficient planning model.21

Aleshire sums up the benefits of citizen participation in the process of city planning as follows:

The first and most basic benefit is that planning should not be done without participation, as a matter of political right in a democratic society...[it] strengthens and helps to preserve the democratic process...

A second benefit...is that it represents a check and balance against the idealistic or the technocratic theorist...it is not possible to separate planning and decision-making...citizen participation provides a most appropriate and necessary check against the well-reasoned power of technicians or professionals which may produce irrelevant and unresponsive action.

The third benefit is that participation provides a forum for the exchange of priorities. Each citizen or group of citizens brings to the planning process a different mix of priorities. Participation in the planning process provides the opportunity for consultation among the groups...A meaningful citizen participation process should seek to resolve such conflicts among citizens. The planning process provides that kind of forum.

A fifth benefit is leadership development. As the process of planning and community development grows more technical,
Second, participation is in a way the antithesis of administrative efficiency. A theoretically efficient administrative model would include a decision-making process involving as few people as possible to allow decisions to be made quickly. The cost-benefit viewpoint of analysis would require that costs be kept as low as possible...

Third, participation in the planning process arouses the expectations of the citizens involved...If resources for implementation are not available, the frustration of all those involved rises.

Fourth, participation in planning raises the question of whether decision-making should be the result of rational reasoning and factual research or the end consensus product of intergroup pressure. Citizen groups bring to a planning process, problems and priorities that are often hard to quantify...

Fifth, participation raises the difficult question of defining who is the "citizen"...The planner must decide whether to try to serve all of the citizens, recognizing their conflicting viewpoints, or whether to play one viewpoint against another and serve that viewpoint which survives intergroup combat. The leadership of the citizens may change frequently and citizen leaders may... have their own individual agenda which are not consistently based on the interests of many or all of the residents of the area involved...Poor people probably do the least planning of any segment of our society...Asking poor people to participate in a planning process, which in itself implies delayed action, is somewhat contradictory...

The sixth cost of participation is representation of the unrepresented. This includes representation of the metropolitanwide interests of neighborhood planning, planning for future as well as present residents...and planning for future conditions versus the present...

A seventh cost or dilemma of citizen participation is that planning must and should precede action, although action is necessary to secure the interest of citizens and thus support their participation. Planning is unreal action. The involvement of citizens in something which is not real is, at best, very difficult to achieve...

An eighth cost of participation is that it requires sustained training, information, and technical assistance which the residents will accept and believe in. Blind confrontation between citizens and technicians is sometimes caused by lack of knowledge or faith in the training and
In summary,

One end product of this participation is that citizens gain a new understanding of community interrelationships... As data and information about a given neighborhood or a given problem are more widely shared and the interrelationships of problems are seen more clearly, the mutual interests of groups in the neighborhood emerge to form the basis of alliances which increase the power of citizens and their ability to influence institutions of society. Building the ability to make decisions is an extremely important process... To encourage constructive reform, the citizen must gain an understanding and thus an educated frustration about the operation of the system. If he does not understand the system's problems, he may become completely disillusioned and decide that reform is not possible or, alternatively that it is unimportant. 25

A third major contribution to the scant literature was published by the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science (Washington) in 1968. This publication consists of a series of articles on many facets of social policy in the American society; 26 Professor Spiegel's own contribution is entitled, "The Many Faces of Citizen Participation: A Bibliographic Review". 27 The most important consideration of this publication is that the Center of Community Affairs of the NTL Institute believed that the subject of citizen participation in "its many faces" was worthy of a full-scale book, which was given wide circulation in the United States by virtue of its paperback format and low price. It can be argued that it marked the full acceptance of the concept of citizen participation by reputable American educational authorities. It was followed by a second volume on "Cases and Programs". 28

27 ibid., pp. 3-17.
there must be leaders who can bridge the gap between the
citizen and the technocrat. These leaders must be
indigenous and must be developed in a continuing fashion.
Participation in the planning process provides the
opportunity as well as the necessity to develop such a
cadre of leaders...

Sixth, citizen participation frequently serves the role of
either taking the heat off hot issues or making cold ones
hot...Citizen participation engendered by [certain] issues
can demonstrate that community attitudes have changed, or
that there is support for what is felt to be a politically
infeasible or unpopular idea...

Seventh, citizen participation in planning should support
the movement toward issue politics both in general and
within political parties. Citizens learn more about the
intricacies of problems and gain the information they
require to deal with those problems. The necessity of
politicians discussing community development issues and
problems increases. There should be little debate that
the movement from personality to issue politics is a
desirable trend...

Eighth, citizen participation plays a kind of iconoclastic
role. Technocrats or political decision makers frequently
operate on the basis of...long-standing assumptions about
people's desires or about the root cause of problems. A
meaningful participation process can identify the flaws in
such reasoning and assumptions. It may destroy paternal­
istic assumptions about the desires of citizens or
scientific conclusions about the root cause of problems...

Ninth, citizen participation in planning can also help to
unite the physical and social planning structures...The
citizen enters the planning process with little knowledge
of, or respect for, the proper boundary lines of the health,
education, or physical planning constituencies. His life
is an integrated process and he does not carefully
distinguish where the duties of social workers cease and
the duties of guidance counselors begin. He expects an
integrated response from the institutions of society...
If the citizen puts demands upon the entire system, the
entire system should be forced to respond and, in the
process, integrate the constituencies and weaken, or even
destroy, the various planning enclaves."

ibid., pp. 375-379.
Robert Dahl\(^3\)\(^1\), were ostensibly concerned with the development of local government and local politics; inevitably they turned their attention to the concept of "citizen participation". Similarly, the sociologists and economists (for example, Herbert J. Gans\(^3\)\(^2\) and Jane Jacobs\(^3\)\(^3\)) were fundamentally concerned with the nature of the urban society and the sociopolitical requirements of social change; inevitably they turned their attention to the concept of "citizen participation". In the specifics of the concerns of these writers and many others the process of urban renewal provided illustrations of political and social activity which always required a fundamental examination of the participation of affected individuals or families within neighbourhoods or entire cities.

Dahl's examination of New Haven is an excellent case in point. Gans' study of the change in social conditions and dislocation of an Italian-American neighbourhood in Boston, and Jane Jacobs' concern with the quality of life in American cities as well as her focus upon major arterial expressways as the nadir of urban despair—all these studies involved very close attention to the participation of people in attempts to resist or influence the changes that were impinging upon their families, their traditional neighbourhoods, and their culturally-influenced attitudes towards the process of political, economic and social change.

The examination by social workers, social work educators and social scientists of the programmes initiated by governments


The objective of these publications was public awareness and understanding of a notion that is difficult for many people to accept, namely, the idea that "ordinary people" have potentially a substantial contribution to make in planning the neighbourhoods in which they reside, in developing social programmes provided by senior levels of government to assist the economically disadvantaged, and the potentiality of such persons for involvement in decision-making within their own communities of residence and the large urban communities of which they are a part.

Spiegel argues that no other issue is as vital to the solving of the so-called "urban crisis" as the viable participation by urban residents in planning the neighbourhoods and cities in which they live and the social programmes which directly affect them. His fundamental thesis is clear from the following:

It is difficult to rank the various ingredients making for competent urban communities. A strong case could be made, however, that citizen participation, even more so than housing subsidies, new jobs, or rat control, is basic to helping people tackle a variety of community and individual problems. Citizen participation is the process than can meaningfully tie programmes to people.29

The contributors in Spiegel's conceptual volume are drawn from a variety of disciplines within the social sciences and from other groups in the urban society. It becomes quite clear that there has been so much overlap in the conceptualization of participation among the many fields of public and private concern that, in fact, the literature on citizen participation could easily be expanded greatly. The political scientists in the 1960s (for example, James Q. Wilson and

29 Hans Spiegel, op. cit., volume II, "Introduction".
speeches of senior governmental ministers urging public attention to the whole matter and, in fact, enunciating new government policy. In the second place there have been a number of government documents published, some of which are specific statements of policy; others have been documents for study and consideration, some exploratory, some little more than linear exhortations for consideration by bureaucrats at various levels in various departments. There have also been a number of "case studies" in which the actual process of participation in neighbourhood planning—community development for the specifics of urban renewal—has been examined; these often form the basis of an exhortative narrative. Within the academic literature there have been a few publications designed to acquaint university students and other interested readers with the fundamentals of participation in the political, economic and social processes evolving in Canada; such publications take the form of collections of readings, newspaper reports and government documents. Finally, there are new directories of agencies and lists of resources available to citizens' groups.

The one strong thread which runs through all these literary efforts is the notion of exhortation. Most speeches, most documents and work papers, and most case studies have been, if not biased then at least laudatory of "citizen participation". There is, in a word, no anti-participation literature, although the occasional local councillor or member of the provincial parliament has spoken out against the alleged activities of leaders of citizens' groups, the activities of certain coalitions of citizens' groups, or with respect to a specific demonstration designed to influence the course of local, provincial or federal legislation.

Policy Statements by Ministers of Government: Major addresses by two powerful politicians in the governments of Ontario and Canada were delivered coincidentally in April 1970. On April 24 the Honourable Robert Welch, then Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship for Ontario, spoke to
and community action agencies in the United States after 1964 were further illustrations of fundamental concern with "participation". The best example is the work of Marris and Rein in which these social scientists and social work educators (British and American respectively) evaluated the nature and consequences of a large number of community action programmes in several American cities. They inevitably focused on the implementation of Congress's requirement that there should be "maximum, feasible participation of the poor" in such programmes. Marris and Rein were not impressed with the manner in which this legislative stricture had been worked out and the epitome of the critical argument is well illustrated in the title of Daniel Moynihan's book published in 1969.

A Spate of Literary Exhortation 1969-1973

If the American and Canadian literature dealing with citizen participation in urban renewal was, indeed, sparse during the 1960s (with due regard to the previous argument that a great many writers on related themes did touch upon the basic concerns of this report), it is certainly true that during the past four years a great deal of literary attention has been paid to the major theme. I shall devote my attention primarily to Ontario and the vistas of Metropolitan Toronto; it would be quite possible, however, to find an extensive list of government documents, publications assisted by government funding, and "straight" literary efforts dealing with other cities and other provinces in Canada.

The new literature on citizen participation has taken many distinct forms. There are, in the first place, the

---


strike, and demonstration have become powerful communication tools. And our new rapid communication systems such as television, jet aircraft, computers, and the modern media, have in many ways decentralized political debate, have informed increasingly greater numbers of people about the central issues of the day, and have enabled more people than ever before to become involved in national, provincial and local concerns.  

The Minister gave his definition of community development as follows:

In theory, community development is a process by which individuals are encouraged and assisted to identify the concerns of their own community; to work together in articulating their own goals and priorities; to choose a course of action; and to set about solving their problems, either directly or by communicating with government and other agencies in a co-operative process of development and growth.  

He had previously argued that he saw citizen participation essentially as a local group effort concerned with neighbourhood development. In his view

...while it may be difficult for many citizens to understand the structure of municipal government, to appreciate fully developments in education, to comprehend the intricacies of our economy, and to become involved in a meaningful way in all national issues, one aspect of their lives to which they can still relate—which is visible to them and to which they feel they belong—is their own neighbourhood.  

This argument emphasizes that governments in the past have failed to respond adequately to local needs and have not given a high enough priority to neighbourhood concerns. The Minister felt that this was changing and that his government recognized the importance of encouraging a feeling of "neighbourhood identification".

At about the same time Robert Andras enunciated for the first time the willingness of the government of Canada to encourage the development and concern of local citizens'
the first Ontario Provincial-Municipal Conference on the subject of "Citizen Participation in Community Development". Two weeks earlier the Honourable Robert Andras, Minister of State for Urban Affairs and responsible for federal housing policies, delivered a major policy address in the House of Commons on his approach to broadening the involvement of citizens in the development of urban communities.

Robert Welch has gone on to become the first Policy Minister for Social Development, created as a consequence of the reorganization of Ontario government departments recommended by the Committee on Government Productivity (COGP). In his new capacity Robert Welch is the Policy Minister through whom the Ministries of Community and Social Services, Colleges and Universities, Education, and Health are co-ordinated. In Ottawa Robert Andras is currently Minister of Manpower but he was the senior person in the Liberal Party assigned to manage the campaign election of October 1972.

In his first address Robert Welch gave a clear indication of the developing policy of his government when he said:

The individual citizen's problems in understanding government structures, frustrations when encountering government organizations, and feelings of powerlessness when confronting bureaucracies with a specific concern, are only too easily understood. But while many of us may have come to accept these problems as an unfortunate disadvantage of large organizations, there is evidence that some segments of the population have begun to develop new and improved channels of communication so that they may more effectively participate in their governments.

We have in the past few years witnessed the birth of strong citizen groups. The protest march, sit-down

---

36 Robert Welch, "Citizen Participation in Community Development", an address to the First Ontario Provincial-Municipal Conference, Toronto, April 24, 1970

37 A Statement on Public Housing Program by the Honourable Robert K. Andras, Minister Responsible for Housing, to the House of Commons, April 21, 1970.
and Responsibility. This thrust on the part of a provincial department (which has now been integrated within the new Policy Ministry known as Treasury, Economics and Intergovernment Affairs) was the result of several years of effort to encourage the orderly development of urban renewal schemes in communities throughout the province; notably, Sudbury, Kingston, Sault St. Marie, and the Alexandra Park Community Improvement Programme in Toronto. Moreover, in an election address in his riding of Spadina (in which both Alexandra Park and the Kensington Market area are located) Allan Grossman enunciated the principle that, as far as he understood the policy of the government of Ontario, no further urban renewal schemes would be approved without the direct participation and apparent approval of citizens' organizations.

The Department's report, which became the formal policy guideline, explored in relatively brief format the three concepts: Renewal, Representation, and Responsibility. It emphasized that renewal inevitably touches upon the livelihoods of people, their feelings, hopes and desires. This first "R" is summed up in the following paragraph:

Meeting with, listening to and making use of the ideas of the people who live and work in renewal areas has become an indispensable requirement to the success of urban renewal plans. It is also a major policy requirement that has to be met before financial aid from the provincial or federal government is granted.42

The statement goes on to indicate, however, that there is no one set pattern of involving citizens but, regardless of diversification, two guiding principles stand out: adequate comprehensive representation, and responsible thought and action by both citizens and municipal agencies alike.

On the question of "Representation", the statement emphasizes that the representation of one vocal interest group in a community does not make for comprehensive citizen involvement.

42 op. cit., p. 2
groups in the whole process of urban development. In his address of April 1970 he announced the willingness of his Ministry, through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, to fund citizens' groups on a per capita (membership) per annum basis. He made particular reference to groups formed to enhance the quality of life in already existing neighbourhoods in which there was a significant component of public housing accommodation and in areas already designated by the federal and provincial governments as urban renewal sites within specific cities in Canada.

Unfortunately Mr. Andras had not fully consulted, if at all, the major organizations in the various provinces (such as the Ontario Housing Corporation) with respect to their views of his new policies. This became a matter of great importance during the next two years, since the government of Canada had offered to provide funds if the respective provincial governments supported such expenditures on a fifty-fifty basis. Since the provinces had not been consulted and had no opportunity to weigh the implications of such policies with respect to their public housing communities, there was little support for the Minister's proposal. Nevertheless, it was obvious by the middle of 1970 that the federal government and certain provincial governments were prepared to support the concept of citizen participation in urban renewal, and defined this very broadly to encompass the notion of community development, the retention of neighbourhood identity, and a variety of related concepts.

**Governmental Publications and Documents for Study:** Seven years before, in the former Department of Municipal Affairs of the Province of Ontario, the Community Planning Branch had prepared a guide to "citizen participation in urban renewal" through a careful formulation of what is called "The Three R's of Citizen Participation"\(^1\), namely, Renewal, Representation

institutions, business associations, social welfare agencies, ethnic agencies and others. These groups can help immensely in providing information, promoting and organizing participation, and in helping the citizen understand his role and responsibilities.

5. Working with citizens affected by renewal action will never be an easy process. Hostility and suspicion must be anticipated. Unskilled renewal staff, misinformed and misdirected local opposition, patronizing and unsympathetic civic officials will alienate residents, frustrate and abort projects to the detriment of all--citizens, community and province alike.

6. It must be appreciated that the opinions and attitudes of people living in areas identified for renewal action will often differ drastically from those of the planner, elected representative and community worker. This is chiefly a matter of outlook and orientation. The planner is goal oriented and has the responsibility of considering the wider community and the needs of the municipality at large. The citizen is understandably more concerned about the local area and his own future. Yet the knowledge of residents about their environment is indispensable to the success of the urban renewal program. Their views must be solicited and respected.44

It is not known what effect this guide has had in the implementation of urban renewal schemes in Ontario, because all urban renewal funding was frozen by the government of Canada with the appointment of a Task Force on Housing and Urban Development in September 1968. After the Report of the Task Force was presented to the Cabinet in the spring of 1969, and was to a substantial degree considered unacceptable, the revival of outstanding urban renewal programmes was not immediate. In fact, the first Minister of State for Urban Affairs, the Honourable Robert Andras, was extremely cautious in moving forward with such programmes. It was not until well into 1971 that the government of Canada gave assurance to various provincial governments, including Ontario, that it would favour the facilitation of certain long-term programmes.

44 op. cit., p. 7
participation. Nevertheless, the nature of representation will vary from community to community and from area to area, but comprehensive representation from the various interest groups in a community and an area must be presented. The essence of the second "R" is:

Representation may take the form of committees, open forums, personal interviews, the submission of written comment or any combination of these. Churches, neighbourhood agencies, service clubs, retail merchant associations and ethnic organizations are a few examples of the interest groups that make up a cross section of local opinion or can provide shape and direction to local action.43

"Responsibility" is defined as accountability for certain actions taken; it must be displayed by those who are charged with the planning and those who receive the benefits. The report emphasizes that there are likely to be put forward as many solutions to urban renewal problems as there are groups or even individuals interested in the future of a particular neighbourhood or community. Ultimately six basic suggestions are presented:

1. Citizen participation is only meaningful if the views of the citizen are heard. The sense of responsibility and involvement must be continuous through all stages of the urban renewal process.

2. An early start, preferably during the study stage, is essential to establish a feeling of good faith with residents and a sound base for communication. Where this is not done, backtracking is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

3. Once an area has been identified for detailed planning, the establishment of a site office actively staffed by personnel skilled in human relations and community organization is essential.

4. While no program can expect 100 per cent participation, every effort must be made to involve as many people as possible. In addition to individual contact, the majority attitudes of residents can be gleaned from contacts with area organizations such as religious

43 op. cit., p. 4.
all levels of government, among the leadership and even the rank and file of citizens' groups, and certainly for use by students interested in social studies without the degree of conceptualization required at the post-graduate level. Moreover, the document was based not only upon the efforts of four persons commissioned to prepare background papers but represents the conclusions of a selected group of participants in a seminar on citizen involvement sponsored by the COGP at the close of 1971.

Citizen Involvement in some ways resembles the arguments put forward by Robert Aleshire (cited previously) in terms of a cost-benefit analysis. The arguments, however, are expressed more simply and are illustrated by municipal and provincial experience, particularly in the field of urban renewal. Although the "Working Paper" is specifically intended to go far beyond the process of urban development, the illustrations derived from "the municipal level" are taken from the Trefann Court and the Kensington area efforts in downtown Toronto.

The provincial level illustrations from Ontario (the establishment of the Community Development Branch, now located in the new Ministry of Community and Social Services), from Nova Scotia (the creation of a Metropolitan Area Planning Communications Network in the Halifax-Dartmouth area), from Manitoba (the reorganization of Metropolitan Winnipeg with the establishment of 13 community committees) are intended to indicate the breadth of Canadian interest in participation.

The report goes so far as to argue that in the new programmes of the federal government known as Opportunities for Youth and the Local Initiatives Programme there are emerging new relationships between governments and citizens which have the effect of encouraging participation and decision-making—an argument that cannot be denied when it is recognized that such programmes do transfer the matter of employment choices and lifestyles to certain self-selected groups.
In particular, the scheme known as Trefann Court in Toronto appeared to be in favour by the latter part of 1971, perhaps because of the nature and quality of citizen participation in the area.

The next phase in Ontario was reached with the publication in April 1972 of a document entitled *Citizen Involvement*, a working paper prepared for the Committee on Government Productivity. The COGP had already announced its proposal for the reform of the departmental system within the province, and the government was in the process of organizing four policy ministries which, in fact, came into operation following the election of October 1972.

The proposals of COGP did mean, however, that the former Department of Municipal Affairs would disappear and be incorporated within the policy ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. "Intergovernmental Affairs" apparently refers not only to the relationships (in such fields as economics and urban affairs) between the government of Ontario and the federal government and the governments of the other nine provinces, but also to such relationships between the government of Ontario and approximately 900 municipal governments within its jurisdiction. The disappearance of the Department of Municipal Affairs has, nevertheless, left a substantial vacuum in the areas of planning and urban renewal in Ontario. It is assumed that the working paper, *Citizen Involvement*, is the logical expansion of the policies under development within municipal affairs in the late 1960s.

This publication is the most comprehensive and readable of all the documents issued by any Canadian government in recent years on the subject of what it calls "The Citizen Participation Phenomenon". Clearly the document was intended for wide circulation among appointed and elected officials at
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The COGP has published for wider public understanding one of the most satisfactory expositions of the background factors, described as "pressures generating demands for participation", as well as the pros and cons of discouraging and encouraging participation. The reasons given for discouraging participation constitute a brief resume of Aleshire's analysis of the costs involved; whereas the reasons for encouraging participation are the familiar analyses of "benefits" which many writers in the fields of political philosophy, sociology and social welfare have espoused for several decades.

In one critical analytical respect, however, Citizen Involvement does attempt to complete the circle of argument by turning one major objection into a positive reaction. In most of the thoughtful analyses of citizen participation a major negative in the process is said to be the potentially damaging effect of participation upon decision-making in government. As government has become more complex and as new trends in public administration have emphasized the crucial importance of powerful analytical and technological capabilities, it is argued that the decision-making process will experience qualitative improvement and a significant increase in effectiveness. As the report emphasizes, the normative thrust is unmistakable: efficiency, rationality, comprehensiveness, control, planning, anticipation.\(^{46}\) It has been argued that the exercise of these approaches may be incompatible with any meaningful participatory process of decision-making.

This traditional view was strongly challenged in a paper written for the COGP by Professor Frederick Thayer who argued that while participation may slow down decision-making processes, may add to the overall cost and design of implementation, and may introduce a host of irrelevant factors, it may do precisely the opposite. Thayer's view is that decisions

\(^{46}\) op.cit., pp. 18-19
which involve costly consequences not foreseen in advance are likely to be the least efficient in the medium and long term. His view is that there can be no better way of discovering unforeseen consequences than by involving in the decision-making processes those likely to be affected by them. Decisions will be slower but can be more economical over the long term; in other words, participation may be cost-effective through cost-avoidance.47

Despite the seemingly neutral position of the Committee on Government Productivity, this neutrality is dissipated in the second half of the report. Under the heading "Our Position" the writers indicate three major conclusions:

First, governments should realize that not all forms of participation are desirable, and should avoid promoting those likely to have negative results. Hence, we accept many of the arguments on the potentially negative aspects of participation raised in part one of this section...Second, governments should devote considerably more resources to planning and implementing ways of actively encouraging positive forms of citizen involvement in their decision making processes...our third conclusion is that any approach to implementing mechanisms for citizen involvement should be continuously exploratory. The stress should be on process and flexibility, rather than on structures and uniformity. With this experimental approach must come a willingness to admit that some experiments do not work and to abandon them.48

The report goes on to refute some of the arguments against citizen participation raised in the earlier part of the report. Moreover, Section Four lists seven suggestions which a provincial government might consider to encourage the development of positive forms of participation. What began as a "Working Paper" for the purposes of general education of the public, including those elected and appointed to governmental office, the document becomes another plea (although more understandable and more rational in its

47 op. cit., p. 25
48 ibid., pp. 26-27.
The final document to be noted in this exposition of governmental publications was prepared by Francis Bregha, Professor of Social Work at the University of Toronto, for the Community Development Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. This report by an academic whose field is community development is not only the most scholarly of the government reports available in Ontario but clearly the most difficult in terms of conceptual framework and language. The document was obviously designed for senior civil servants and middle management, and surely could not have been intended for the general public, whether this be defined as the clients of the Ministry or social workers with whom the Ministry is regularly in contact.

The historical introduction to this tightly packed monograph is very much like those previously analysed. The author makes no pretense in breaking new ground in historical analysis and invites the knowledgeable reader to move immediately to his chapters on "Participatory Techniques" and "The Process of Participation". Nevertheless, Bregha's contribution first divides government's activities and responsibilities into two sets: (a) Policy Formulation and Planning, (b) Administration and Programme Implementation (that is, delivery of services). The report assumes that the various techniques at the disposition of government for encouraging participation can be broadly grouped into four categories:

(a) Information and feed-back;
(b) Consultation;
(c) Joint planning;
(d) Delegated authority.

Bregha's major contribution to the emerging literature in Canada consists of several graphic presentations in which he cross-classifies the two sets of governmental activities and

50 Francis Bregha, Public Participation in Planning, Policy and Program (Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1973, undated).
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presentation of alternatives) for increased citizen participation as a significant value in a liberal democratic society.

In the course of this shift from neutrality to exhortation, citizen involvement becomes entangled in certain contradictory arguments. The report states:

Reaching the "man at the bottom" will not be easy. One answer may be the use of task forces or parliamentary committees which meet directly with citizens. Advisory committees may be another such device. Perhaps we should also examine the option of providing resources to groups of disadvantaged people, so that they can hire experts to help them understand the implications of a proposal and suggest comments and possible changes.

This is an extremely interesting argument in view of the fact that the first two-thirds of the document contain many references to the clear and relatively biased "value systems" which, in the view of the writers of the report, planners, experts of all types, and academics must inevitably hold.

Nevertheless, it is proposed that so-called "disadvantaged people" should be provided with the resources to hire experts of their own. In some curious way there are obviously biased experts who make value judgments which are anti-citizen and anti-participatory; and there is a group available for hire which consists of unbiased experts who either do not hold or express value judgments at all or express value judgments that are positive, acceptable and to the benefit of people rather than for their alleged future discontent.

It is also noteworthy that the COGP published four background papers touching upon "participation" within the political system and between citizens and their governments; these papers were specifically commissioned for public discussion. They are little known and yet they may have played an important part in influencing the development and expansion of public policy in Ontario during the past two or three years.

49 ibid., p. 35.
one hand and services on the other. The term "environment" is clearly used to describe the overall framework in which formulation and planning as well as programme implementation take place; while the term "service" is used as it is customarily understood in the phrase, "delivery of services". Following these tabular presentations the report devotes a substantial chapter to the four major participatory techniques stating the pros and cons, and the benefits and costs involved in governmental utilization of each.

As Dr. Bregha indicates, the more sophisticated or experienced consumer of his "manual" finds most interest in the last two chapters, "The Process of Participation" and "A Participation Policy". The report is oriented strongly towards conceptual analysis and is a sophisticated presentation of the essentials of governmental attention to the process of citizen involvement. As such, it has presumably received careful attention from senior governmental officials in the Ministry of Community and Social Services, but as far as the literature is concerned it must be classified as an academic exercise in the best sense of that term.

Case Studies: At the time of the emergence of increased public interest in the citizen participation phenomenon there was coincidentally, and certainly in Metropolitan Toronto, the emergence of a new publishing industry. A number of new firms sprang up for the express purpose of publishing what might be described as "a radical literature" in the area of urban affairs and urban development. It is not surprising, therefore, that there has already been published a number of books--many in the quick paperback editions like the Nowlans' *The Bad Trip* which purports to describe the horrors of the Spadina Expressway as it was conceived before its formal termination by the Premier of Ontario)--as well as a series of

---

responsibilities with five aspects within the process of participation, and presents these cross-classifications as a beginning in two tables which show polar positions. The first table seeks to depict the situation of governmental experience with the non-participatory approach in both policy formulation and the implementation of programme. He illustrates the type of activity, degree of understanding among citizens, the time and resources required in the two sets of activities, certain political aspects, and finally comments upon effectiveness.

The second table presents the same cross-classification in which a participatory approach by government is assumed. These two graphic presentations are helpful in presenting the stark positions of theoreticians and, in effect, they could be described as a "black and white approach". In the non-participatory approach all the material presented by the author is within a picture of inadequacy, dilatory planning, poor or unpopular political aspects, and little or no effectiveness. The impression is conveyed that the participatory approach reverses substantially all these negatives and what emerges is a government which, in the colloquial sense, "comes up smelling of roses". Clearly, Bregha does not expect the reader to accept the extreme positions but presents what amounts to the two termini of a linear distribution.

In summary, the author presents a third table entitled "Applicability of Participatory Techniques", in which he turns to the four previously indicated techniques at the disposal of government (information and feedback, consultation, joint planning, and delegated authority), and he relates these to the two major sets of government activities (policy formulation and programme implementation) in the two areas of environment on the

---
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day-by-day activity over the years 1966-71, the reader obtains a picture of the reality of citizen participation in urban renewal which can only be gained by the participant or, in this case, the participant-observer who was by experience a trained journalist. The lessons of Trefann Court are not yet distinguishable, because the ultimate plan put forward by the Working Committee (composed of citizens drawn from the three organizations, as well as elected representatives and civic officials) represents a milestone in Canadian planning history which has not yet been implemented.

The future of Trefann Court rests in a design prepared by a planner hired by the Working Committee (in short, by the citizens themselves) and approved by the representatives of the citizens working with elected and appointed officials. Both the federal and provincial governments have given approval in principle but in 1973, a year after the publication of Fraser's book, the reality of implementation is still very much unrealized. The framework of implementation may be clear to those who sat on the Working Committee and to those who live in the neighbourhood, but to the citizens of Toronto who are aware of the stringencies in the housing market it is not yet demonstrable that the tremendous degree of citizen participation in the urban renewal process will be fulfilled.

The contribution of a major case study of these dimensions rests in Fraser's quasi-academic attempt to trace the entire history of urban redevelopment in central Toronto and, thus, to place Trefann Court in its proper perspective. This is not a work of entertainment or pure and simple journalism based upon human interest stories. It is a record carefully documented, carefully assembled for the purpose of tracing a particular case in Canadian urban planning in which new departures were undertaken, in which new efforts were made, and in which new experiences occurred for the first time. The hiring by a neighbourhood of its own planner, the preparation of a very substantial plan by a Working Committee (an illustra-
semi-permanent exercises on the "new urban politics" by such writers as James Lorimer, John Sewell, and Stephen Clarkson. From the point of view of this study the significance of these new literary efforts rests in the fact that most of the authors were deeply involved in the citizen participation movement; the question of citizen involvement is essential in all that they write, whatever aspects of political, economic or social development come within their jaundiced view.

A more substantial case study was written by Graham Fraser. For a year-and-a-half the author devoted all his attention to participant observation within the interaction taking place in a five-block ten-acre strip in east-central Toronto, immediately to the south of the large Regent Park projects. Fraser entered the picture a decade or more after the area had been actively considered for urban renewal treatment and about five years after the formal designation of the neighbourhood as an urban renewal scheme entitled Trefann Court. The name was adopted in 1966 and for the ensuing four years a tremendous effort was mounted--by a series of citizens' organizations with sometimes overlapping memberships and indistinct groupings of tenants on the one hand, homeowners on the other, with a third group composed of businessmen who owned the shops on the arterial perimeters--to forestall and eliminate, if possible, the plan put forward by the City of Toronto Planning Board and slated for implementation by the City's Development Department.

In 1970 a turning point occurred when the Council created a Working Committee for Trefann Court under the nominal jurisdiction of the Urban Renewal Committee, an ad hoc organization chaired for approximately two years by the present incumbent of the Mayor's Office of the City of Toronto, David Crombie. As Fraser describes the hour-by-hour,

its published title the book could quite easily have been entitled "Community Development: Canada". There is, in fact, a serious difficulty for the reader in differentiating the two concepts: citizen participation and community development. The editor appears to be aware of this problem and indicates that

...we are not using any narrow and hence restricting view of such concepts as community development and citizen participation. And yet, all of the articles are linked by such ideas as the interaction of people, partnership, trust, self-responsibility, and participation. 58

It would seem possible for the business community to make exactly the same arguments if this publication had been concerned with such matters as the changing administrative organization within major stock exchanges in large Canadian metropolitan centres, along with such considerations as the attempt to spread the ownership of certain corporations through profit-sharing plans which would enable employees to purchase some portion of the enterprise in which they work and thus participate in its growth and development. In short, such ideas as interaction, partnership, trust, self-responsibility are not confined to the subject of "community development".

In his "Introduction" Draper devotes most of his attention to an exposition of the basic principles of community development. He does introduce the subject of citizen participation, but within the framework of community development; eventually he shifts ground to present a definition:

In community development the journey is the learning, the skills and the confidence acquired by those participating in the process. Community development implies a very particular value system.

Be that as it may, these caveats underline the confusion which remains in defining precisely the concept of citizen participation, and Draper's book does serve the basic purpose

58 Draper, op. cit., "A Note to the Reader" (pages unnumbered).
59 op. cit., "Introduction" (pages unnumbered).
tion of what Bregha meant by "joint planning"), the concurrence by City Council in the neighbourhood self-development proposals, and approval in principle by the senior levels of government were all "firsts" in urban Canadian development. This story, however, is not yet complete.

Readings and Directories: By 1970 interest in the subject of citizen participation was sufficient to encourage Professor James A. Draper of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education to develop a book of readings in the field. Draper assembled, arranged and edited thirty papers, some of which had been published previously in one form or another. His publication is in seven sections, commencing with "Ideology", proceeding through a series of case studies from Newfoundland, Manitoba, and elsewhere in Canada; and it includes "Indian Participation" (Section Six), and "Application and Analysis" (Section Seven). It could be argued that this great variety of essays is either a tremendous contribution or, alternatively, that Draper produced a conglomeration of materials which, as editor, he has forced within headings.

For example, the first Section, "The Ideology of Participation", can scarcely accommodate a case history depicting student activities at the University of Toronto along with the strong theory-based exhortations of Dr. Wilson Head of York University, as well as the matter of "citizen development" and "participation in the legislative process". Nevertheless, these four essays are all grouped under the same rubric and the serious reader would be hard put to discern the "ideology of participation" from this Section of differential argument.

The major query raised by Draper's book of readings (which was, in fact, the first such collection and still the only one published in Canada purporting to draw upon the phenomenon of "citizen participation") is its lack of clear focus. Despite

---

Any citizens' group in possession of this Directory should have no difficulty in identifying other groups with similar interests or which are sufficiently close geographically to enable close communication. At the same time, the publication, Resources, allows an examination of numerous voluntary organizations, foundations, corporations, and government agencies which may be interested in contributing money or other assistance to citizens' groups. This document lists the organizations and their objectives, the interests of various foundations, indicates when applications must be submitted and where they must be submitted, and the like. In short, the Ministry of Community and Social Services considers that it has a responsibility to communicate information concerning many organizations in the province—public and private, non-profit and corporate—for the potential benefit of community groups.

It is interesting to note that within this latter publication information concerning 14 provincial ministries is also listed; there is an additional listing for the Management Board of the Cabinet (formerly the Treasury Board), and a special section on Legal Aid. The entry for the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs includes a description of the Urban Renewal Section and states provincial policy, that citizen participation must take place during the planning stages of urban renewal if there is to be provincial funding. Furthermore, formal requests will come from municipalities after discussion with the Urban Renewal Section of the Ministry.62

The most recent directory is entitled Directory of Low Income Citizen Groups in Canada,63 which lists all known

62 ibid., p. 44
he had in mind. Obviously a book of readings is designed to put together a series of expositions and experiences which the reader could not easily discover without difficulty.

Mario Carota's study of 1970, which represented the first effort to note the existence of and draw attention to the objectives of citizens' groups within Canada, has been followed within the last two years by a number of directories indicating the expansion in the number of such groups and the very special attention directed towards the exposition of resources available. In 1973, for example, the Community Development Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services issued a Directory of Ontario Community Groups 60 and also a large guide entitled Resources for Community Groups 61.

The first of these two publications lists by municipality a large number of groups; these groups are then classified in eight types of interest: Community Action Centres; Community Media; Community Associations; Cottager Associations; Ecology Groups; Ratepayer, Residents and Tenants Associations; Consumer Groups; and so-called "Umbrella Groups". This listing occupies one-third of the publication; the last third constitutes an additional cross-classification whereby all the groups appear within municipal listings, the municipalities being ordered alphabetically within the Regions of Ontario. The last 25 pages list groups under the heading of the various Counties of Ontario and the listings for Metropolitan Toronto appear under the heading, "Regional Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto" (detached from any County); this section is subdivided into the various Boroughs from East York to York, with the groups in the City of Toronto appearing after the listings for the Borough of Scarborough.

60 Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Community Development Branch, Director of Ontario Community Groups (Toronto, March 1973)
61 --------, Resources for Community Groups (Toronto, 1973)
The Bureau argued that:

Urban renewal policy making has consistently stimulated conflict between neighbourhood groups and local government officials because of the high economic and social costs at stake for each side. The residents stand to lose homes and a neighbourhood they have known all their life; the City stand to gain improved physical surroundings concomitant with an improved assessment base, and enhanced prestige for 'successful' renewal.

The writers of this study were clearly influenced by the work of Professor James Q. Wilson (cited earlier in this chapter), as well as the material available to the research group on "Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal" at the University of Toronto. The Bureau's view of citizen participation is that of a "democratic value", and the report states:

The concept of citizen participation thus serves many masters; it is standard rhetoric for every campaigning reformist, the rationale for decentralizing the policy process, the battle cry for every citizens' group and a continuing puzzle for every political analyst.

A major contribution of this research is a very clear exposition of the origins of the conflict between elected and appointed officials within a city such as Toronto and the residents of specific neighbourhoods. The writers list these origins as, first, conflicting priorities; and, secondly, conflicting perspectives. The Bureau emphasizes that the City and its neighbourhoods have very different priorities. These problems are often manifested in the problems of planning wherein the neighbourhood usually argues from a basis of self-interest. The report insists that these basic differences cannot be resolved for all time but will reappear with every neighbourhood-city issue. The experiences of the past three years have borne out this conclusion. Nevertheless:

66 op. cit., p.4.
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organizations under provincial headings. Where possible the name and telephone number of the officer of contact within the organization are provided. No attempt is made to classify the organizations by interest; rather, they are listed in alphabetical order within the provinces and not by city. In the introduction the fundamental fact and dilemma with respect to citizen participation are posed:

Because of the continued rapid growth in the numbers of organizations formed by low income Canadians in recent years and the high rate of change among them as new organizations succeed old ones, groups split and merge, and mailing addresses change with each new executive, any such directory will no doubt be less than totally accurate. It is hoped nonetheless that this listing will be of assistance to those who want to communicate with low income organizations and to low income organizations who want to communicate with each other.

The Essence of Recent Theory-Building

All the essential features of the theoretical exposition of citizen participation in urban development were, in fact, expatiated extremely well in a publication of the Bureau of Municipal Research in January 1970. This document was purported to be based on research in direct contact with all relevant citizen groups concerned with participation in local government. The Bureau found that there were only 15 groups when the study was carried out in late 1969, and this confirms the findings of Carota. There is, however, a considerable contrast to be made with the 1973 Director of Ontario Community Groups, in which there are 63 listings alone for Metropolitan Toronto under the heading "Ratepayers, Residents and Tenants Associations".

64 op. cit., second page (unnumbered).

It is interesting to note that the Bureau's discussions with officials of the "fifteen active groups" in the City revealed:

The officers of the association are elected and are responsible for the records, conducting meetings and expressing the viewpoints of the groups to the City. Generally, this executive is composed of well educated, middle class individuals who are interested in seeing the neighbourhood become more important in the policy making of the City. To this extent they hold substantially different goals from the bulk of the membership. The bulk of the membership has short-term goals and is actively involved during periods of specific threats to the neighbourhood when the need for action is immediate.70

The significance of this rests in the fact that it is one of the first statements in which it was recognized that many citizens' groups were, in fact, formed through leadership exerted by middle- and upper middle-class professionals who were moving into older neighbourhoods. These persons not only expounded a new set of goals for the future of their neighbourhoods but were clearly convinced that they had the power and the knowledge to influence future urban development. As a consequence, many citizens' organizations in downtown Toronto were soon dominated and formally led by individuals who were radicals, planners, engineers, lawyers, university teachers, and social workers. This fundamental change in such leadership potential has had a profound effect within the City and the metropolitan area of Toronto during the past four years.

The Bureau's policy statement concluded with a review of alternative proposals intended to enhance the role of the neighbourhood in policy making and to promote a policy of regular consultation between government and neighbourhood groups. The report states;
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...those factors which exacerbate conflict between the City and neighbourhood—a lack of communication, misunderstanding of motives and intention, and a lack of trust between local government officials and neighbourhood groups—are recognizable and can be controlled.

A further contribution of the Bureau's study concerns the whole question of the role of the local politician as an elected representative. Certainly, the politicians of the period prior to 1970 understood their role as that of city council participants with broader viewpoints than those of the constituencies which elected them. Clearly, the expectations and attitudes of the neighbourhood groups are different. Although these two sets of expectations (that of the politician and that of neighbourhood groups) are different, they are nevertheless opposite sides of the same coin. The report sums up this significant matter as follows:

The politician's understanding of his own role is one-half of the relationship between neighbourhood groups and politicians; the role that the neighbourhood group assumes is the other, equally important, half of the relationship. As contributors to policy making, neighbourhood groups have a much less structured role than elected representatives. There are no legal or historical principles that guide their activities and they have no legal rights or obligations beyond those of any ratepayer. They are neither elected at large nor appointed by government and are accountable to only themselves. In this situation, differences can be expected in the way groups organize and pursue their goals. Differences will occur in the ability to plan long and short range goals, size of membership, methods for recruiting members, dependence on leadership of action, and attitudes towards government. These differences are generally related to the socio-economic background of the members of the groups. Groups from wealthier parts of the City are much more likely to be structured in a manner that is conducive to a satisfying working relationship with local government than are groups from the very poor parts of the City.
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Nevertheless, the Bureau offers six recommendations, five of which are exhortations to local governments to offer a more substantial role to citizen involvement. Only the final recommendation places an onus on neighbourhood groups to demonstrate effective organization within their own neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{74}

It is very difficult to avoid the view that writers and politicians alike are afraid to oppose either the notion or the specific implementation of citizen participation. If this is a legitimate stance it may be devoid of strength by virtue of the absence of both basic and applied research. There has been little study of the reality of citizen participation from an academic, and thus objective, point of view. Admittedly, it is very difficult to develop research designs for testing a concept as nebulous as that of "citizen participation", as this research group learned as early as the fall of 1967. However, until there are soundly based research studies concerned with the positing of questions for objective examination through the scientific method, the notions of bias will persist. There has been a tremendous amount of heat generated in the past five years, particularly in Metro Toronto, but there has been very little light shed on the problem.

\textsuperscript{74} ibid., p. 15
our research indicates, however, that problems between the City and the neighbourhood are more basic than a lack of structural mechanisms for neighbourhood participation -- there is no organizational panacea that can resolve City-neighbourhood problems. What is needed is a new set of ground rules as the basis of a mutual understanding about how the neighbourhood concept can fit into policy development in the City of Toronto. From this will emerge some workable proposals for increased neighbourhood participation. 71

On the basis of this finding the Bureau concluded that new ground rules must be developed to ensure that neighbourhood groups have an improved status with a formal and specific role to plan in local government. The report stresses that two basic premises must remain: first, that neighbourhood groups are independent of local governments; and, secondly, that the final authority to make decisions rests with local governments and the elected representatives. It follows, therefore, that neighbourhood groups can neither be the creation of local governments nor have their operations subsidized. This argument runs counter to a major proposal that remains very much alive in Toronto: that the taxpayers should finance the employment of a substantial number of community organizers who would be elected to specific neighbourhoods. The Bureau also concludes that in the decision-making process the City is the senior partner and the neighbourhood group the junior partner. 72 The report ends on a pessimistic note:

Put more in perspective, although interest in local government is extremely low, interest in the role of the neighbourhood is even lower. This low level of interest and involvement by citizens in politics will continue to be the largest single factor inhibiting the constructive development of the neighbourhood role in local government and, at the same time, is the biggest single reason for the need to continue working at making improvements in neighbourhood participation. Voluntary associations such as neighbourhood groups are one of the more important agents in society for making people more politically aware and improving the base of a working democracy. 73

71 ibid., p. 13
72 ibid., p. 13
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This failure in communication was alleged to rest in the inability of professionally-trained and highly-skilled public servants and elected officials to explain their plans, programmes and the stages of implementation of redevelopment in language that could be understood by the typically modestly-educated and low-income residents of affected neighbourhoods. On the middle level of communication it was argued that the typical approaches to citizen participation were quite inadequate; specifically, the printing of leaflets or booklets of explanation, the calling of meetings in schools or other community facilities, or the explanations given in press releases by City Council. None of these were understandable or acceptable to persons who knew only that they would lose their homes and familiar patterns of living.

On yet a higher level of communication the argument was made that the planners and politicians simply did not trust the people, that the residents of urban renewal neighbourhoods had nothing whatsoever to contribute to the future development of their neighbourhoods and had no right to participate. It was argued that either they were so mobile that they lived in such areas for a very short time and then moved out, or they were so poorly skilled in the art of communication that they could not possibly hold viewpoints worthy of examination and incorporation in the overall planning.

On the basis of the "failure-of-communication" hypothesis, a first major approach to research was initiated in the spring of 1968. A series of simple but extremely demanding questions were posed, including the following:

1. What are the goals of urban renewal?
2. What does urban renewal mean to the resident of an affected neighbourhood?
3. Do those responsible for preparing and approving urban renewal schemes have the same basic goals as the residents?
Chapter V

The Questions for Research

Under the circumstances surrounding the process of urban renewal in the United States and Canada from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s the research team was hard put to identify the most productive approaches to a systematic examination of "citizen participation in urban renewal". The concepts in this area of study are so hard to define--there were so many definitions and controversies surrounding the concept and process of "citizen participation", the literature was scarce, and evaluative research was even scarcer--that, combined, they emphasize the inherent methodological difficulties in studying citizen participation. The notion surrounding the process of urban renewal, involving as it did the loss of homes to long-term residents in certain areas and to low-income families primarily, compounded these inhibitions.

It was reasoned, however, that as a first phase the research programme could explore in some depth the assertion of several reputable social scientists (Robert Weaver, Robert Wood, Hans Spiegel; and, in Canada, the writer of this report)\(^75\) that the threatened breakdown in urban renewal was basically a failure in communication. It had been argued in many communities that the members of the boards and staffs of planning and redevelopment agencies were unable to communicate to the residents of designated urban renewal areas the positive gains which a renewal programme held out not only for the wider community but for the residents themselves. Moreover, elected councillors in municipal government, as well as senior appointed officials who headed such departments of local government as Assessment, Works, Streets, Traffic, and the like, were equally unable to express their roles in non-technical language.

\(^{75}\) Robert Weaver, The Urban Complex (Garden City, Doubleday, 1964); Robert Wood, Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1959); Hans Spiegel, op. cit.; Albert Rose, op. cit.
2. Who would be the most appropriate persons to provide responses to the major questions designed to test the hypothesis from the several points of view? In particular, who would be considered appropriate respondents on the part of planners and decision-makers, and who would be appropriate respondents on the part of citizen participants?

3. In which urban renewal areas, or with respect to which urban renewal areas in Toronto, should the research be undertaken for best results?

On the first major set of problems, which involved the whole question of the methodological approach to data collection, there was little difficulty in making a choice. The structured research interview has been widely accepted in social research by social scientists, social workers, or urban planners. It was the unanimous decision of the research team—consisting of the writer (a professor in the School of Social Work), a Research Assistant who was a candidate for the doctorate, and ten graduate students working for the degree of Master of Social Work—that interviews should be held with a sample of ostensibly reasonably-informed respondents, to be chosen carefully with respect to a series of criteria. The total sample would have to be sufficiently large and representative to enable conclusions to be drawn on even a modest level of generalization.

On the second important matter of methodology the research team determined that there were four important sub-groups of potential respondents:

**Group A**: leaders of citizens' groups who were also residents of the areas designated for urban renewal.

**Group B**: local advisors, specifically, professionals in social work, public health, theology, who were working with individuals in the urban renewal areas.

**Group C**: decision-makers, such as politicians and city planners involved in urban renewal.

**Group D**: A group described as "influencers of opinion", such as those who wrote regularly as journalists,
4. Do the decision-makers perceive the primary goals of urban renewal schemes in the same manner as do the residents of affected areas?

5. What are the basic concerns of citizens and citizens' groups who involve themselves in urban renewal?

6. What sorts of persons participate in residents' or neighbourhood associations?

7. Why are some residents of designated urban renewal areas more involved in so-called "participatory democracy" than others?

8. What are the appropriate goals for citizens in urban renewal areas?

9. If citizens were more involved in the processes of planning and implementation of urban renewal programmes would there be more or less citizen resistance to such programmes?

10. If citizens do participate in the planning and implementation of urban renewal programmes, should every citizen of the city have a voice or only those directly affected by the proposals?

These questions formed the basis of the research instrument and the collection of data in this first phase of the research programme.76

Once it was determined that this major aspect of the research would seek to test the "failure-of-communication" hypothesis, the major questions remaining fell into three broad groups:

1. What would be the best research approach for testing the hypothesis? In particular, which research approach would be most appropriate to gain responses to such questions as the ten propositions cited above?

76 See Appendix A, "Group Research Project" under the auspices of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto, 1967-68.
for interview; this was true of all groups with the exception of Group C, where the principal investigator's knowledge was paramount. In due course well over 30 potential interviewees had been listed for each of the four sub-groups.

The whole process of interviewing depended, of course, upon the third group of questions previously identified, namely, the urban renewal areas or neighbourhoods which were to be the foci of concern in the research process. The research group chose to study six areas in the City of Toronto; none was located beyond the boundaries of the central city in the metropolitan area. Each area was at a different stage in the urban renewal process. There was also a continuum in the distribution of progress within the urban renewal process, if such a distribution could be devised, which the group felt would give increasing insight into the whole question of research. Accordingly, the following neighbourhoods were chosen for study:

1. **Alexandra Park**, a neighbourhood in west-central Toronto clearly defined by boundaries which were major arteries and which was relatively far advanced in the development of an urban renewal programme in the latter months of 1968; witness the fact that it was formally designated as the Alexandra Park Urban Improvement Project, funded in part by four levels of government including the Metropolitan Toronto Council.

2. **Don Mount**, a neighbourhood in east Toronto which was under construction in terms of public housing facilities and undergoing an examination for potential rehabilitation of homes and other properties not slated for demolition.

3. **Trefann Court**, a third clearly defined area in east-central Toronto where an urban renewal scheme had already been set out by the Development Department of the City of Toronto.
conference participants, academics, persons who had served as members of local boards and commissions involved in urban affairs.

Composition of Sub-Samples and Methods of Interviewing

The use of such terms as "leaders of citizen groups", "decision-makers" and "influencers of opinion" are evidence that there was no attempt to develop a simple random sampling of respondents in the first phase of the research process. Rather, a universe of potential informants was stratified into the four sub-groups described briefly above, and even within the sample compositions of these groups there was no attempt at simple random sampling as would be called for in a classical research design. The group used every available source of information to identify those individuals who in any capacity, voluntary or remunerated, would potentially have some light to shed on the matter of citizen participation in urban renewal.

The procedure whereby the samples of respondents were developed was thus the answer to the second major group of questions, namely, how to identify and select well-informed interviewees. Since the leader of the research had devoted some twenty years to voluntary and consultative activity in the process of urban development in the City of Toronto and throughout the metropolitan area, it was not difficult to develop a list of potential respondents. Nevertheless, the changing composition of citizens' organizations made it impossible for any one person to be able to identify those who might have a point of view to present. Thus, for Group A the researchers turned to local councillors, social workers in the field of community planning, certain public officials and the newspapers to identify persons who had taken leadership roles during the previous two or three years as urban renewal programmes developed in downtown Toronto.

The sub-samples were not difficult to develop because those who were identified in the early process of investigation named other persons who might be knowledgeable and appropriate
but do not provide or suggest any structure for the respondent's reply. In addition, the research group devised four alternative-response questions in which alternatives were typed on cards and respondents were asked to rank them according to their preferences. An examination of the schedule and Appendix B will indicate that the four major Parts covered all the questions posed in the ten propositions cited earlier in this chapter. Specifically, the first Part dealt with attitudes towards urban renewal as a concept, including the whole question of goals. In the second section the nature of citizen participation was explored, and this was followed by a third section aimed at identifying the process of citizen participation as seen by the respondents. Because the whole question of the rehabilitation of housing was very much alive at the time of the study and very much a part of the concept of urban renewal, the last section of the interview dealt with the attitudes and expectations of the respondents towards rehabilitation. The research schedule was developed as a draft, tested in certain parts of the community outside the six selected areas, redrafted, altered and tested again until the research group was satisfied that it had the potential to achieve objectives inherent in testing the basic hypotheses.

By the late spring of 1968 the research team had successfully completed 94 interviews. The respondents were carefully cross-classified prior to assignment to specific interviewers, that is, they were distributed among the four major sub-sample groups on either the basis of their clear position in the urban setting or a careful judgment by the research team. An attempt was made to gain opinions from respondents who were closely associated with one or more of the six geographical urban renewal areas selected for study. The simple results of the data collection process were 24 completed.

4. **Don Vale**, a neighbourhood to the north of the major concentrations of public housing in Regent Park North and Regent Park South, and for which there was not a definite plan in 1968-69.

5. **Kensington**, a neighbourhood to the north of Alexandra Park for which an urban renewal scheme was in preparation and in which a strong citizens' organization appeared to be playing a substantial role.

6. **St. James Town**, a huge private apartment development, perhaps the largest concentration of high-rise apartment buildings in Canada, immediately to the west of Don Vale, in which the privately developed housing was nearing completion in the spring of 1969. Nevertheless, part of the housing in St. James Town was owned by the Ontario Housing Corporation for the accommodation of public housing applicants.

Once these major questions were answered to the satisfaction of the research group, namely, the basic approach to data collection, the definition and composition of samples of respondents for the purpose of research interviewing, and the selection of designated or contemplated urban renewal areas in which to examine the major question of citizen participation, the research process was active. It must be clear from the previous discussion, however, that this was not to be a study in which interviewers went from door to door to discuss the interests and concerns of the residents. Rather, the research design was carefully structured and the potential respondents were carefully selected. It remained only to contact them, arrange for an appointment and conduct a carefully semi-structured but informal personal interview.

The research instrument (the interview schedule) was developed in line with appropriate statistical techniques with many open-ended questions. The distinguishing characteristic of open-ended questions is that they merely raise an issue
Those who lived in downtown Toronto neighbourhoods designated for urban renewal by the mid-1960s differed widely in their attitudes towards the goals and consequences of the urban renewal process. In part these differences depended upon their housing and socio-economic status: whether they were resident homeowners, tenants, or small business men who operated stores and shops on the perimeters of the urban renewal areas. Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of the respondents interviewed had one major unity within their diversity of views; specifically, they believed their goals as residents differed sharply in fact from the objectives of so-called "decision-makers"--the elected politicians and the appointed planning officials.

The research undertaken in six neighbourhoods in 1968 and 1969 indicated very clearly that the first fundamental problem, however difficult to solve, was the glaring lack of trust between the major participants in the urban renewal process. Residents of these areas, whatever their status, understood a few basic considerations. They believed that they were about to lose their homes and that, as an alternative, the rehabilitation of the dwellings they occupied was unrealistic and self-defeating as far as their future was concerned. As tenants, they were certain that absentee landlords, if forced to spend substantial or even modest amounts of money to improve their properties, would raise the rents to the point where they would be unable to continue as residents.

In much the same form of reasoning, homeowners were convinced that the process of rehabilitation of their homes would involve them in additional mortgage or other instalment debt. Since they were already hard put to meet essential housing expenditures in homes that were relatively free from mortgage encumbrance, they could not see how they could
interviews from Group A (citizen leaders), 26 from Group B (advisors to citizens' groups), 25 from Group C (initiators and decision-makers), and 19 from Group D (influencers of public opinion). The respondents were co-operative, frank, and voluble in the sense that the interviewers completed the interview schedules with verbatim comments wherever possible; the interviewers also included their own impressions in substantial detail.

Not more than half-a-dozen persons refused to participate in the research project. The most notable refusal came from a person who was identified clearly in the media as a local advisor to citizens' groups and later elected as a councillor. His flat statement to the interviewer was, "It [the interview] will not do any good". It has never been clear to whom or to what the interview and/or the research programme "would not do any good". Another notable refusal came from an academic who told the principal investigator that "I don't give a ---- for your research. I have my own research to do". At the time of the statement the person in question was the President of a local citizens' group where, as a resident of a primarily low-income area, he represented fully the new type of professional person who tended to move into the downtown neighbourhoods in Toronto and other Canadian cities during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Such persons thereby clearly displaced low-income families, particularly tenants who found their homes purchased by members of this new group of downtown residents.

In a curious way the interviews with the so-called "citizen leaders" who were, in fact, upper middle-class bureaucrats or members of professional groups forecast the course of urban development in several of these neighbourhoods. The urban renewal process was halted; plans of urban planners and City Departments were forestalled; and, in the slogan of the mid-1970s, "neighbourhoods were preserved". For whom they were preserved is the major question to be answered during the next ten or fifteen years.
comparison of the views of "community workers" and "decision-makers".79

It could be argued that the comparative analysis of responses from two groups frequently in contact (persons who assumed positions of leadership in citizens' organizations, and elected and appointed officials who were in the process of planning urban renewal schemes) would result in a simple self-fulfilling prophecy. It was evident that the 24 persons in the first group had some years of conflict with many of those who were described as "decision-makers", within such areas as Don Mount, Trefann Court, Kensington, and Alexandra Park. It was conceivable that the research was in substantial measure a record of the experiences of disputants and that the conclusions were foregone. It was partly for this reason that the second study included all the responses to the significant questions and probes designed to open up the whole question of goals and objectives, despite its emphasis on a comparison between two groups of professionals.

In this context each interviewee was asked, as the first open-ended question: "What does urban renewal mean to you?" This opened up a number of avenues of exploration and was followed by: "What would you say are the goals of urban renewal?" As this question was somewhat more difficult for citizen participants and others, it was followed by the presentation of a typed card on which six possible goals were listed in random order. The respondent was then asked to rank these goals in the order of importance for himself. The first group were then asked: "Do you feel that those responsible for preparing and approving urban renewal schemes have the same primary goals as you have?" The overwhelming majority answered "No", and many gave their reasons. The decision-makers and the opinion-influencers were asked a

---

continue to remain in their owner-occupied residences.

Similarly, local business men were defeatist concerning the impact of the urban renewal process upon their economic activities, whether or not they lived within or above their small shops. They were convinced that the essence of urban renewal was the elimination of such businesses (they had the examples of Regent Park North and Regent Park South to offer in evidence) and they thus favoured expropriation of their property and the enactment of Amendments to Part III of the NRHA to ensure generous treatment in their relocation to other business opportunities. In the case of Trefann Court, however, officials of the residents' association were bitter towards such business men who, they claimed, lost complete interest in participating in the development of the urban renewal programme once they were assured that their small shops on two of the four boundary streets would be permitted to remain.

The data collected in the first phase of the research programme, commencing about January 1968, were analysed intensively by two members of the team working independently with respect to all aspects of understanding and communication of goals and objectives. One analysis involved a detailed comparison of the responses of the first group of interviewees (leading citizen participants, particularly executive members of residents' associations) and the third group of respondents (the decision-makers, including politicians and planners employed by government and private consultants as well as private developers). 78 The second study, also in the first stage of the research, involved a detailed analysis of the responses to certain specific questions on the part of all 94 persons interviewed, but with particular reference to a

Although these five general areas appear to be the dominant forces behind the development of current urban renewal policies and practices, the research group felt that a sixth goal must be added. This would appear to be reflected in the increased demand for citizen participation in urban renewal and may be described as "improvement of the neighbourhood in the interests of the residents of the area". The interests of neighbourhood residents clearly included the improvement of their housing conditions but during the last decade have expanded far beyond this objective to include the improvement of educational and recreational facilities, public works and resident involvement on a large scale in what may be termed "the community life".

Participants in the setting and determination of goals for urban renewal were represented in this research primarily by those interviewed in the first three groups described in the previous chapter (see pp. 70-71). Those interviewed were:

**Group A**

**Alexandra Park**: Two respondents, one of whom was the Chairman of the Tenants Association and former Vice-President of the Residents Association; he had been a homeowner in the area for a number of years and was currently a tenant. The second person was an executive member of the Residents Association.

**Don Mount**: Five respondents who included the former President of the Don Mount Citizens Association; he had lived in the area for many years and had attended all meetings of various organizations since the initiation of urban renewal in the area. Others included the current President of the Residents Association (the new name adopted after expropriation and demolition of part of the neighbourhood had occurred), and several executive members of the Residents Association. One interviewee had achieved notoriety as the last holdout in the process of
similar question in a slightly different form: "Do you feel that those who live in urban renewal areas perceive the primary goals of urban renewal schemes as you do?" Again, the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated a negative answer.

**Determination of Goals for Urban Renewal**

The vast literature and efforts at conceptualization during the past three decades or more in such fields as economic, social and urban development may be summarized, as far as urban renewal goals are concerned, through the identification and examination of what Robinson calls "five major thrusts". The first may be described as "the renewal of blighted areas" and has as its central concern physical inadequacy or deterioration of housing and other structures. The second thrust lies in the direction of "an improvement in social conditions" and assumes a relationship between physical inadequacy and social consequences, in both physical and emotional impacts on those who must reside in such circumstances. The third thrust rests in "economic objectives" wherein both the matters of local taxation and the broader field of investment have played a part in the emergence of current policies and practices.

The fourth thrust may be described as "the provision of low-cost housing"—a long-standing goal that has as its central concern the provision, through new construction or rehabilitation of existing structures, of new low-cost or low-rental housing. This goal is clearly not unrelated to the physical, social and economic concerns already identified. The fifth thrust is "the linkage between urban renewal and the concern for the overall planning of urban land use". In this last respect urban renewal is conceived as only one aspect of the more generalized goal of rational planning for the entire community.

---

80 Robinson, op. cit., p. 57.
had lived in the neighbourhood for eight years prior to the active commencement of private urban renewal in 1965. Two members of the committee who no longer resided in the neighbourhood were also interviewed.

As Brown averred, the group of persons who had assumed responsibility for the organization, development and movement of citizens' organizations were selected for their intimate knowledge of the feelings, moods and conditions within these several neighbourhoods. They were acutely aware of the causes which had led to the development of citizens' organizations and of the aim of members through participation in the process of urban renewal. They were also selected for interview because of their familiarity in general with the social, economic and psychological impact of urban renewal upon the lives of the residents of affected neighbourhoods. 81

Group B
The community workers interviewed were:
Ten staff members of social agencies in urban renewal areas, including two current and one former Executive Directors of settlement houses; two former Executive Directors of a community service project in an urban renewal area; and five staff members of settlement houses, including a Programme Director and a social group worker, and three persons (one a social work student) working with residents' associations in renewal areas.
Five persons employed by the City of Toronto Development Department, two of whom worked from urban renewal area site offices, and three of whom worked from and under the supervision of settlement houses.
One person, a professional planner, employed by the

81 Brown, op. cit., p. 65
expropriation and who no longer lived in the area.

Trefann Court: Five respondents who were the President of the Trefann Court Residents Association; the Executive Secretary and editor of "Trefann Court News", who had lived in the area for ten years; an executive member of the newly-formed Trefann Court Tenants Association; and two additional active members of the Tenants group. It will be recalled that there were two organizations in Trefann Court and, on occasion, a businessmen's association as well.

Don Vale: Three respondents, including an executive member of the Don Vale Residents Association, the corresponding and membership Secretary, and a person self-described as "a typical resident and political scientist" whose occupation was researcher and university teacher.

Kensington Market: Six respondents including the President of the Residents Association whose occupation was a town planner; he had lived in the area since 1942. Another respondent was the planning Chairman of the Residents Association whose occupation was a professional engineer; he had also been a resident in the area for some time and was very active in its community life. A priest of the Roman Catholic church which provided social services to the Portuguese community in the area was a respondent and he acted as a spokesman for this group and advised the Kensington Area Residents Association on the special problems and situations of the Portuguese, and interpreted the goals of the Association to that special ethnic group.

St. James Town: Three respondents who included the President of the Housing and Residents Committee; she
In the first place, many of those interviewed continue to hold positions of importance, whether in the elected offices of local government, in the appointed staff positions of planning boards and the Development Department, or located simply within the citizens' organizations. Most respondents have participated actively in the discussions and developments that have taken place since 1968, and they continue to be powerful personal participants in the broad field of urban development.

The second factor which continues to establish relevance for the research rests in the fact that there have been unusual circumstances within the several urban renewal areas considered. Although the Alexandra Park and Don Mount programmes have been concluded to all intents and purposes, the process of urban renewal in other important neighbourhoods has been curiously effective or ineffective, depending on one's point of view. For example, there is no question that the process of citizen participation reached its most apparent significance in Trefann Court. As a consequence, the original plans put forward by the City of Toronto Planning Board about 1966 were abandoned and a new plan for the entire neighbourhood was developed between 1970 and 1972 under the aegis of a Working Committee which included politicians, planners and citizen leaders. The Committee hired its own community planner, devised its own set of plans and priorities and, in fact, was touted as the first effective urban renewal scheme in Canada--effective in the sense that residents had participated actively throughout the entire process and were clearly committed to the implementation of the plan.

In mid-1973, however (as this report is being written), the plan has not been implemented, the very first steps in construction have been halted by virtue of differences between the successful bidder on the construction contract and the co-operative housing organization which engaged its
City of Toronto Planning Department, and working from a site office.
Seven persons, including three clergymen, working in parishes or church centres in renewal areas.
Four persons, including one professionally trained social worker, working exclusively with residents' associations on a full-time basis, financed by the Company of Young Canadians and private donations.

**Group C**
The "decision-makers" interviewed were:

Fourteen members of the Toronto City Council, including three Controllers and eleven Aldermen.
Five of the Aldermen and one Controller were members of the Committee on Housing, Fire and Legislation. Eight Aldermen, two of whom sat on the Housing, Fire and Legislation Committee, and one Controller served on the Buildings and Development Committee. The third Controller interviewed sat on neither committee.

Two planners, employed by the Community Planning Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs, Province of Ontario.
Three planners, two employed at the time of the interviews by the City of Toronto Planning Board; and one former employee of the Board.
One planner employed by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.
Four planners in private practice, three of whom have architectural backgrounds.
One developer working in the construction industry. 82

The relevance of the research interviews is clearly established when the record of the past five years is examined.

---

In the opposite extreme the Kensington Area is probably the most encouraging example of the development of an urban renewal programme which has been to some degree implemented to the satisfaction of residents; yet some planners and elected representatives consider it a failure. KARA was instrumental in establishing a rapport with members of City Council, the Planning Board, the Board of Education, and with their representative in the provincial parliament. The major aspect of urban renewal planning in Kensington during the past five years may be seen in two propositions: on the one hand, there has been no demolition for public housing or other community purposes; on the other hand, the plans of the Board of Education of the City of Toronto for a new elementary school were developed with KARA. The school has now opened as a Community School, designed to serve the whole community with a variety of programmes available for many hours during the entire week, and not simply as an elementary school open from 8.30 in the morning to 4.30 in evening. The story of Kensington was dramatized by a former City councillor.84

The Enunciation of Goals by Citizen Leaders

The entire matter of relationships between the residents of a neighbourhood designated or under consideration for urban renewal (as represented by their leaders with citizens' organizations) and the decision-makers begins with the meaning of urban renewal for the particular person. Thus, the first question posed in the 1968 interviews reads: "What does urban renewal mean to you?" It is quite clear, in hindsight, that the responses provided bear all the significant indications of the resolutions which were and sometimes were not effected in the ensuing five years. For example, the mood of citizen leaders of KARA was positive and optimistic and,

84 Horace Brown, "A Miracle at Kensington", a brief presented to the Board of Control on April 17, 1968, on behalf of the Kensington Area Residents' Association (Toronto, 1968).
firm. Moreover, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has indicated that he is not satisfied with the forces at work within Trefann Court, and statements of equal uncertainty have emanated from local and provincial elected representatives. In a word, the subject of Fighting Back, the most widely publicized successful experiment in participation by all parties to an urban renewal plan, has not proceeded towards the implementation for almost two years and the implications of this for citizen participation will be explored somewhat in the concluding chapter of this report. 83

In Don Vale, where a proposal for an urban renewal project had been made by the City and opposed by the residents, city planners worked for two years with the executive and members of the Ward 2 Residents Association (later the Don Vale Residents Association) to develop a new scheme acceptable to the residents. The whole project has been abandoned by City Council within the past 18 months.

83 The first phase of Trefann Court was approved by the Government of Canada in December 1971. This programme provides for the rehabilitation of five houses and the construction of another 16 under the aegis of Trefann Homes Corporation, a community-based non-profit organization. After a dispute with the builder referred to in the text, the Corporation has been unable to raise the necessary mortgage of $300,000. Without resolving the question the federal government announced on September 6, 1973 that it had approved the second phase of the Trefann Court urban renewal scheme at a total cost of more than $4 million (the first phase was estimated previously to cost $2 million making a total of $6 million plus). Costs are distributed as follows: Government of Canada, 50%; Government of Ontario, 25%; Metropolitan Toronto, 12.5%; City of Toronto, 12.5%.
haphazard development, a way of making the area what citizens want it to be. Although initial feeling in this area was quite negative, within a year this has progressed to a feeling of welcoming urban renewal as a friend, a tool to help us fix up our area. (Kensington Area)

A profit-making proposition for the government. I would like to know how much money they are making on low-rental housing. Land is expropriated and owner is paid an inadequate amount. Then he is moved into a low-rental apartment and charged too much in comparison to the standard of living today. (Alexandra Park)

These quotations illustrate one of the significant findings in this major research undertaking. There was a very definite socio-economic class bias on the part of citizen leaders with respect to the goals and objectives of the process of urban renewal and in terms of their set of attitudes towards citizen participation, towards local government, towards elected and appointed officials, and towards society in general. Those persons whose views were expressions of curt anger and disenchantment were, for the most part, lower middle-class or working-class citizens who were long-term residents of neighbourhoods under study. On the other hand, those respondents who saw urban renewal as an opportunity and whose language was much more sophisticated in terms of the nature and use of vocabulary were, for the most part, middle and upper-middle class persons, often members of professions, with variable relationships to the areas as far as length of residence is concerned. The following quotations from Don Mount and Don Vale illustrate this point further:

I don't like it because of the City's indecent way of dealing with the people--giving inadequate payment for homes, not informing the people about proposed clearance, giving them three months to vacate. (Don Mount)

It has an intensely negative meaning. Urban renewal activity is a mindless glob--the Board of Control is a disgusting procedure. (Don Vale)
from their point of view in 1973, the partnership with the decision-makers in City Council and the Planning Board has been effective. On the other hand, the residents of Trefann Court and, particularly, Don Mount were extremely negative concerning the real meaning of urban renewal, as the following quotations attest:

Toronto is going to get beautiful and I am going to pay for it. In other words, I am going to lose my house in the process. (Trefann Court)

In this specific sense, it means the studying of an area which is in some need of rehabilitation, reorganization or redevelopment and through a co-operative effort of government and citizens, bringing about this rehabilitation and redevelopment in such a way that it improves the area for those people who are actually living there. (Kensington Area)

It means that whatever change is going to take place must be for the better of, firstly, the people who are presently resident in the area and, further, for the betterment of society as a whole. In terms of physical structure it means improvements made to some buildings and the tearing down of others. However, it means to me social improvement as well as physical. (Kensington Area)

It means uprooting houses and uprooting people. We've been uprooted once already so that the City could build a school--no help was offered to us at all to help relocate us. I resented this and this is all part of what urban renewal means to me. (Trefann Court)

Renewal was at an evolving stage and in Kensington is a type of social experiment. It involves renewing all social agencies and working with government bodies such as the Planning and Development Departments. There should be conservation, rehabilitation and lastly spot clearance. (Kensington Area)

I see a dichotomy between urban renewal as it is and it could be. Now it is usually seen as a threat, but it can hold great possibilities for the renewal of a neighbourhood. Urban renewal can be a positive protective thing--by which citizens benefit from the City (e.g. through having house inspected and advice given, through having rezoning applications for the area by private developers easily dismissed without having to be fought). Urban renewal is a protection against
as much success as was sometimes claimed at the time of demonstrations, marches, invasion of committee rooms in City Hall, and other overt techniques.

The Meaning of Urban Renewal

At the time of the 1968 research interviews with the so-called "decision-makers" (persons who were for the most part elected politicians within the City of Toronto and professional planners within the planning agencies of the City and the government of Metropolitan Toronto) there was already some experience with resistance to the process of urban renewal. There had been in the mid-1960s the very strong determination of the residents of Don Mount (Napier Place) to the expropriation and clearance of their homes. Most of those who were forced to relocate were homeowners but, inevitably, the amounts offered to them by the City of Toronto or awarded to them in the expropriation proceedings when arbitration was required were insufficient to enable them to purchase another home of a generally similar nature in another, perhaps nearby, neighbourhood.

Most did not have unrealistic aspirations and their determination to resist was crystallized in the stand taken by Mrs. Dorothy Graham who remained in her home without hydro-electric service and without water service from time to time, in the midst of demolition, clearance and a great deal of accumulation of mud and water as the urban renewal programme got underway. Mrs. Graham became the last resident in the area to be cleared in Don Mount for a substantial public housing project under the auspices of the Ontario Housing Corporation. In her role she became a symbol of resident resistance rather than citizen participation; her exposition of the notion that in the process of urban renewal the municipalities should provide a "house for a house" attracted wide attention not only in Ontario but, to some extent, throughout Canada. At one point she persuaded the Mayor of the City of Toronto to drive her, in
For an older person it's a tragedy. The uncertainty is enough to give them heart attacks (the reference was to expropriation). Infringement on human rights in most cases. I emphasize that it may have to happen—you can't stop progress—but the City must do it fairly and reasonably. (Don Vale)

It means pushing the "little man". "They" are trying to uproot families from their homes which they have sweated for years to buy. "They" give them a certain amount of money, could not care less whether or not it is enough for them to buy another house without getting into more debt. Some families have to end up in an old folks' home. (St. James Town)

To renew the area so that it can be a better place to live. The first concern should be to accommodate people in the area and respond to their wishes. Some want to move out and are automatically out of urban renewal. For those who stay their social way of life as well as accommodation should be renewed. (Kensington Area)

These respondents, regardless of their socio-economic class, were relatively sophisticated in the new art of "citizen participation". An interesting aspect of the situation was the existence of an informal network of personal relationships between them. Some spokesmen for the Trefann Court area paid tribute to persons who had resided in Don Mount, where a strong fight against urban renewal had been waged during the preceding two years. They claimed that they had learned a great deal about techniques of participation and approaches to the decision-makers from the leaders of the citizens groups in Don Mount. Similarly, spokesmen from the Kensington Area (KARA) paid tribute to the leaders of Trefann Court who, they claimed, had taught them. What was meant in these references was not always a positive learning experience but sometimes lessons in what to avoid, and how to avoid stalemate in mindless quarrels with planners and elected representatives. The success in recent years of Kensington is largely explained by the Kensington leaders' avoidance of open conflict with politicians and planners. In comparison the techniques of confrontation employed by the citizens groups in Trefann Court did not gain
extent than community workers, citizen leaders, or even those who have been termed in this report as "influencers of opinion".

Robinson found that only one decision-maker failed to include some reference to physical concerns in his description of urban renewal goals. The others reflected a wide range of emphasis on physical concerns and varying concentrations on particular aspects of urban renewal. This member of the research team developed a system of classification in which four groupings of responses were identified:

(1) those which made a strong identification of urban renewal with slum clearance and redevelopment;
(2) those which identified physical concerns as primary but which included rehabilitation and/or conservation as well as clearance within the framework of urban renewal;
(3) those which included physical concerns as one aspect of urban renewal with some other concern identified as the primary goal;
(4) those which excluded or rejected urban renewal.

The views of the decision-makers and the basis for a system of classification became apparent in the following notable responses to the question, "What does urban renewal mean to you?" *

In the broad sense it means the total progressive re-building of the already built-up area of an urban core. However, the term has become synonymous with the publicly-assisted programmes for redevelopment and rehabilitation of blighted areas within the already built-up urban area. (Member, City Council Buildings and Development Committee)

It means the renewal of the urban fabric and prevention of the mistakes of the past. It means the replacement of obsolete areas by new and more functional, socially desirable ones. It covers all land uses. As a total

* Respondents were promised confidentiality and the form of identification used is intended to maintain such assurances.
his City-owned limousine, in the search of a similar house—a house that could be purchased in a similar neighbourhood with the amount of money she would receive as a consequence of expropriation. The Mayor admitted that it was a very difficult search indeed, that she had not been unreasonable, and that she understood the disadvantaged position in which such homeowners were placed as a consequence of the urban renewal scheme.

Despite the apparent "reasonableness" of those who demanded better awards as a result of the compulsory taking of their homes, the whole question of more adequate expropriation legislation is not entirely germane to the phenomenon of citizen participation. Few politicians and planners had, indeed, any experience with organized citizen groups before 1969. It was only when the organizations within Trefann Court, Don Vale and the Kensington Area came into full awareness of their potentiality as a representative force of entire neighbourhoods that the phenomenon we now call "citizen participation in urban renewal" became really apparent to professionals and elected officials alike.

Nevertheless, the interviews revealed some degree of bitterness on the part of certain respondents. It might have been expected that the decision-makers would place far more emphasis than the leaders of citizens organizations upon the physical aspects of urban renewal, and Robinson found that this was definitely the case. The obvious physical component in urban renewal was referred to in a variety of ways by the majority of those interviewed in this research programme. Many raised the goals of overall planning and related them to urban renewal goals; but it was the decision-makers, as might be expected, who emphasized planning as a primary goal of urban renewal to a greater

85 Robinson, op. cit., p. 64
It doesn't have a very good connotation. On the favourable side some areas are progressing nicely, e.g., Alexandra Park, a fine development for people of varying age groups. But even that one took nine years to get off the books. The length of time involved is the part I don't like. We are doing better with regard to the kind of building we are putting up--now the buildings are very good. We are getting away from massive Regent Park developments with the size and high density and so on. But, as a result of probing more, it appears we are going backwards. We haven't faced up to the question of the homeowner; we haven't improved the homeowner's lot. I'm in favour of cleaning up blighted areas but I vote against urban renewal schemes because of the homeowner question. (Member, City Board of Control)

It means what it always has to me. Where you have an already existing city there has to be a process of adaptation to changing needs and areas that are run down will need to be rectified--as identified in the city urban renewal study of 1956. The goals are abstract. It's hard to interpret because of this; change calls for functional improvement. It is a society (not just planners) that calls for improvement of undesirable conditions. (A professional planner)

For a variety of reasons these expressions of personal understanding are different from those expressed by citizen leaders. Elected officials, professional architects and planners were possessed of a greater degree of formal education, were more facile in their verbal expressions, and were more accustomed to the consideration of conceptual problems. Nevertheless, when citizen leaders who were, in themselves, professional persons were expressing their understanding of the process of urban renewal there was little difference between their responses and those of the decision-makers. In short, the question of social class cannot be neglected when one is considering the nature and expression of citizen participation in urban renewal.

Neither can the differences be ignored in the more detailed consideration of the goals of urban renewal in the early part of the interviews. Statistically, the first and second choices of citizen leaders, when asked to rank a
A co-ordinated programme it enlists both public and private endeavours. In some instances it calls for the use of public funds and public powers. St. James Town and the Toronto-Dominion Centre are both urban renewal. In a sense every new building is part of urban renewal. (A professional planner)

I guess there are really two aspects—the planning side as distinct from implementation—but the more I think of it I guess these two processes are part and parcel of one overall process, i.e., urban renewal. Urban renewal is the net process of maintaining good parts of the urban community, reinforcing viable parts through rehabilitation. In areas that have "started to slip" action is required from both public and private sources. Redevelopment—the tearing down of houses—should be used only in drastic situations and sparingly when rehabilitation is not possible. Something else must be pointed out—urban renewal does not mean renewal of an area just because there is blight. It also means renewal of an area due to changing needs of the city, e.g., to meet transportation and industrial needs. (A government planning official)

The demolishing of older areas and replacing bad housing with a planned development of semi-detached, detached and apartment units. Despite hardships it is necessary to keep in mind the main interest of renewal. We must look after people and make sure that the displaced have a completed renewal area to go to. (Member, City Council Buildings and Development Committee)

It is revitalization of a city and of the specific community involved. It is a great deal more than bricks and mortar and demolition. It is an attempt to revitalize the city without destroying the community itself. (Member, City Board of Control)

The term "urban renewal" means the conservation and rehabilitation of housing. Redevelopment is not included although the need is recognized. It is the process of refurbishing a particular area which has deteriorated. It may require the application of housing by-laws, including expropriation. (Member, City Council Buildings and Development Committee)

Any co-ordinated effort including several levels of government to improve the quality of life through public works. (Member, City Council Committee on Housing, Fire and Legislation)
The goals are to rebuild an area and provide the physical assets that go with an area, such as school accommodation and a parks and recreation community programme. (Member, City Council Committee on Buildings and Development)

To revitalize the decaying, deteriorating parts of an old, that is, over 100 years old, city; to eliminate bad structures, whether houses or obsolete commercial buildings; to modernize the sewer system, effect changes in traffic patterns, to make the city a better place to live or work, to create a balance of parkland where indicated. (Member, City Council Committee on Building and Development)

It is hard to rank. All these are important and interconnected and it's different in different areas and projects. Once you clear slums and raise the standard of living everything else follows. Housing can't be "low cost" to taxpayers though it may be "low rental" to tenants. To build low cost housing would be to re-create a slum. (Member, City Council Committee on Housing, Fire and Legislation)

The goals of urban renewal are really improving the quality of people; providing an environment to citizens of such quality that allows them to meet their aspirations. Human values, health values and social values are all involved. (Member, City Council Committee on Housing, Fire and Legislation)

The quality of life is improved by creating a planned city. I hope this is what we are doing. The day of hit and miss is gone. More than one thing must go on at the same time, must go together. All areas of development here are central, goals don't really have to be separated. We should back those who want to redevelop, we need to revitalize the central area for taxes. That's why the proposed Harbour Plan is fabulous, land can be reclaimed cheaply and nobody is disturbed. (Member, City Board of Control)

There are two goals--adaptation to changing needs and functions of the city; and the rectifying of deteriorated undesirable conditions, undesirable not only in a physical sense. In urban renewal you are affecting people, operating in something that already exists and affects people's lives and businesses. (A professional planner)

Two of the respondents, one a senior elected official and the second an experienced town planner, added quite profound observations on the nature of the goals of urban
series of goals in order of importance, were significantly different from the choices of the decision-makers. For example, the goal described "improving the quality of life", together with the clearly related goal "building a better neighbourhood", were first or second choices of citizen leaders in 65% of the recorded cases. On the other hand, these essentially broad and philosophical notions appeared as first and second choices recorded in exactly 50% of the decision-makers. This appears to be a curious reversal of the previous argument concerning familiarity with conceptual thinking, but it is not difficult to understand when one considers the concerns of those appointed or elected to public office for the purpose of deciding the form and shape of the urban centre. Thus, the goals described as "clearing slums" and "creating a planned city" appeared approximately one in six times in the interviews with citizen leaders, but with the decision-makers the frequency was just short of 30%. The specific notion of creating a planned city was accepted only twice by citizen leaders but eight times by decision-makers.

This simple arithmetic analysis is strongly supported by the following verbal responses of decision-makers to the question, "What would you say are the goals of urban renewal?"

The primary goal is the adaptation of the existing physical form of the urban area to the continued growth of the city and its changing functions. (A professional planner)

The goals are first, redevelopment of aging areas and, second, rehabilitation of families where the majority need more promising accommodation. (Member, City Council Committee on Buildings and Development)

The goals are firstly to make the urban community a healthier place in which to live and work and, secondly, a goal must include consideration of the needs of the people directly involved when an area is deemed "urban renewal area". Too many people are concerned with aesthetic factors alone. They want the city to look beautiful. They forget they are also going to be dealing with human lives in order to achieve the goal. (A professional planner)
renewal and the problem of ranking some as more important than others. The politician said:

I am desperately concerned about increasing the supply of low cost housing but I am underplaying the first goal listed--there is a terrible danger in equating urban renewal and low cost housing. In fact, urban renewal can rarely increase the supply of low cost housing, unless there was little residential development in the area beforehand. As for the second goal [revitalizing the Central Business District], I think ribbon development is dead and urban renewal will not revive it. Instead, we need to give the impetus to business to take a hard look at itself.

The town planner summed up this entire matter of conflict of goals in urban renewal:

It doesn't make sense to think in terms of most of these objectives--of course, improve the quality of life but that's so nebulous. The whole idea of neighbourhood is questionable but of course you try to improve attractiveness, in the sense that people will want to live in the area. Again, creating a planned city, you've already got a city. You don't start with an ideal and plan--clearing slums--it depends on what you mean. If the housing is intolerable in society's terms you clear or correct where it makes sense. Revitalizing the Central Business District--in a broad sense, yes, this is a goal so that the centre can fulfil its role. If you don't make changes you can throttle the business district, but it must have internal reason and vitality. This is not a valid goal in itself. You can't use the city to make the central district successful--it must have a viability of its own. With respect to "increasing the supply of low cost housing", land in renewal areas should be used to the greatest advantage in terms of the needs of adaptation. Often it is the low cost housing, but maybe not. There is a tendency to stuff as much as you can into an area, but it must be of quality, not simply create poor conditions. Everything possible needs to be done to increase the supply of low cost housing but you cannot rely on the odd bit of opportunity that you have in renewal. No, this has to be a goal in itself if this is what you're after and it should be.

Nevertheless, it had been indicated previously that the group of citizen leaders and the group of decision-makers were almost unanimous in their negative response to a question concerning similar perceptions of the goals of
urban renewal on the part of members of other groups. Citizen leaders, with only one exception, were emphatic in their notion that those responsible for preparing and for approving renewal schemes do not have the same primary goals as they do. On the other hand, appointed and elected officials responsible for legislation and the designation, approval and planning of urban renewal areas were, with just two exceptions, equally convinced that those who live in urban renewal areas do not perceive the primary goal of such schemes as they did. This appeared to be the central dilemma in the development of relationships between citizen groups and officials charged with responsibility in Toronto during the late 1960s and early 1970s. There were fundamental clashes of view on the objectives of the entire exercise.

One experienced senior person in the profession of urban planning stated:

It's hard to know, views aren't constant, they change. My experience is that those who live in urban renewal areas are first and foremost concerned with what is going to happen to them. Initially we talked to people in the areas and told them about plans. They were understanding of public goals and accepted them as being sound. They wanted to know how they were going to be affected, what they were going to experience. It has changed in the last two or three years, mainly in that there has been a feeling spread around that people should not accept public objectives. This has been introduced from the outside and doesn't really stem from the areas, but broader influences in society. By and large people are quite reasonable but can't help getting involved in peripheral issues, for example, compensation. Many felt they weren't getting the deal they should, so you can't discuss anything with them because they feel that if they agree on anything they won't get a better deal.

There is no question from the evidence in these interviews that the matter of urban renewal process in the years under study had become far more than some rational exploration of the problems of people, the nature of neighbourhoods and the manner in which the improvement of the latter might assist the well-being of the former. Several elected
officials spoke bitterly about the political objectives of some of their colleagues as well as those of certain citizen leaders. There is certainly no question that the whole matter of urban renewal became the focus of discontent within certain neighbourhoods, primarily because some persons who aspired to public office felt that these issues, when seized upon and taken in full tide to their inevitable crest, would mean their election and the elimination from public office of those who resisted new roles for local citizen groups. Their judgement was proved to be correct in the civic elections of December 1972.

Throughout the interviews with the decision-makers there ran a thread of changing views on the whole matter of urban renewal, as both a policy and a process. Some respondents indicated that their views had not changed fundamentally but others were quite clear in their emphasis upon new conceptions. Some spoke of their changing view that the relatively simple process had become extremely complicated. Others talked about the related notion of time, specifically, that they saw urban renewal as a process extending over many years, if not an entire generation, rather than a simple process of clearing blight and replacing inadequate physical structures (whether residential or commercial) with sound and adequate housing and community facilities. There was by no means any degree of optimism evident in the majority of these interviews. In hindsight the analyst can see elected and appointed officials "girding for battle" as they realized that the situation of the early 1960s had passed and, while in those years significant physical change had occurred as a result of public policies, they could now see that the strengthened legislation within the NHA had come far too late to enable rapid improvement in renewal neighbourhoods.
The Views of Appointed and Self-appointed Advisors

There were two groups of advisors in the research interviews of 1968-69. Group "B" were for the most part social workers, ministers in various churches, and officials of governmental and non-governmental agencies working in or in the vicinity of urban renewal areas. They are described in this text as appointed advisors because their organizations had in most cases been located in downtown neighbourhoods for a great many years; their responsibilities as social workers, public health nurses, or other professional persons had always been directed towards the improvement of health, welfare and spiritual components in the lives of neighbourhood residents. On the other hand, there were a few professional persons--graduates of universities and sometimes post-graduate social workers--who had deliberately moved into older neighbourhoods for the purpose of organizing the residents to participate in the process of urban and social development. These persons are herein described as self-appointed advisors.

The second group (Group "D" in this research) were described as the "opinion influencers". They could scarcely be called "appointed" or "self-appointed" in this context, but to some degree they are more the latter than the former. They included retired members of planning boards, former government employees who had entered the field of private consultation, and a few academics interested in urban development and who had made their points of view known through newspaper articles and research publications. This group also included politicians who were known to be the "housing critics" of their respective parties in the provincial legislature, and officials of other organizations in the community which had a direct interest in such fields as real estate, mortgage financing and urban development generally.

The opinion influencers had one attribute in common--they were vocal in the field of housing, urban renewal and
urban development. Some spoke frequently to local groups and participated directly in their activities with respect to the position of City Council on plans for designated urban renewal areas. Some wrote articles for the editorial pages of the press. Some appeared frequently on public platforms, or made speeches which received publicity in the news media. Some were particularly active in such organizations as the Bureau of Municipal Research, the Community Planning Association of Canada, and the Association of Housing and Urban Renewal Officials which had recently been formed in this country. In short, they had an opinion to express on the nature of urban renewal planning and they frequently expressed it.

On the important question, "What does urban renewal mean to you?", some of their more notable responses were the following:

It means the opportunity to revitalize declining areas--residential and commercial--with an eye to improving the environment for the citizens via the use of governmental operations rather than private development. (A former housing official.)

It depends on what audience it relates to. For me professionally, I see it as having the primary objective of restoring an appropriate "land-to-improvements" ratio. An urban renewal scheme that does not have sound economic rationale will not be saleable to the general public. If the programme is explained exclusively in terms of the social "have-nots" then it is difficult to interest politicians at the local and federal levels. Conversely, if a needed social objective is supported by an economic feasibility study it will be accepted. This should result in low-cost, low-quality housing being replaced by more expensive better quality housing. Personally, in Canada, at least Ontario, urban renewal has gone as far as it can without a much broader interpretation of expropriation procedures. We need more public write-down. We have tended to stress private urban renewal with privately assembled land with the objective of denser use than previously existed. This is too time consuming and too costly. (An official of a research organization)

It is interpreted by me to be a "con game" of the government to keep people "happy". I know it means redevelopment, rehabilitation, conservation and hopefully
with a main goal of leading to a better life; but I have been interested in the field of urban renewal for 25-30 years mostly working with people right in the areas, especially the Regent Park development and the West End, and I have been disappointed. I have seen too many frustrations, too much waiting of citizens involved. So I really wonder if in reality these programmes do lead to a "better life". Urban renewal is a programme to improve situations but it has been without real success or, for that matter, without real "down and out failure". Urban renewal is a great term but the reality so far has been disappointing. This term for me is loaded with personal meanings because of my involvement and I am not too hopeful for success in the near future. (A University social scientist)

It is a sugar-coated phrase used by the City to cover subsidies for other levels of governments and involves mostly the use of expropriation to effect an improvement. Urban renewal also involves, technically of course, rehabilitation, but little of this is going on. Not only is there hoped-to-be physical improvement, but also improved social wellbeing of people. (A former member of City Council)

It means updating the physical and sometimes the social fabric of a neighbourhood with government taking the losses. (A University social scientist)

Replacing the older fabric of the City with either something new or a rehabilitation of an older area. The term "urban renewal" is associated largely with public development--the image the public has conceives of urban renewal in this way. But really urban renewal is both public and private. (Official of a housing development organization)

Replacement of the fabric of a community as it becomes obsolete and outworn. It includes both physical and social renewal. (A former member of a planning board)

It means good municipal housekeeping. (A private planner active in community organizations)

It's a bloody mess and a shame the way it has been gone at. The first step--to ask the public what it wants--has been ignored. The findings of a questionnaire I sent out said that people want open spaces, "a city with a soul". (A newspaper writer)
Although it can be argued that there was nothing particularly new in these expressions of personal meaning, they were often expressed with more evident feeling and with more pungent language than was at the command of other respondents. This was to be expected in view of the normal occupations of the so-called "opinion influencers". Nevertheless, the striking fact emerged that whatever their flair for vocal and written expression, all but a handful in this fourth group were agreed on a negative answer to the question, "Do you feel that those who live in urban renewal areas perceive the primary goal of urban renewal as you do?" Among the few exceptions the answer was indecisive depending upon the circumstances of particular projects or particular political events.

It will be recalled that the immediate question following an expression of the personal meaning of urban renewal was, "What would you say were the goals of urban renewal?" It had been anticipated that this group--well known in the communication arts, well educated and knowledgeable about the broad field of housing and urban renewal--would express views that were somewhat different from those of the decision-makers and citizen leaders. The following verbatim extracts reveal that such an expectation was not realized:

To increase the stock of decent housing available at rents that can be afforded. There is the collateral objective of preserving the stock that presently exists. (A member of a research organization)

Firstly, to provide low rental housing that is adequate for people's needs; secondly, to clean up slum areas; thirdly, to provide a better life; and fourth, to improve the economy. However, I often think that many City of Toronto and provincial government officials do not really mean what they say. There is often both a manifest and a latent purpose in what they say. Often government officials are out, for instance, to get a building contract for a friend. (A University social scientist)
The goals of urban renewal are to get rid of the blighted areas; to provide more building space in an area where the land is not being put to full use, for example, to build schools, parks and so on; to provide a better transportation system and other public services. The goal of private urban renewal is to make the best economic use of the land. Any urban renewal undertaken by a private plan must be economically feasible. The objective of public urban renewal is not the same as private urban renewal. The public urban renewal is geared to the whole, the private only to a part. (Official of a private housing development organization)

As I tell my students, the goals are (1) more adequate tax revenue; (2) to create a halo effect, i.e., improvement by government in one area will spread to others: (3) the welfare of the people in an urban renewal area; and (4) eliminating cost to city departments of combatting the costs of blight, e.g., fire and police protection services. (A university social scientist)

Its principal goal is to upgrade the physical and social aspects of the community's environment. (Housing critic of a political party)

As a city develops, some parts deteriorate, others change by themselves. Some parts need help in changing for the better. The aim of renewal is to make sure the neighbourhood changed is for the better. (An executive member of several community organizations)

The most interesting aspect of these comments by prominent persons who may be said to influence public opinion is the frequent reference to the differential function of public as against private urban renewal. Not only officials of housing development organizations and those working for the media, but academics clearly emphasized the difference in objectives between the two sets of auspices. This was interesting because the hostility towards urban renewal operations in central Toronto was by no means limited to projected operations by inter-governmental authorities working under federal-provincial legislation.

In the early and mid-1960s the demolition of the large neighbourhood now housing the most concentrated density of
apartment dwellers in Canada, St. James Town, was the occasion for a great deal of unrest and expressions of concern by residents, staff and board members in community agencies, and by elected officials within City Council. St. James Town was considered to be a classic example of "blockbusting" activities wherein, it was alleged, the development organization first purchased a series of homes from willing vendors and allowed these to deteriorate systematically. One part of this operation was said to be the allocation of such purchased homes to low-income families and to families in receipt of welfare assistance, who could be expected to both overcrowd and to deteriorate the physical accommodation. There is no question that the St. James Town neighbourhood (to the north of Wellesley Street, between Sherbourne and Parliament Streets) had all the appearance of a battle zone for two or three years. With some houses boarded up, some demolished and their sites enclosed by wooden hoarding, and with an obvious appearance of deterioration within those houses not yet purchased by the developer, the owners and tenants who remained had little incentive to maintain their unpurchased houses. They knew that the development organization had made application to City Council for the adoption of a development plan for the entire neighbourhood.

Under these circumstances the social agencies in the broad central Toronto neighbourhood and throughout the community linked together to form an organization which would attempt to meet the needs of persons displaced and those who continued to reside in St. James Town under apparently distressing conditions. This was one of the first experiments in co-operative social action within the City of Toronto and the entire record of these efforts has been reported in full. 86

These observations have been placed on the record, partly because they influenced the activities of the research group and partly to indicate that opposition to urban renewal was not confined to public activity. There were frequent references in the research interviews to the experience in Don Mount Court, Alexandra Park, and Trefann Court, but it was difficult to learn very much at the end of the 1960s about the experience of St. James Town. By the time the research was undertaken all the original (early 1960s) residents had been dispersed and, while the research group did manage to interview some of the former leaders of the residents, they had moved a considerable distance from their original homes and were by no means pleased to discuss their previous experience. Under all these circumstances it is curious that the "opinion influencers" made so much distinction between public and private urban renewal.

In statistical terms, Group D interviewees ranked the goals of urban renewal in very much the same way as the "decision-makers". The greatest emphasis was placed on the goal listed on the researcher's card as "building a better neighbourhood". This was the first or second choice of 40% of the respondents, followed closely by the goal described as "improving quality of life". It is curious, therefore, that these prominent members of the community selected as the most significant goals of urban renewal highly conceptual expressions rather than quite pragmatic notions such as "increasing the supply of low-cost housing" or "clearing slums". In fact, the concept of "creating a planned city" was the third most important selection of these respondents and the notion of increasing the availability of housing for low-income families and the related concept of clearing slums were well down the list of choices.

Nevertheless, later in these interviews (in that part concerned with the "nature of citizen participation") this same group of respondents conceived financial concerns and
housing as the two most significant issues to citizens and citizens' organizations. This would appear logical if one recalls that these respondents were almost unanimous in their view that residents in urban renewal areas did not hold the same set of goals as they did, and the specifications are now clear. In their view, the major objectives of urban renewal programmes fell into the realm of philosophy—a better planned city, an improved quality of life, building better neighbourhoods—but they recognized that those directly affected were concerned with the most important bread-and-butter issues: the quantity and the cost of housing accommodation.

There were, finally, the views of the advisors to citizen groups—some appointed (as has been indicated previously) by virtue of their work in recognized community groups, and some self-appointed by virtue of their deliberate self-implantation in urban renewal neighbourhoods. The interviewees included staff members of the most important neighbourhood and settlement houses in downtown Toronto, as well as churches which bordered the clearly designated urban renewal areas. Persons who described themselves as community organizers, programme directors, community workers, and pastors of various denominations comprised the majority of those interviewed. Their knowledge of the six areas selected for investigation was intimate, personal, and very often bitter. Yet their specific statements were not particularly new or profound. Some of the most notable answers to the first question in the interview schedule, "What does urban renewal mean to you?" were the following:

Urban renewal should be a forward step for the area.
It should be beneficial in terms of improvement for the people—with a minimum of clearance, and the people should fully understand the process. The way it is practised in Toronto at present is ghastly—the process is chaotic and the results non-beneficial to the people.
It means to uplift, regenerate or rebuild something. It implies upheaving the whole community and starting from scratch. In a sense it is a "new birth". However, it is more than just reconstruction of physical quarters. It also has a good deal to do with the social effects on the people in the area. As it is presently being used, though, it seems to mean having to do away with all and is a complete type of thing. Rehabilitation is not really a part of urban renewal now.

It means redevelopment and rehabilitation. It means tearing down old houses and building new ones. Primarily I am negative in my attitude right now towards urban renewal because of what I have seen happen right here—in Don Mount. These people have been given a really rough time by the city. I am positive towards urban renewal to the extent that I see the absolute necessity of renewing dilapidated parts of the city. It's the present method I don't agree with. And I predict further trouble in Don Mount when people begin to move into the new buildings. The people still in their own old houses will be very hostile towards them.

Chaos! As I have found it, it has lacked a definitive policy from the Municipal level. Those responsible haven't come to grips with citizen participation in the formulation of plans. There is not a sufficient relationship between the Development Department and the physical planning. As I would like to see it, there should be less red tape. Those responsible should come down on a citizen participation policy or, alternatively, as some American cities have done, to ignore this and clear out an area completely. Local citizens who are affected by urban renewal and bear the cost of improving the city should tangibly benefit in the improvement, that is, money, preferred loans and so on.

It means that people in the community are dispossessed of the houses in which they live. It means that poor housing is substituted with better physical structures. At the same time it also means a dislocation and scattering of the neighbourhood and community. Only about 25% of the people come back to the area.

Renewal of a deteriorated area of the city with municipal intervention and backing. It could mean a wide range of things, but since I am in the social work field, I emphasize the social aspects and am concerned about deteriorated areas.
The remaining responses to that first question were more mundane than those quoted. It is not possible, in reading research interviews, to measure the tone of the respondents and the degree of emphasis and feeling displayed. The members of the research group noted in many cases that some respondents in all four groups were bitter, profane and angry. It was clear that by the late 1960s the experience with urban renewal in Toronto had caused a tremendous amount of "hard feeling" and had led many colleagues within political life to become personal enemies. In hindsight it presaged the major political struggles of the first half of the 1970s and the changes in the composition of City Council which were in part related to the attitudes of newcomers towards the concept of neighbourhoods and their alleged destruction or conservation.

As in the case of all three previously described groups, the advisors to citizen groups were almost unanimous in their view that "those responsible for preparing and for approving urban renewal schemes" did not have the same primary goals as they did. Among this substantial group only one answered "Yes"—that is, that those responsible for urban renewal and the respondent had the same goals—while two others responded a qualified "Yes and No". This reinforces the significant finding in this first research experiment that a major difficulty was the lack of correspondence of imputed goals in the process. Thus, on the question, "What would you say are the goals of urban renewal?", the statistical finding was quite startling in its correspondence with the choices of the "influencers of opinion".

The research team had expected that social workers, clergymen and various officials of community organizations working with low-income and disadvantaged families in the poorest neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto would emphasize housing and slum clearance as their primary choice. In fact, "increasing the supply of low-cost housing" was the choice of
only four persons and the second choice of one; "clearing slums" was even less significant and was the second choice of one respondent and the first choice of none. Rather, as before, these professionals chose the same conceptual phrases as the more academically oriented opinion-influencers and decision-makers in the previous two groups analysed.

The most frequent first choice on the statistical card was "improving quality of life" (about one-third of the group), while the most significant second choice in about the same proportion was the concept of "building a better neighbourhood". It is probable that a research interview which originates in a professional school within a university induces conceptual responses on the part of interviewees who are professionals or quasi-professionals in the community or who have a university background. It is possible that those interviewed felt that their intellectual responses were called for and that the concepts of both low-cost housing and slum clearance were somewhat unrealistic in terms of the legislation and experience of the late 1960s. These were certainly least favoured alternatives by those persons active in advising the residents of urban renewal areas. In short, the choice of goals in order of importance did not necessarily disavow their concern with housing for the people, but it was surely not expected that the choice of highly theoretical propositions involving phrases such as "quality of life" and "a better neighbourhood" would be so favoured by the respondents; they are just as difficult to define and defend as the notion of "slum clearance".

This group of advisors displayed no particular special wisdom in response to the question, "What would you say are the goals of urban renewal?" Some of the most notable expressions were the following:

First, rehabilitation of the environment with a view to making a better community for all economic groups. Second, the provision of safe, sanitary and decent housing. Thirdly, the development of community
organizations on a local basis so that there is some possibility of interaction in the new community which is somehow to result. And fourthly, the provision of adequate social, educational, recreational and other services. (A clergyman)

The goals, as I see them, include physical renewal and provision of better low-cost housing. I also believe that a goal of urban renewal is a social goal—the mental outlook of the people involved should be looked at more closely and involved in "urban renewal", that is, dealing with their negative attitude towards tearing down houses and with their unmet social and psychological needs, should be included as a goal of urban renewal. (A clergyman associated with a neighbourhood centre)

The goal is to "put your house in order"—to put the community in order and renew it in all ways. Of course this is done with the help of the government but the community must be willing if urban renewal is to be effective. Keeping the analogy with the family: if relatives come in and start rearranging the house, it's not the same or as effective as it would be if an issue that came from the family itself. It's the same with government and community. If the government takes the initiative in planning for the area and in forcing ready-made plans on the community, then urban renewal will fall flat on its face. (A community worker in a settlement house)

Create a fuller life: first; physically in terms of housing that is compatible to the needs of the community; socially—establish a better neighbourhood; recreationally—the development of facilities; and spiritually—a vital need of every person. (A clergyman, a long-time pastor)

One major goal is to combine physical and social rehabilitation, that is, to link urban renewal with anti-poverty programmes. This is necessary because people with many problems congregate in deteriorated areas. Also it must be recognized that urban renewal has to involve citizens' participation from the beginning if it is to be successful. (A social worker and former co-ordinator of a neighbourhood services programme)

Among this group of respondents more interesting statements of concern came forward spontaneously in response to the question of similarity or dissimilarity of goals
between those who must make the decisions in preparing and approving urban renewal schemes and the respondents themselves. For example, the following statements reveal the bitterness felt by many community based members of various professions:

The city is more interested in increasing the tax base and bringing in private development. It has no interest in the residents of the area. Those responsible for urban renewal pay lip service to increasing the supply of low-cost housing but this is never accomplished. *(A community organizer)*

It seems to me that the official philosophy of the planning authorities is that the central part of the city should be a place of residence for high-income families with few or no children. The changes are directed towards getting the poor out of the city, rather than trying to relocate them properly in a familiar environment. Also, planning around the centre of the city is too much geared to car transportation--it should be more oriented to public transportation. *(A clergyman active in urban studies)*

The people I deal with had no practical knowledge of just what the people wanted. The planners are more concerned with how they do something than why they are doing it. The politicians' goals are to blossom their own political life without consultation with the people they represent. There are too many decision makers with no attempt to co-ordinate their decisions with the ideas of the people. For example, the social survey which I did...was never used. *(A community organizer)*

How can they have the same goals? The City does not have the same goals because officials don't talk to the people to find out their views, their ideas. Up until recently there has been no connection between city government and people. Let's face it--it's the government that is renewing and it seems as if this is being done for their own sake. The government should be the employee of the people--and so far they seem not to be recognizing this. *(A community worker in a neighbourhood settlement house)*

Those responsible are so busy working within the existing legislation that they fail to consider or do not attempt to consider what would be best--what new courses of action or legislation would be best for the inhabitants. *(A community worker)*
These were the more pungent remarks by persons who lived, worked, or both within the geographical area of an urban renewal neighbourhood. Many of those interviewed were considered militant by some members of both the Board of Control of the City of Toronto, and the Buildings and Development Committee, and by some of the influencers of opinion. It was remarkable that very few of the citizen leaders interviewed pointed with approval or expressed gratitude to these professional persons who had benefitted them in their struggles with the Department of Development, the City Planning Board, or simply the City of Toronto--whichever political grouping appeared to them to be "the enemy". In very few cases did any interviewed resident designate a specific "helper" by name or offer praise for their activities. It appeared that Groups A and B--the leaders of residents' organizations and their advisors--worked side by side and yet in two different dimensions. They were clearly meeting together and working together; but it must be evident that many citizen leaders did not trust their advisors, either those who worked for the traditional community organizations or the "self-appointed" advisors who moved into neighbourhoods deliberately, they said, to assist the poor, the disadvantaged and the brow-beaten residents of areas wherein public improvement programmes were under serious consideration.

Summary

If allowance is made for the broad variation in educational and vocational experience, the responses of our groups of knowledgeable persons interviewed in 1968-69 were not fundamentally different. It had been expected that leaders of citizens' organizations would be persons of working class or lower middle class socio-economic status; it had been expected that advisors to citizens' groups would be primarily university-trained graduates of social science and social work programmes; it had been expected that the decision-makers
would be primarily university-trained professional planners, and elected politicians who were either businessmen or lawyers; it had been expected that the "opinion influencers" would be the most experienced and most highly educated of all persons interviewed. These expectations were fulfilled for the most part, although it has been emphasized that a number of leaders of citizens' groups were highly educated professional persons--social workers, lawyers, planners, architects, writers--who had already moved into the older neighbourhoods and were helping to organize resistance to urban renewal programmes.

A further expectation, that seemed to flow logically from the socio-economic distribution found among the residents, was a significant qualitative difference in their responses. The members of the research team assumed that citizens' leaders would be "simple folk", bewildered by the whole process of urban development and primarily prejudiced against public housing, and fundamentally concerned about the potential loss of their homes. The latter part of the expectation was accurate but the former was not. In the choice of propositions descriptive of urban renewal goals, citizens' leaders chose conceptual statements just as often as did their counsellors, their elected representatives, their appointed town planners, and those who were university professors in Metropolitan Toronto.

The research group had anticipated that citizens' leaders and their advisors would "zero in" on the need for low-income housing and the need for appropriate financial compensation for the dislocation caused by urban renewal activity. In the last section of the interview concerned with, specifically, the "rehabilitation of housing" these concerns did emerge and in the description of the entire process of citizen participation there was much attention to the matter of compensation when residents were likely to lose their homes through expropriation. Nevertheless, most members of all
four groups of interviewees most often conceived the goals of urban renewal to be "improved quality of life" and "building a better neighbourhood", or "creating a planned city". All are phrases of conceptual quality, difficult to define, and difficult to interpret. The more specific phrases, such as "increasing the supply of low cost housing", "clearing slums", and "revitalizing the Central Business District" were rarely recorded as important goals. It was argued earlier that many residents may have been influenced by the graduate status of the interviewers and their university sponsorship. They may have felt better in their choice of broad intellectual propositions rather than appearing selfish in citing personal objectives, that is, their own houses and their own financial positions.

One of the most important findings of this first phase of the research programme was the discovery that almost every person interviewed stated the primary goals of neighbourhood residents as totally different from those of persons responsible for preparing and for approving urban renewal schemes. The exceptions were fewer than 10%, and even among this small percentage the interviewees were undecided; comments were both positive and negative. It would seem to be an unavoidable conclusion, therefore, that the major hypothesis which was tested in this phase of the research was clearly proven. It had been hypothesized that negative citizen response to urban renewal programmes was based upon misunderstanding of the objectives and distrust of the activities of decision-makers. This proposition perhaps extended to both appointed officials (City staff, urban planners, members of the Development Department) and elected officials (the Mayor and members of such City Council Committees as Buildings and Development, and Housing, Fire and Legislation).

In hindsight, nearly five years later, this might appear surprising. It does assist greatly in explaining what has
happened in downtown Toronto and in the politics of Toronto since 1969. This is not to assert that great understanding or vast reservoirs of trust have developed in recent years. Yet, the election of 1972, which brought together a majority of City Councillors pledged to curtail development and to preserve neighbourhoods, is substantially explicable in terms of the events explored in the research work described in this study.
Chapter VII

The Process of Citizen Participation

The idea of participation by citizens in the development of their communities and in many other aspects of society is encircled with romantic notions and stereotypes that are not mutually exclusive. On the one hand those persons who participate actively in fostering, modifying or blocking a particular change in the form and shape of the urban environment are often seen by elected officials and municipal planners as selfish trouble-makers whose only goal is to extract as much compensation as possible from the local or other governmental authority.

On the other hand such persons are seen by newspaper writers and members of the helping professions (education, social work, theology, public health) to be victims of a harsh industrial society in which poverty has persisted in the midst of affluence and who are not only striking a blow for freedom but making it possible for many otherwise ordinary persons in the community to realize a substantial degree of personal fulfilment. In a brief word, during the past decade or more the social science notions of participation as personal value have clashed repeatedly with the views of the politicians and bureaucrats that many citizens are dedicated primarily to obstruction, obfuscation, and/or are led by self-seeking politicians or would-be politicians for their own personal advantage.

The awareness of this fundamental difference of views led the research group to explore as fully as possible the entire process of citizen participation, as it was understood by the respondents at that time. The introduction to this essential component in the research took the form of an opening question: "What are the basic concerns of citizens and citizen groups who involve themselves in urban renewal?" This was followed by the presentation of a card on which several possible concerns were listed and the respondent was asked to rank these in order of importance;
it was also possible to add to the list of concerns. Moreover, since it was well known that there were deep disputes between owners of property in potential urban renewal areas and tenants--both those who rented from absentee landlords and those who lived in the homes of owner occupants--the citizen concerns on the statistical card were cross-classified by "owners" and "tenants".

These opening questions were followed by more than twenty approaches to the nature of citizen participation. They included specific interests of the respondents in the process of participation in their particular neighbourhood (or others), the reasons some persons participate more than others, the kinds of persons who assume leadership positions and those who do not. In short, the entire process of citizen activity was explored, whether such activity was to help preserve the respondent's residential neighbourhood or to play a significant role in the process of change.

The leaders of citizens' or residents' associations (the first groups interviewed and, presumably, clearly aware of the basic concerns of citizens) were almost unanimous in their choice of two concerns as the most important: "housing" and "financial". These were also the choices of property owners and were not significantly less emphasized by tenants. As might be expected, financial considerations were given more prominence by property owners, but in the case of tenants it was clearly seen that their concern with housing (if they should have to leave the neighbourhood) and with rents (financial concerns) were two sides of the same coin. Nevertheless, in the verbal expressions which accompanied these choices financial considerations clearly emerged as different kinds of problems for owners than for tenants. For example, on the question regarding the basic concerns of citizens and citizen groups the following were notable comments:
To get better living conditions for tenants and better prices for homeowners, everybody must be involved. It is nonsense to have a nice looking city with unhappy people living within.

The basic concerns are getting a house for a house; making people realize that our houses are good enough; and going to City Hall to try and prevent the plan from being passed.

First, the residents' association should be trying to relate the wishes of the residents. It's hard to say what these wishes are. I wouldn't. My major concern is not to see deteriorated zones in the area, whether houses, garages, etc., not only physical deteriorations, but housekeeping.

The price of their homes. The City has offered too low prices per home.

They are concerned about people--concerned about the other guy. People in Trefann and Don Vale stood behind me.

It depends on which area you are talking about but usually they are unsure about what is going to happen--especially because of housing.

Fear of losing their homes because of the scarcity of housing, because of the convenience of the area, because of the fear of the City taking advantage of them financially.

The concerns are primarily selfish. There is also recognition of a quality of life in the centre of the City which most have deliberately chosen to return to.

It is possible to generalize from these choices and the above verbatim expressions. Money was a prime consideration, whether by a homeowner about to be expropriated for the purposes of implementing an urban renewal scheme, or by a tenant who knew that relocation would be required. The assurance given by civic politicians and members of the Ontario Housing Corporation, that those displaced would have a high priority for admission to public housing, was by no means satisfying.
Homeowners who became active in citizens' organizations in urban renewal areas wanted to continue to be homeowners, but many did not succeed in these objectives.\textsuperscript{87} Tenants, on the other hand, were not anxious to apply for public housing, either because of the inevitable waiting period or they feared that their particular circumstances might not commend them to the tenant placement officials of the OHC. Many tenants, it must be emphasized, were single persons or couples who rented or boarded in owner-occupied dwellings. They knew that public housing did not exist at that time for individual persons and couples who were not elderly; and even in such a case there was a long waiting list maintained by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company which was responsible for senior citizens' housing. The basic precipitating factor for citizen participation, therefore, was a fear of the inability to obtain adequate housing in the private market and such inability was based clearly upon financial inadequacy.

As might be expected, the interviews showed that professional advisors to citizens' groups had a realistic picture of the basic concerns of citizens who involved themselves in urban renewal. They were probably more cognizant of the poverty in which their clients lived as well as of the economic realities of the market place. In statistical terms these advisors, whose roles ranged from those of community organizer to spiritual counsellor, chose the "financial" concern above all others as influencing both owners and tenants in renewal neighbourhoods. Their second choice was, of course, "housing", but their view of the overall living standards of their clients apparently led them to dwell more on the financial aspects of the urban dilemma than the need for shelter.

These tendencies to rank financial considerations above all others caused the interviewees in Group B (advisors to citizens' groups) to make scarce mention of any other possible consideration—political concerns, personal concerns, and those defined as social-recreational, that is, the desire to provide better facilities in deteriorated neighbourhoods. This system of rank ordering is mentioned not only because the reality of economic disadvantage must always loom large in the minds of those professionals who work with low-income families, but their choices raise a fundamental contradiction in response. In the previous chapter it was noted that advisors to citizens' groups chose highly conceptual objectives as the major goals of urban renewal; for example, "building a better neighbourhood", "creating a planned city", and "improving the quality of life". When asked specifically about citizen participation, however, these persons moved much closer to the reality of life and emphasized that the goals of the citizens were economic rather than emotional and ephemeral.

The specific verbatim comments of some of those designated as advisors to citizens' groups were most revealing, as the following examples will indicate:

That they should get a fair return on their property is a basic concern; also that they should have a voice in decisions directly affecting them.

Primarily it is to improve the community. So far citizens have had to do two things in order to improve their community. Firstly, they have had to protect the community from the negligent interference of government. They have to prevent their area and themselves from becoming another Alexandra Park where government took over as an alien power without consulting residents. Residents have had to and must figure out how to improve their community. The government cannot be, as it often has been, like a "nosey neighbour", who interferes in your affairs without consulting you. Of course, if the government, like a friendly neighbour, comes in as a helper, then residents can co-operate.
They are reasonable people, genuinely concerned for the community as a whole. There is self interest, and they expect improved neighbourhoods, planned neighbourhoods—through better services.

Partially self interest, i.e., what will I get for my property? Some elements of "community-mindedness".

First, the question—what is going to happen to them? This is selfish but understandable. Then they become more organized and begin to get concerned with other people; for example, what's going to happen to that old man? They develop leadership qualities and learn how to lobby. It may be very therapeutic for them!

With respect to St. James Town citizens, all the tenants were concerned with housing per se. They couldn't afford the high cost of housing. They were concerned with why the area had been allowed to deteriorate. They wanted to know where public housing was—where recreational, school, medical resources were located.

The main concern was to obtain more money for their properties and vacate the neighbourhood, especially the older homeowners. The tenants' concerns were generally swamped by the property owners.

What is going to happen to their own housing situation? The personal loss of living accommodation.

Some want the area re-zoned for high-rise, so they will make money. Others want residential zoning enforced and want help in rehabilitating their homes. Still others seek a fair price and replacement value for their house.

In these responses there were some hints of the days to come in the urban renewal areas in downtown Toronto. There was a clear division of response between owners and tenants among leaders of citizen groups. Owners were far more concerned with the compensation for expropriation than were tenants, and this is understandable. They feared, quite rightly, that they would receive only modest and inadequate payments from the City of Toronto which were governed by a provincial Expropriation Act (this Act has since been revised to help in such matters). The fact is that since 1969 both the City and the province have been
reluctant to expropriate any homes for public purposes, which is in large measure related to the impact of citizen groups' resistance to urban renewal activity in the middle and late 1960s.

On the other hand, the fact that citizen leaders and their professional advisors recognized the financial problems of homeowners but were less clear about the problems of tenants in these neighbourhoods was a foretaste of the expulsion of low-income tenants from many areas during the past five years. The homeowner was understandably concerned with his financial capacity to obtain replacement housing, preferably housing that he would own. The tenant was understandably concerned with the problem of obtaining any housing at all. In the struggles between various groups, representing owners on the one hand and tenants on the other, in such communities as Trefann Court and the Kensington area from 1969 to 1973, the ultimate expression was that of opposition to poor families. Homeowners were entitled to reasonable settlements to permit them to relocate elsewhere. Tenants were less well off, however, and presumably were destined for public housing.

In 1968-69 the OHC was just beginning to make an impact in Metro Toronto in terms of the supply of public housing, and there is no doubt that many tenants suffered as a result of the activities of citizens' groups. The neighbourhoods were protected from the incursion of public housing, but the owners sold to middle and upper-middle class purchasers who renovated their homes. By the mid-1970s it was certain that neither the low-income families of the quarter-century following the end of the War nor the traditional homeowner whose residence probably dated from the 1920s or 1930s would ever return to the renewal neighbourhoods.
The two remaining groups of respondents, the "decision-makers" and the "opinion-influencers", were even more emphatic in their views of the basic concerns of citizens and citizen groups. Among the planners and politicians (decision-makers) more than three-quarters of the rank-ordered concerns were those described as "financial" and "housing". Financial considerations were the first or second choice of seventeen respondents; the problem of housing was the first or second choice of fifteen respondents. In the group described as "opinion-influencers" financial considerations were the first choice of twelve respondents, ten of whom chose "housing" as their second choice.

The following are some interesting comments of these respondents:

Proper compensation for their homes...if we can leave the door open for negotiations, then certain of the people would be happy. For a large number, compensation for their homes is the only means of financing other accommodation. They have to be assured that they can go out and buy. (Member, City of Toronto Board of Control)

What's going to happen to me? To my association with the neighbourhood and to my home? He is concerned about the money he gets, even though he may be happy to leave. Some are concerned about public housing as a relocation resource for them, or find it distasteful as a neighbour for them. Some feel that City Hall is "out to get them". (A senior planner, Government of Ontario)

Generally, they are dedicated, sincere people; but often those who involve themselves are those who have panicked over money; and feel that by pressuring the City they can get more money. (Member, City of Toronto Committee on Buildings and Development)

Mainly fear of the unknown and anxiety; the urban renewal procedures, which (by law) force the City to declare an area as urban renewal, bring pressures on the people. I wish we didn't have to do this. Then their first declared concern is compensation for expropriation--and this hasn't been adequately worked out yet. Next is their fear of the cost of rehabilitation and anxiety as to what standard the Government is
moving toward. Also a lot of people don't want to live in public housing and yet see no way out of it. And if there is a real community, people are very frightened of the threat to it. There is a general fear of the Government or establishment imposing its will on people. I do think this is being overcome now though in Don Vale and Kensington. (Member, City of Toronto Board of Control)

Initially, am I going to be taken--moved out of my home--or not--or asked to fix up my house without them making much distinction between being asked to or forced to? Although the numbers have been small either way, rather more people had asked that their homes be included for clearance than had asked that they be left. Secondly, they asked, if my property is to be taken, how am I going to be compensated and/or provided for (owners compensated, tenants provided for). In the past people were satisfied, they did better than in the open market, but in Regent Park, for example, expropriation was handled badly. It took years to reach settlement. Properties were expropriated in 1949, settlements took over five to six years to make, and people were getting 1949 prices. There should be provision to account for inflation. Thirdly, they ask what provision there is for rehousing. Both tenants and owners were concerned about this--a fair number of both--but most look after themselves and prefer to do so. Fourth, those who asked to rehabilitate their properties want to know about financing and quickly come to the issue of what they will be forced to do. I believe you can't force them to go beyond minimum standards, using a double standard regarding renewal areas. This is part of my general philosophy of renewal as part of a normal process. Fifth, they are interested in what is to be done for the area and satisfying this interest is a valid exercise. Once it's satisfied they accept it and leave it at that and allow the City to develop and change. In Toronto there are not great areas of immobile population. Toronto's population is aware and not like that. There are some backwater pockets, remnants of population left behind, which are often Anglo-Saxon, hostile enclaves, most worried about being moved. (A senior urban planner in private practice)

They are generally against it as a package which has not been adequately explained. Basically, they see it as change and they don't like it! They see change as detrimental to their property values. (Official of a research organization)
There are different concerns, depending on whether or not citizens are tenants or owners. A basic concern of owners is getting enough money for their houses. Renters might be more prone to feeling happy that they were to move out of houses to better accommodation. However, a basic concern of all is dealing with the feelings of "being pushed around". Those involved in urban renewal are often resentful of not being compelled to a greater degree. There is much defensiveness, and a general feeling that the general process of urban renewal is not democratic. (Member of a university social science department)

There are two concerns which might or might not both be present in the same group. First, there is simple self-defence--to oppose change. Second, there is a desire to introduce into renewal legislation mechanisms whereby costs of renewal are not borne by those who are being renewed. (Member of a university social science department)

Basically, they don't want to be shoved around. It is a concern, I think, to be a first class citizen. If someone offers the citizen a chance to speak up and be master of his fate to some degree, then his self-image is raised. Tenants, who are used to moving frequently and are likely on welfare may take pushing around in their stride because they're used to it. In clearance, you aren't assured of compensation nor of the City giving the required help for rehabilitation. And anybody without these two answers is behind the eight ball no matter how much confidence he has. (An active member of various community organizations)

We are left with an unusual paradox. Throughout the first part of the interviews with all four groups, the goals of urban renewal were defined in esoteric, emotional, or conceptual terms. When this consideration was extended to the reasons citizens and citizen groups become concerned in matters of urban renewal, all four groups chose to emphasize financial considerations and the significant problem of housing accommodation as the two principal concerns. Does this apparent paradox pose a logical confirmation of the "failure-of-communication hypothesis", or does it not support the hypothesis?
In one line of reasoning the responses to these two significant aspects of the research interviews were entirely consistent. All groups of respondents indicated that those charged with making decisions in the urban renewal process did not hold the same goals as those who resided in the designated neighbourhoods. Thus all four groups of respondents agreed that the goals of the planners and politicians were to be expressed in such terms as "creating a planned city" and "improving the quality of life", and the like. On the other hand the citizens whose goals were not the same conceived their requirements to be eminently pragmatic; specifically, "Where do I go from here in terms of housing and how do I finance my next purchase or my next (and probably higher) rental payments?" In this form of argument the responses were entirely consistent.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the responses were quite inconsistent. If the goals of urban renewal are entirely conceptual, there can be no tangible results of the urban renewal process of benefit to the residents of the neighbourhood. Yet all respondents were clearly aware that throughout the 1960s urban renewal programmes in Toronto, as well as in other major cities in Canada, included some elements of housing accommodation, usually in the form of public housing. If this can be accepted, the urban renewal programmes did hold out some hope that residents would remain in the neighbourhood, on the assumption that tenants at least would be eligible for public housing accommodation. The real problem then begins to emerge, namely, a dislike of public housing on the one hand and a dislike of "being pushed around", as several respondents put it, on the other. The process of "being pushed around" was interpreted by citizen leaders and the members of their associations as being forced out of homes slated for demolition and thus being forced to apply for public housing, the reputation of which they disliked.
Who Participates and Why

Once the research respondents had concluded their exploration of the basic concerns of citizens and citizens' groups and had attempted to rank these in order, the research interviews turned to the question of the kind of person who participates and the reasons some participate more than others. This area of enquiry was followed by a third attempt at rank ordering in the research process—this time with respect to "the reasons for more participation" (rather than less) in the view of the respondents. This aspect of the research interviews led to a series of questions on the appropriate roles for citizens in urban renewal planning.

There was no consensus on the specific questions, "Some citizens become more involved than others. What makes them more interested?" and "What sort of person participates in residents' or neighbourhood associations?" This lack of agreement extended to a third question, "What kinds of people take leadership positions?" Among the leaders of citizens' organizations almost every possible response was offered: for example, some respondents felt that men participated more than women, while others indicated the reverse: some felt that New Canadians who had special reasons for a great interest in their new homes were the most numerous and active participants in such associations, while others discounted New Canadians entirely and indicated that native-born Canadians were the prime participants. Some respondents placed emphasis on occupational status, indicating that working-class persons and pensioners were more often participants; others (and this was a very frequent response) emphasized that homeowners were the prime participants. Most people agreed that those who were more than 40 years of age were more likely to participate than those under 30, but this expression is easily explained by the fact that almost every
interviewee in the first group of respondents (the leaders of citizens' organizations) was 40 years of age or over.

The following are some of the more notable comments made in this area:

I have been in a union of one kind or another all my life. I feel that some people are "fighters", while others fear "bucking" City Hall. Some feel it's a lost cause because they are unable to get answers from the power structure. Therefore only 49 people will turn out to a meeting when there should be 249. This shows lack of confidence in the power structure.

The sort of person who participates in residents' associations is a middle-aged or elderly person of working-class status, with an income of $4,000 to $5,000 a year. The ratio of women to men is about 60 to 40; the ratio of New Canadians to native-born Canadians is about 40 to 60. The kind of people who take leadership positions are the hard-working, fighting type--and independent. I am that type--I own my own taxi.

Each person is a special case. The explanation of why they participate is complicated. There may be psychological factors. There is no typical resident involved. Each has something special.

I think that the ones that attend are usually interested people who lay down the law and speak up for themselves and others in the community. There is some financial concern--to get a fair deal. But I don't think anyone is out to really make a fortune. Emotional upset is important. Some have lived in such lousy houses all their lives, and knew this, and want to push for a fair deal--a good place to live. In the original Residents' Association, the majority were owners with only two tenants attending regularly. Then we split; and now we have a lot of tenants attending our Tenants' Association.

The sort of person who participates in associations--there are a lot of mothers in our Tenants' Association--we are all women. In the other association (homeowners) they're all men. Some are on welfare and Mothers Allowance; but I think the homeowners resent having welfare recipients as part of groups representing the neighbourhood.

The kind of person who takes leadership positions are those who are steady participants in citizens' organizations and in other organizations too. You
I have never heard of citizens' groups before—only in Toronto recently. But they sure are rising fast. I really don't know why—they just are.

Some citizens are like turtles in their mud puddle. Most people who participate want to get out. Those who want to stay in the area in an old house don't participate. We have to bang away at some people for a while to get them to come out. It is very hard to get some interested and active. They are too lazy. If you gave out free beer they would be there.

The kind of people who take leadership positions—some are run by politicians. I object to that situation. Others are run by a group of people interested in the areas. I want the people themselves rather than the politicians to speak up for the area on these issues. As far as outside organizers and social workers are concerned, they don't have any qualities that enable them to be the special leaders of groups. I feel that social workers should live in the area for a year, rather than come in immediately and presume to start up groups. It isn't fair.

In this area it is not the Portuguese (85% of population) who got involved, so much as the Canadian-born, whose parents were often immigrants. We had command of English and so could be more vocal, though we were a small group. Homeowners are more likely to become involved, as are those who intend to continue living in the area. The greater one's wish to move out of the area, the less likely he is to become involved.

Among the general members, most of whom are Portuguese, the ones who were most active were those who were threatened. And they could become even more involved if we could find a form for them to express their involvement in their own language. We feel we have got excellent involvement of up to 300 people at meetings—on the level at which they are able to give this.

The sort of person who participates—they are mostly homeowners and usually those with big families; unlike Canadians, the Portuguese family may include parents, in-laws and other relatives. I have only my own impressions from observation, but I think they are mostly blue-collar workers in construction or service industries. Their age is mostly in the 30s and 40s, since immigrants are usually young enough to work. Many women work, and though Portuguese women are not usually seen with men in public, they come to our meetings and whisper to the men who then get up and
speak. The women are concerned because home and family are affected by urban renewal.

The kind of people who take leadership positions in this area are those who have lived here the longest, who stayed in the area much of their life, because of various ties, and are not likely to move away now. They are mostly from the Ukrainian, Jewish, Hungarian, and Irish groups, but few Portuguese have been here long enough or know English well enough to take such positions. The leaders are known in the neighbourhood and command some respect from neighbours. They have taken on community responsibilities too—for example, introducing immigrants to the Canadian way of life.

What made me concerned was having to put up with other people's filth and dirt and carelessness. They never clean their walks or rake their lawns—I'm ashamed to walk down the end of this street. They have no respect for other people's property. My husband doesn't like me always going to meetings but I get involved—I don't intend to have City Hall or any others walk over me.

In Don Mount it was older people, most of them had lived there for years. The only younger ones were the absentee landlords. Some families had children and sometimes three families in one house. There were a lot of new Canadians. I think it's too bad, and I think it's too bad that very few men take an interest; they can't be bothered going to meetings.

The sort of person who participates in neighbourhood associations are mostly middle-aged residents who have been in the neighbourhood for years and their homes mean a great deal to them. In Don Mount most people tended to take the lead. The kinds of people who take leadership positions are the more intelligent, educated people with a better understanding of what is going on and how to deal with it.

One last series of quotations is interesting in that the respondent, now an active politician, separated citizens into two groups: those who do not participate and those who do. He stated:

Those who don't participate: some are inarticulate people who find themselves at a loss and therefore don't participate. A fairly large number are apathetic, thinking that nothing will happen or whatever does is for the best. Those who do: some have a latent,
demagogic ability--there's a bit of that in all of us--a few find it exciting because the "directing minds" weren't controlling things and we thought we could accomplish things. But only half of those involved feel something can be done. Some believe public authorities won't do anything useful on their own but can be influenced to do something useful.

The kinds of people who take leadership positions include those with a bit of noblesse oblige--a clergyman, a doctor, etc. Also those with a lot to gain or lose, that is, a man who bought his property for speculative purposes and others who value their homes highly.

There was far more consensus when it came to the rank ordering of the reasons listed on the card. The most common first or second choice of respondents was by far "neighbourhood residents' unrest". Coupled with this proposition was "home ownership", which was the second choice of most who considered the unrest of neighbourhood residents as the prime reason for more citizen participation. The other possibilities were of scant interest to the leaders of citizens' groups, although an opportunity was offered to them to mention "outside organizers", "news and other media", and "concern for the wider community". It was found, however, that this variety of possibilities gave an opportunity to other participants in the research to lay charges against certain groups which, they felt, had civil disobedience, social unrest, and just plain "trouble-making" in mind.

The second group of respondents (advisors to citizens' groups) were inevitably in more direct contact with government officials and staff members of various community organizations and, as a generalization, were working to gain action from that amorphous group described as "decision-makers". It was not surprising, therefore, that this group chose "administrative policies and practices" as its first or second choice--second only to the matter of home ownership.

* See Appendix A, p. 6, Question 10(b)
In essence, these professionals saw the anguish of homeowners in urban renewal neighbourhoods as the major consideration, and the policies and practices in housing and planning activities of government as the major obstacles to the realization of the citizens' personal objectives. There was only one mention of "outside organizers" among 24 respondents and only twice was the phrase "news and other media" of interest. The respondents' clients had not identified "administrative policies and practices", except in two cases, but the members of the helping professions saw "bureaucratic obstruction" in their neighbourhoods as the major factor in citizen participation. They did not view "unrest among neighbourhood residents" as a factor of great significance but rather as a reaction to the implementation of government policy on the one hand and its consequences--the loss of home ownership--on the other.

The concerns of the advisors to citizens' groups are well illustrated in the following:

The kinds of people who take leadership positions are the most active people in the organization, namely, property owners. They are more politically aware. They had previous experiences in organizations of one type or another, for example, trade unions. They are more willing "to stick their necks out". However, they are not essentially different from those who are not essentially leaders, but they change upon becoming leaders.

Most people in Alexandra Park were involved because of the issue of expropriation--the large amount of homeowners.* Few were interested in what happened to the neighbourhood as a whole. Now, for example, in Kensington there is more overall concern for the total neighbourhood. The danger of being expropriated without adequate compensation is the primary concern of the house-owning groups.

The sort of person who participates in residents' associations was, in Alexandra Park, more women than men. The women were more active on committees. There

* It was estimated about 1961 that slightly more than 60% of the dwelling units in Alexandra Park were occupied by homeowners.
were also the lower economic groups—but size of families varied. New Canadians were not very active. In Kensington there are more stable families—people who have been living in the community for a number of years.

The kinds of people who take leadership positions are members of old established families in the community. Someone who is just beginning to make his way up the socio-economic scale has no time for this, until it poses a real and immediate threat to his serenity.

Sex generally makes no difference but where the chips are down the males come through. As far as occupational status generally, those who participate have the highest status in the particular community. They are fairly young people in their thirties and their racial origin is mainly Anglo-Saxon or Jewish.

Most of us who take leadership roles of any kind have a kind of dominant personality. Often as I have, we have a desire for political or community recognition. Many are aware of their own needs to be leaders, but equally so a person can be just acting out his own aggression.

Some are more hostile than others because of the way they are approached and the lack of respect which is given them. They are forced to negotiate without there being any real legal question—that is, they are threatened with expropriation as an end product.

The kinds of people who take leadership positions are people who feel "it just isn't right"; also those who have a basic orientation towards "the rights of people". They are also people who are concerned for the unity of the family.

Females often participate more, males who are heads of families are often afraid to involve themselves because they fear this might somehow lead to the loss of their job. Often, too, it may be someone who has an investment in a local business.

The characteristics of those who participate in residents' associations are: mothers; extroverts—with many unmet needs; the real rabble-rousers; the really concerned ones who feel they are being unfairly treated; native Canadians—most immigrants, especially recent ones, find it difficult to become involved in the community; and occupational status is not an important factor.
The answer is the same that would be given for any "political life" (and I don't mean political in the party sense). Some naturally get more involved. Of course there are often personal circumstances preventing involvement. Some residents from countries where no one can speak up against the government fear the government too much to participate. If there are tensions at home--such as the wife having a nervous breakdown--then a person will not participate as readily... my experience has been that the human qualities, the potential for participation, are present in everyone. The only really distinguishing factor is that leaders are of male sex.

Homeowners in Don Vale that are involved are eggheads with a vested interest around not getting dislocated from the area. In other areas people are more inadequate and hence feel more threatened. Homeowners are more active than tenants who are apathetic until they see that they can do something.

They are interested in self-preservation. Some use the residents' associations as political springboards. Some have an ability to sling words together and may become spokesmen.

Those with verbal ability and higher educational status seem to participate more. As far as the kinds of persons who take leadership positions--the professors, etc.--are capable men and able to defend their rights. North of Carleton are town houses. South of Carleton is the bad housing where industry and residential units are mixed. Here are the social problems and the people on welfare. There are only two representatives in the Association from south of Carleton--the higher socio-economically rated people participate.

Both the leaders of citizens' groups and their professional advisors reached almost unanimous agreement on one important issue. On the question "If citizens were involved in the above processes (specific aspects of urban renewal planning) would there be more or less citizen resistance?" none of the citizens' leaders indicated that there would be more resistance; all but two said that there would be less resistance (both indicated that there would be more and less resistance). The advisors were almost unanimous; only one suggested that there might be both more and less resistance; all others said there would be less resistance.
The comments which were added to the choice of the "less" option were best expressed in the following words:

If you are involved in something, you feel part of it and are more likely to accept it. There is a developmental process of involvement, much like the development of relationship in casework.

But it will take a long time. Neither the City nor the people are used to it, and at this point they really can't talk to each other. Also we must not think that if it fails a few times it is an unworkable model--there will be problems at first.

Ultimately, yes. There will always be conflict, but perhaps this way a stalemate can be avoided.

Planners and politicians were emphatically different from citizen leaders and their advisors in choosing and ranking the reasons for more citizen participation. More than 70% of the "decision-makers" considered that "neighbourhood residents' unrest" and "outside organizers" were the prime considerations in stimulating citizen participation. Several respondents ranked these two propositions as of equal importance. It is very clear that professionals engaged in urban planning and urban development, and elected officials who were required to make the decisions (translating plans into reality) were, by 1969, quite convinced that education, unrest, resistance--all perhaps stimulated by outside organizers, rabble-rousers, or even "foreign agitators"--were behind their serious difficulties in the urban renewal programme.

At the same time there was a fair degree of emphasis upon "news and other media", which suggested that such coverage of the meetings, marches, debates and arguments conducted in various renewal areas were the reason for more citizen participation and almost as important as "outside organizers" in stimulating resistance. The decision-makers did not place much emphasis upon "administrative policies and procedures". However, they did recognize the importance of home ownership as a precipitating factor but certainly
not to the extent that the residents of these areas and their local advisors saw the loss of homes as a factor of significance.

The final group of interviewees, the "opinion-influencers", were far closer to the decision-makers in their views than they were to citizen leaders. This could be anticipated yet, at the same time, these prominent members of the community were not inclined to disregard "administrative policies and practices" as a factor of significance. In fact, as much emphasis was placed upon the process of administration and its role in precipitating citizen resistance to urban renewal as was placed upon unrest among the residents of neighbourhoods. However, these respondents were more inclined to view "neighbourhood unrest" and "activities of outside organizers" as factors of great importance than were the citizens and their advisors, who were more inclined to rank home ownership as a factor of considerable importance.

The question of the prediction of "more or less citizen resistance" (if residents were deeply involved in urban renewal planning) again showed some interesting deviations from the responses of the previous group. Although the majority of all respondents (more than 80%) believed firmly that there would be less resistance to the implementation of urban renewal programmes if citizen participation were a reality, a number of respondents in the last two groups felt that there would indeed be more resistance rather than less. Among the decision-makers about 20% felt that there would be more resistance, or certainly no less, if citizens were involved in a direct and intensive manner. Their reasoning appeared to be that opening up the opportunities for participation in the planning process would stiffen rather than weaken the resistance of local residents to major change in their environment.

Apparently more than four-fifths of all respondents felt that the residents of urban renewal neighbourhoods would
find that participation meant that the urban renewal plan was indeed their plan and would thus get behind it and push elected representatives at more than one level of government for the implementation of the plan. This has happened to some degree in Trefann Court and Kensington. On the other hand, several decision-makers and almost half of the "opinion-influencers" were convinced that resistance to the implementation of urban planning would increase rather than decrease if citizens were involved in the planning process. Their view has apparently been confirmed in such neighbourhoods as Don Vale during the past three or four years.

The following are some observations on various aspects of the reasons for more or less citizen participation, and the possibilities of more or less resistance if participation became a clear aspect of urban renewal planning:

The news media often have a detrimental effect by blowing things up out of proportion. Neighbourhood residents' unrest and outside organizers, plus outside political participation are all tied together as a factor. Administrative policies and practices have some bearing here. We have been going back and forth to Queen's Park to see if we couldn't work out something better as to the question of compensation.

St. Christopher House is a rock on which many crises have been solved. This factor in Kensington and Alexandra Park has had a great bearing on the reasonable way in which things have happened. and (two community workers) may get pretty excited, but they are still reasonable people. The ethnic groups in Kensington and Alexandra Park have had an influence on the direction of citizen participation here—at least it is a factor. Also, the resident leadership seems very responsible.

Each area seems to arouse a deluge of negative participation (not much positive) that frightens off the potential positive participants who are willing to negotiate reasonably. I do believe that, if disturbances that have been rampant in some areas were traced to their source, the same individuals would rear their heads and be recognized as leaders of resentful attitudes and involved in political factions.
I would really like to know the answer to that question (important reasons for differences in citizen participation from area to area). I have asked it and although I have no original ideas, I can tell you what many people I have consulted have said. Do you know that the problems encountered around urban renewal and citizen participation have been peculiar to Toronto as compared with Kitchener, Hamilton, etc.? In these cities there has been little protest. My consultants have stated that the reason for it has been due to the intrusion of political people. Perhaps these citizens have a basic desire or need to attack the establishment; politicians use urban renewal, the people involved use the entire situation for political capital. I don't know about differences in citizen participation from area to area within the City except that where there has been more intrusion by professionals and politicians from outside, there has been more citizen unrest than participation.

I find the proposition, "neighbourhood residents' unrest", very funny. The citizens are the makers of their own destiny. I can describe in detail how citizens make sure that every meeting is attended by radio and T.V. people and count their success in the number of pictures taken.

My first choice is "outside organizers". You always find those who stir up trouble. It's good for citizens to involve themselves, but when it's a political manoeuver, when political parties are behind it, all it does is stir up resentment. Some of these groups are politically inspired, and this is why there's more citizen participation today. Moreover, the press creates a lot of unrest.

These outside organizers don't help the people at all (referring to group in Trefann Court). They just stir up all kinds of trouble and get the people all upset. I am much more favourable towards the role of the neighbourhood houses in Alexandra Park and Kensington.

The news and other media really stir up the people. This is one of our big problems. Papers are too sympathetic, too inclined to lionize—all they do is criticize authorities and it's no wonder we breed this type of criticism for every authority. Look at the police—how they're criticized by the press. They're not constructive. It's this destructive criticism and not telling the whole story. We could do much more if we could just point out what we are trying to do. We're spending a fortune on these people and all we do is get crucified.
In at least one area, outside organizers have the responsibility for what has happened, but they only have this influence because of neighbourhood unrest, news media, and home ownership. The news media are terribly irresponsible. They raise hell with politicians for years to do something and then, whatever step is taken, they say it's wrong. They are always negative and make no attempt to help people understand. The organizers and the news media between them have respectively precluded a dialogue taking place between the administration and the people. In the early days of urban renewal our administration was often unthinking, though it wasn't uncaring.

The big factor here is time lag in performance by the City. Where time lag is the greatest, citizens participate more. Also where there are citizens with time and money available there is more citizen participation. It wasn't the areas where there are all "miserably poor people" but areas where there are citizens who have a sense of initiative, opportunity, and have had a breath of freedom. In my view it is the high degree prevalent at City Hall that is responsible for more citizen participation--in a rising up against the establishment--in some areas. I also feel that some outsiders such as the lawyer, (named), have moved from trouble spot to trouble spot.

In summary, this research exploration brought out very clearly the fundamental differences in view between those who lived and worked in the designated neighbourhoods and those who were responsible for political and administrative action. The concerns of individuals and families living in old neighbourhoods deemed by the City Planning Board to be in need of "improvement" (this could mean everything from a modest programme of rehabilitation to a major programme of slum clearance) were primarily activitated by their desire to maintain home ownership. They were also stimulated by appointed and self-appointed advisors who sought to tutor, organize and urge them to resist the major changes in their environment which would come about as a result of the implementation of intergovernmental programmes.

It is not difficult to understand, therefore, that those who were required to make the decisions maintained that
it was those very persons—those who took leadership positions in emerging citizen groups and those who advised and encouraged them to take action—who were the major forces behind unrest and, in more polite terms, more citizen participation. These were not unfeeling persons but professionals and politicians who believed sincerely that they were involved in planning and decision-making for the benefit of residents and the entire community.

They saw their actions misunderstood, misinterpreted, blocked, frustrated, and even described in terms suggestive of an atmosphere of totalitarianism by persons whose motives were not clear to them. They eagerly embraced the notion of joint activity (although no one used the term "conspiracy") between neighbourhood residents who were inclined to be troublesome and outright agitators who either worked for personal aggrandisement or for political parties seeking a more prominent role in downtown Toronto. The elections of 1969 and 1972 confirmed some of their worst fears. Not only were some of the very persons involved in resistance to urban renewal elected to City Council, but representation in the Provincial Legislature was also influenced, to some extent, by participation of certain candidates in the activities of neighbourhood groups in Don Mount Court, Don Vale, Trefann Court, and the Kensington area.

The Beginnings: Fears and Crises

There was a substantial and important degree of anxiety and fear in the middle and late 1960s throughout a great many older neighbourhoods in the downtown areas of the City of Toronto. Although inflation was a permanent aspect of the housing market, it had by no means attained the degree of intensity rampant in the early 1970s. Thus, the explanation for the degree of fear and its role in the precipitation of citizen movements in the 1960s lay elsewhere, and they are not difficult to ascertain.

Toronto was the site of two of the largest residential developments in Canada, both constituting major private and
public initiatives in the broad area of urban redevelopment. The first, Regent Park North, was the largest slum clearance and public housing programme in Canada, which neared completion at the beginning of the 1960s and provided accommodation for 1,397 families. Immediately to the south of this project the federal-provincial partnership had initiated a further clearance of some 27 acres which would provide 732 dwelling units and thus accommodate an additional population of about 3,500 needy persons.

Although Regent Park North and Regent Park South were under different auspices, they typified for many low-income families their ultimate residential fate. These projects were relatively well managed and provided "decent, adequate and sanitary housing accommodation" in the very best traditions of public housing programmes in Canada and the United States; but they were already widely known as low-income ghettos in which, allegedly, villages of the poor merely duplicated the low-grade living standards of slum dwellers whose lives these projects had sought to improve.

The news media, as well as aspirants to public office, played upon these images and fears of low-income families in a good many neighbourhoods throughout a wide swathe in central Toronto (south of Bloor Street and extending from the eastern terminus of working class family life, approximately at Queen Street and Kingston Road, to Landsdowne Avenue in the far west). Most of these areas were in far better condition than those now known as Regent Park North and South, and they provided relatively good and cheap accommodation for the thousands of newcomers to the heart of Metropolitan Toronto who arrived each year during the 1950s and 1960s.

Nevertheless, there was the prime fear of public action with the end result of clearance and the creation of public housing. The appointment of the Ontario Housing Corporation in the summer of 1964 did nothing to assuage the fears.
Officials of the Corporation declared that the prime requirement was a massive injection of public housing accommodation throughout Ontario, and particularly in Metropolitan Toronto. Since it was known that the suburban municipalities were strongly resistant to large additions to the stock of public housing in Metro Toronto (the experience in Lawrence Heights in North York, and in Warden Woods in Scarborough had been well publicized), the apparent determination of the government of Ontario was another factor making for anxiety.

There was, of course, the continuous activity of the City Planning Board in urban renewal planning, particularly in the years 1963-65. In October 1963 the Board presented to the City Board of Control "A Report on Priorities for Urban Renewal Study Areas". In this document 12 relatively small areas within the City were rank ordered, from those in which the deficiencies were greatest to those with the least. Within the next year the Planning Board continued its studies of nearly 60 distinct pockets of blight. Its continued investigation of improvement in the housing stock and in the total urban environment within the City was eventually collated in a major report which received a great deal of attention by the news media. The residents of many older neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto were thus afforded a clear picture of probable public urban renewal activity.

Fear was not restricted to the probability of public action in the redevelopment of older neighbourhoods. There was the outstanding example of private initiative in the development of St. James Town, probably the largest grouping of dwelling units in multiple form in the entire country.

88 City of Toronto Planning Board, "Improvement Programme for Residential Areas" (Toronto, January 1965). See also Albert Rose, "Rehabilitation of Housing in Central Toronto" (Toronto, September 1966).
St. James Town was a huge "municipality" within the heart of downtown Toronto and by 1965 included some of the largest apartment buildings in Ontario, perhaps in Canada. Its projected 10,000 dwelling units would house a population of about 15,000 to 20,000 persons, and the fact that this project appeared to be successful, from both a construction and a financial point of view, was a further threat. The announcement by the OHC that it would accept a proposal from Meridian Corporation to create almost 900 public housing dwelling units on the extreme west end of St. James Town produced even more anxiety. It appeared to many persons on the fringe of City Council and in emerging citizen groups that there was a potential working agreement between the public authorities and private developers who would devote part of their residential stock to public housing accommodation in return for mortgage assistance, assistance in assembling land, and perhaps tenancies at guaranteed rents.

Neither can inflation be dismissed, as the comments of the respondents indicated. Citizens' greatest fear appeared to be the possibility of having to leave one home and buy another, or to leave one rented accommodation and find another at a rental within their income potential.

Under all these circumstances, and in particular in the light of the experience of the residents of St. James Town (who were all eventually dispaced from a vast area stretching from Wellesley Street on the south to near Bloor Street--Danforth Avenue--on the north, and from Parliament Street on the east to near Sherbourne Street on the west), citizens in many neighbourhoods began to view the future with such trepidation that they felt they had nothing to lose in their resistance to the alleged progress of urban development. As one former citizen leader in St. James Town said:

I lived on Bleecker Street in the area for eight years. I joined a committee in 1965 when urban renewal had already begun. I do not know how the
residents were informed about the urban renewal plan initially. I heard via "word of mouth" that the Syndicate had bought out the homes.* I don't know why this area was chosen for urban renewal; I knew only that apartments would be built and that the City Council had stepped in to prevent the Syndicate from bleeding the people. Everybody was up in arms. They did not know where alternative accommodation was coming from; they could only see the bulldozer coming in. This is the reason for the formation of the committee.

A social worker, who was active in the Neighbourhood Services Programme created to assist those being dislocated from the St. James Town area, confirmed these impressions in the following words:

The manner in which the local residents were informed about the urban renewal plan was simply that the private developer who had bought up the houses gave them notice to quit. The developer actually precipitated this crisis so that he would be relieved of the responsibility to the residents. And in fact the City took on (for the first time in a private project) the considerable responsibility of maintaining houses, collecting rents, relocating residents, and so on.

This area was chosen for urban renewal because it was a desirable location for high-density, high-rise apartments. The east-west subway was planned to pass nearby. The private developer stood to profit greatly from it. The initial reaction of local residents was simply that they marched on City Hall, saying, "You must help us re-locate". Their organization had the backing of St. Simon's Anglican Church and the Christian Resource Centre. They were losing their homes and had nowhere to go.

During this renewal and relocation crisis various agencies in the City loaned some members of their staff to the area. These individuals formed what became known as the Neighbourhood Services Programme. As professionals

* The Syndicate was a consortium of developers who eventually became united in the Meridian Corporation which is still the nominal owner of St. James Town, yet maintains a number of subsidiaries under their original names (e.g., Howard Investments).
they were considered independent of their agencies and were paid from a grant by the City. One of the most senior members of this group, in response to the question concerning the process by which local residents were informed about the urban renewal plan, said:

They weren't actually informed at all. When they saw the bulldozers come in they began to suspect something and so went to City Hall in order to find out what the plans were. They couldn't find out what was going on; they attempted to discover a plan for over a year. In the area there were even influential people, for example, lawyers and so on, who weren't able to find out the plan. The people were frightened and angry; there was no provision for them as far as they could discover.

Don Mount Court, about two miles south and half-a-mile east of St. James Town, was the site of an equally notorious, but this time public urban renewal programme. Don Mount became the second "horrible example", which the respondents in this research quoted repeatedly as the basis for their recognition that citizen participation must anticipate the problems thrust upon them by public authorities and private entrepreneurs. One member of the executive of the Don Mount Residents' Association stated:

I was a homeowner living in the area when it became an area for urban renewal. There was either a letter sent to each homeowner or a notice in the paper that as of that date the area belonged to the City and that expropriation would begin and people could negotiate for a settlement. I don't know why this area was chosen for urban renewal, and I am still wondering. There were some houses on one street which were really bad and needed to be torn down, but basically the area could have been rehabilitated. The local residents were initially shocked. There was a divided reaction. Some owners who had very poorly kept homes were happy that they could make a good settlement. Others were angry that they had to move.

There was general resentment at having no say in the matter. Some homeowners who had very poor homes and couldn't afford to improve them saw this as their opportunity to improve them without getting into debt. Others were angry because they had good homes, they were proud of and liked the neighbourhood and resented moving.
This view was confirmed by another member of the Residents' Association, who said:

The local residents were informed about the urban renewal plan at the first public meeting at St. Anne's Church. This was the first I knew about it; I guess that's when most found out. I don't know why the area was chosen for urban renewal. I guess they thought it was in a bad state. I think they should pull down the whole of Hamilton Street, including my house—as long as I get my price.

A Comparison: Trefann Court and the Kensington Area

Earlier in this report it was argued that the nature of citizen participation in the Trefann Court neighbourhood was quite different from that in the Kensington area. The techniques employed by community organizers, the nature of the specific activities of citizens' organizations, the nature and objectives of such organizations, the specific socio-economic characteristics of the leaders of the major citizens' organizations, and the ultimate results (given the hindsight of the middle 1970s looking back at the later 1960s) were substantially different. Perhaps the speculative argument of the author can be substantiated in the responses of the prime movers in the respective dramatic episodes, when interviewed by the research teams of 1968-69.

When a senior official of the Trefann Court Residents' Association was asked how he became associated with the neighbourhood and the process by which the residents were informed about the urban renewal plan, he answered:

I have lived in the area for several years. This association became active about 18 months ago when the urban renewal proposal was published in the newspaper. Rumours were the main source of information before the newspaper stories started to carry proposals for Don Mount, Trefann Court, and Alexandra Park. The core issue was expropriation.

This area was chosen for urban renewal because it is rundown, but the City is responsible for not applying the laws. The City has actually discouraged
homeowners from improving their homes. It has never done anything concerning the side streets and so on and allowed the area to go "to pot".

When he was asked about the reactions of residents to proposals for the area, he responded:

The citizens were upset because of the uncertainty surrounding the proposals. The threat of expropriation left them in a state of anxiety. The citizens had no idea where they could go to escape the spectre of urban renewal again.

On the other hand, a member of the executive of the Trefann Court Tenants' Association stated:

I've lived here for at least ten years. We got letters promising us $15 per room to move--but that deal got lost somewhere in the shuffle when the old plan was thrown out. We were invited to attend meetings to learn more about the plan.

With respect to the reaction of local residents, they did not believe it. Some are still living in a dream world and think they won't have to move. The reasons were, I guess, because it had been rumoured for such a long time--then when the announcement came they just refused to accept it. I didn't think they'd come below Dundas Street.

Despite these affirmations, another member of the Trefann Court Tenants' Association stated that she had been a tenant in the area for ten years and was informed about the urban renewal plan when the Planning Board showed maps at a meeting at the school. She felt that the area was chosen for urban renewal because of its bad housing; and that the initial reaction of local residents to proposals for the area were simply that the plan was "O.K.", except for lack of recreation facilities.

Perhaps the most important interview came from a long-term member and official of the residents' association. In her view, as a person who had lived in the area for over ten years, there were rumours for years that something would happen. She said:
Probably we had been sent something, but I do not remember. In 1966 I had read about it in the papers. There was no actual meeting for Trefann per se, but there were Ward 2 meetings. I felt that we were "really told" as the plans were going through and that the City did not listen to our complaints.

She believed that it was the politicians, not the people in the area, who wanted renewal; to the politicians the houses were all slums. She did not know why the City was so anxious ten years ago (mid-1950s), because then they had to pay the entire cost. She said that the voters were "hollering" to get people out of the slums. The public had an inaccurate image of what the houses were like; for example, they thought of rats and families without electricity. The newspapers report facts, such as the number of Christmas baskets needed or those who don't pay (or can't pay) their light bills. She went on to state:

The papers do not tell about those who are alright. I greatly resent the fact that the renewal areas were named after the worst streets. Homeowners were forced to repair their houses but absentee landlords were not.

Initially, ten or so years ago, everyone ignored the proposals. Later, as it became a reality, people became upset. I became very upset when in 1966-67 the Corporation built a warehouse for the CBC and began pressuring landlords to sell land for CBC use, perhaps for a parking lot. I was not asked to sell but some of my friends were and this upset me.

The residents responded individualistically. Some wanted to sell; others did not. The initial apathy was due to the fact that many could not read and therefore seldom read the newspapers. I can summarize my feelings by saying, "How would you feel seeing a big developer settling there asking for your land and house and you knowing that you would not get enough to get another home?"

The Trefann Court neighbourhood was thus widely described in the press and in the media as "a slum", and the residents were aware of this opprobrium, whether they were homeowners or tenants. However, there did not appear to be any clearly
formulated approach to the provision of information for the residents of the area, whatever their housing status. Some seemed to believe that they had first learned about it in the newspapers; some were certain that proposals had been in existence in some form since the late 1950s, that is, for a decade or more. The feelings that all appeared to have in common were anger, resentment and fear. But there was no one specific crisis to which the respondents could point and argue that "that was the beginning of citizen participation".

The situation in the Kensington Area neighbourhood was a very great contrast to that in Trefann. One spokesman for the KARA said:

There was a series of community meetings at which the City showed slides and explained possibilities. These were organized on the basis of language groups and community interests. The area was chosen for urban renewal because it came under the definition of an area in need of such treatment.

The initial reaction of local residents was one of concern and uncertainty as to the future of their homes. With the Portuguese there was confusion and much doubt as to what this all meant. There were some emotional outbursts, but as a whole it really boiled down to not knowing what it was all about.

A member of the Executive Committee of KARA put it even more positively:

I think that the residents actually created the urban renewal. People here were aware that improvements should be made—and we approached City Hall first some years ago. Of course some residents were surprised when the City had public meetings in January and February 1967 to announce that plans were being formulated for our area. Kensington was third on the list of priorities set by the City for urban renewal consideration.

The initial reaction of local residents was fear—quite great fear. The fear was based on previous results seen in other areas.
In the view of a senior member of the residents' association the local residents were informed through letters from the Mayor which outlined where meetings would take place. The area was chosen for urban renewal in the improvement programme of 1965, wherein the Planning Department designated it as a priority area. In 1962 the Kensington Market Plan could not be implemented, beyond the first stage, because of lack of funds. Urban renewal on such a small sub-area would not be approved; thus the "embracement of the overall area to alleviate this problem of getting funds". He stated:

By going to urban renewal you get funds which would not be available under local improvement plans.

As far as the initial reaction of local residents was concerned Kensington is still in the plan stage. The outcry was "who classified us as sub-standard?" Some became frightened and sold their homes and moved out. They were frightened because they did not comprehend what rehabilitation meant as put forward in the 1964 legislation.

A further confirmation of a more rational approach to the dissemination of information and the involvement of citizens in the urban renewal process was provided by a long-standing and senior member of KARA who, in response to the question, "What was the process by which local residents were informed about the urban renewal plan?", stated:

Last April the City held public meetings in St. Stephen's Church in the area (some in Portuguese, some in English) in which City planners presented plans and spoke to the meetings. A local was usually asked or persuaded to chair the meeting. Though he would know nothing of the plans beforehand, in a few cases later people held him responsible and there was quite a bit of resentment at this pretense of citizen participation.

In response to the question, "Why was this area chosen for urban renewal?", this citizen leader replied:
After the 1964 Amendments to the NHA, considerable funds were available for urban renewal and considerable pressure built up to use this. Cities realized that they could now do things they could never do before and began looking for sites on which to do it. When areas were designated in Toronto, Kensington Market was included at our Alderman's request. But the surrounding residential area had to be included too, to qualify for federal funds. In sum, the designation of this area was a rather irresponsible application of the legislation by people who had no idea of the consequences.

Thus, with respect to the initial reaction of local residents, they were bitter, upset, afraid. The original theme of our Association was "Stop urban renewal", and we early passed a resolution that "We will not participate in urban renewal as it is presently constituted". People felt a threat of urban renewal, feared their houses could be taken from them. I couldn't give anyone any assurances it wouldn't happen.

The plans which were presented had been made with very little reference to the people's wishes. In many cases the plans simply put into technical language the things we already knew (for example, described the threats to the neighbourhood of Western Hospital expansion, and of the Spadina Expressway). Although these were just descriptions of existing trends, people took them to be statements of policy (as well they might have become if we hadn't acted) and thus they were bitter.

These verbatim responses appeared to indicate much the same picture as in Trefann, but there was the significant difference pointed to much earlier in this research report. The people speaking in Trefann Court were long-time residents of severely blighted areas, of relatively low income, and clearly aware of their incapacity in the housing market if they were displaced from their neighbourhood. Expropriations would not permit them to purchase another house, and for tenants there seemed to be no recourse but to place their names on the long waiting lists maintained by the Housing Authority of Toronto for Regent Park North and the OHC for Regent Park South and other emerging public housing accommodation.
The persons speaking in, for and about the Kensington Area were primarily businessmen and others with professional backgrounds in theology, engineering, urban development, and the like. They were possessed of the skills required for community organization. As the picture of the citizen participation process emerges in the balance of this section of the report it can be seen how successful they were by comparison with those in other neighbourhoods who had to rely for the most part on representatives of traditional agencies and self-appointed advisors who moved in with the belief that there was an important task required in the organization of these residents to resist the urban renewal process.

It was the view of several respondents that the people in Trefann Court kept putting off the possibility of forming some kind of organization. In August 1966 the plan, it was said, was approved by all levels of government, and a community organizer was sent in to help the citizens. This person soon found out who was interested in the problems of the area in the urban renewal process, and began to print leaflets which later became the "Newsletter" of the Trefann Court Residents' Association. The full implications of urban renewal thus became a reality in Trefann in the year 1966 and thereafter. However, it was agreed by officials of the two organizations interviewed that the local residents could not have got started without the presence of the community worker, because "they did not know how to organize themselves; also, they knew nothing about City Hall".

The community worker assisted the group in hiring a lawyer whose capacity was then that of law student. This man, who later became one of two Aldermen for the specific Ward in which Trefann is located, persuaded the Development Department of the City to allow the residents to use the site office. Within a few months those interested in forming
an association elected temporary officers and once they became organized they had a full-scale election. Nevertheless, there were frequent references in the interviews to the presence of rival organizations. Apparently one group favoured the City's plan for neighbourhood renewal, while the Residents' Association was strongly opposed to it, particularly after the organization of a group known as "T-CUP" (Trefann Community Union Project).

In October 1967, just before the provincial election, the Honourable Allan Grossman, who is the Member of Parliament for the area which includes Kensington, stated that no urban renewal plan, at the present time or in the future, should be carried out unless a local citizens' committee participated from the beginning. When told about this statement and asked for reactions, a senior member of the Executive of the Trefann Court Residents' Association smiled and said that she agreed but that the Association was still trying to figure out how the planners could put it through before the people knew what was going on. In a word, they suspected the integrity of planning officials and felt that participation would not in fact be offered or they suspected that they would not have an opportunity to participate. She added:

It could not be accomplished. It [the Grossman proposal] could not be accomplished the way things are now. How can you be sure it would include the people involved? It is very difficult for the residents to organize themselves, and this is what scares me.

The respondent concluded that portion of the interview by insisting that other groups in Trefann Court wanted the plan to go through and refused to call meetings of their respective associations where opposition might develop.

By contrast, Kensington was an area which, for several years, had a local chapter of the City of Toronto's annual " Beautify Your Neighbourhood" campaign which was the forerunner of KARA. About May 1967, after the meetings
sponsored by the City, a letter was sent out inviting people in the area to participate in discussions before forming a residents' association. The first general meeting was held in September 1967 and at that time it was decided to form an association and elect officers. The letter from the City had advised the citizens to form an association to protect their interests.

The residents were aware of the threat of urban renewal after the public meetings held by the City in April of that year. Allan Grossman* made his pre-election commitment in October and the residents became aware of the more positive implications of urban renewal for them. There was a settlement house (St. Christopher House) with a history of nearly fifty years of service to the community. On the staff of the House was a community worker available to assist the local residents in carrying out meetings of their membership with politicians, local social agencies and institutions such as the Western Hospital. Members of the Executive of the Association began to appear before City Council to confront them with a request for changes in their redevelopment plans.

The members of KARA felt very pleased with the statement by Allan Grossman because, in their view, "that's our statement". It was made by the Minister in direct response to the demands of the Association; in their view, he was facing difficulties as far as re-election was concerned. The resulting shift in popular feeling influenced his being elected in 1967, which occurred just after the association had been formed. Members of the Executive felt that the election was a good opportunity for the use of political pressure. There was no question in their view that Mr. Grossman's commitment could be implemented. A leader in KARA said emphatically:

* Allan Grossman was a member of the Cabinet.
If the Province stands behind this statement and refuses to fund a project which doesn't involve citizens, then this is a way to stop the steamroller of urban renewal. Because of the legislation, if the Provincial Government doesn't supply the funds, then the Federal Government can't, and thus the City has either to consult with the citizens or finance the whole project itself.

In a nutshell, the contrast between the process in Trefann Court and in Kensington was one of the nature of confrontation with the local politicians. Within a year the Trefann Court group, led by their community workers, self-appointed advisors and junior lawyer invaded a Committee Room in the new City Hall and disrupted a Committee meeting. The meeting had to be cancelled and this was a remarkable event in Toronto's history because it was the first time that such a demonstration had taken the form of a direct intrusion into local government business. The Alderman representing the Ward in which Kensington was located was one of the strongest exponents of participation and a continuous spokesman for KARA. Perhaps it was chance; perhaps it was just good luck; perhaps it was the basic socio-economic difference in the make-up of the members of the Executives of the two associations. Nevertheless, the lessons have become clear over the years: far less was accomplished in Trefann Court than in Kensington.

The Appropriate Role for Citizens in Urban Renewal Areas

The research group was persuaded at an early stage in their activity of 1967-68 that one important area of exploration would have to embrace the views of respondents concerning the roles that citizens ought to play in urban renewal planning. It was one aspect of the entire project which appeared essential. The various views concerning the kinds of persons who participate and their reasons, the pressure points at which citizen participation began to take shape in specific neighbourhoods, the important reasons for citizen concern, and the major explanations for more rather
than less citizen participation were all in a sense in the past, albeit the immediate past. Almost all the respondents had an experiential time span of perhaps five to ten years: only one or two interviews referred to situations of the mid-1950s; a moderate number confined their comments to the post-1965 period. For the most part, however, the entire decade of the 1960s was the time span involved in the professional conversations which constitute the process of research interviewing.

An examination of the appropriate roles for citizens was clearly not the next step, but a look at the future--the early 1970s and perhaps the way in which respondents saw the future of urban development and the "players on the scene" in the years ahead, perhaps to 1985. The research schedule was thus designed to include a substantial number of questions concerning what citizens ought to be doing in the future.

This area of the research instrument began with the question, "What is the appropriate role for citizens in urban renewal areas?" In order to assist the respondent to proceed from the general to the specific, this was followed by a further enquiry, "What role is there for citizens in the following tasks: (1) designating target areas, (2) helping to formulate plans, (3) reacting to proposals, and (4) helping to implement plans?" This was followed by the enquiry, "If citizens were involved in the above processes, would there be more or less citizen resistance?" The responses to that proposition have been fully explored in the previous discussion.

There was no consistency in the responses of the four groups of respondents to any of these propositions. Perhaps the most meaningful way of presenting the different reactions would be to cite the responses of some of the more clearly discerning interviewees. This material is not intended to represent consensus but merely to present some interesting
propositions put forward. The following are some answers to the question, "What is the appropriate role for citizens in urban renewal areas?":

If citizens are to participate meaningfully they must have a veto power. It must be meaningful. Nobody should tell them what they must do. Their opinions must be recognized. The citizens must be able to say what use should be made of the area--what should go and what should not. (Senior official, Residents' Association, Trefann Court)

To fight from the word "go". There is nothing in the plans re concern for the lives of the people. Nothing about a fair deal for people. A lot of people suffer net losses on their properties upon expropriation. Market value is one thing to the City but another thing to the homeowner. (Senior official, Don Mount Citizens' Association)

The residents would say that they should be given the political power to make all decisions which affect their area. If there were other interest groups, then their views would have to be taken into account. The implication is that we require a new neighbourhood political association. (Member, Don Vale Residents' Association)

It is to inform, advise and direct the planners and developers in the process of renewing, rehabilitating, and preserving the area. (Spokesman, Kensington Area)

To concentrate their efforts for the betterment of the total community involved rather than concentrating efforts for their own individual biases and desires--to participate to the fullest extent. (Executive member, Kensington Area Residents' Association)

I really don't know. We have a real right to have more of a say in where we are to go. There is no space, no houses right now. I know one thing--some people are saying we should help plan for the area, etc. I don't see how. We're not smart like the planners. I'm so used to having an authority figure telling me what to do, I guess that I just can't see how we can participate more than in having a say about money and where we (the tenants) are to go. (Executive member, Trefann Court Tenants' Association)

Their role is that of partnership with government officials in evolving a proper renewal scheme for the betterment of the area. The partnership involves
planning and implementing the scheme. (Executive member, Kensington Area Residents' Association)

The citizens' role is as partners with their elected representatives in solving community problems, in finding responsible solutions. They should also give direction to technicians who can work out the necessary plans to implement these policies. In urban renewal there are two parts or roles, one for the City and one for people, and, as in a marriage, it won't work unless both do their part. (Senior official. Kensington Area Residents' Association)

The citizen should also be able to offer his plan. They are more aware of their own personal needs, likes and dislikes than the planners. They are the ones who are going to live there. (Former senior official, Alexandra Park Residents' Association)

Citizens must have the primary role. Unless the project is for the benefit of the citizens in the area, it is worse than useless. Citizens should give their specifications to planners and should be a part of bodies giving final recommendations to politicians--and, things are beginning to happen. (Member, Executive Committee, Don Vale Residents' Association)

Organize a committee, have meetings with real estate agents and the City Hall people, and work out the best possible deals for their homes. This committee could work with the City for the interests of the people and the community. (Former Executive member, Housing and Residents' Committee, St. James Town)

The emphasis by the leaders of citizens' groups was primarily upon struggle and resistance. Citizen leaders clearly were frightened of such concepts as "urban renewal planning", as is obvious from some of their responses. The community workers advising them were really putting them in the position of "put up or shut up" and many were fearful of having overextended themselves. The following quotations from their professional advisors, with an emphasis on the process of planning and participation within it, demonstrate a somewhat more sophisticated approach. This may have meaning to the news media and to the professional planners and politicians, but it did more to frighten citizen
leaders than to encourage them:

Participation in urban renewal planning from the beginning of the process. (A community organizer, Trefann Court)

They should be involved in everything that happens even before the plan is produced. There should be a dialogue between City and citizens. Representatives of the City should be put in an area two years before the plan is finalized, in order to be in constant touch with the feelings and wishes of the people. (A community worker, neighbourhood settlement house, Kensington Area)

In Chicago, through Alinsky, the Worthwest Area [sic] came up with a plan of its own, using professional advisors. It was approved by City Hall. This is the ideal way. (A clerg;yan active in urban community organizations)

The citizens should be organized to collectively discuss their problems around living in the neighbourhood and possible effects urban renewal could have on them. A community worker should meet with them to interpret and explain urban renewal to them. When they had doubts they would have access to facts. Then the decision-makers should invite the neighbourhood to come and discuss it with them, rather than forcing the people to come begging to them. There would be a much better atmosphere for discussion. (A community organizer, Don Mount area)

They should certainly have a say in their own future and the City should make certain that they do. City planners should be resource people to the citizens, not the authorities; resource people rather than expediters. (A clerg;yan active in a neighbourhood centre in east Toronto)

It is to renew their community if they so desire. To commission the plan, to supervise implementation of any urban renewal. Urban renewal has to be done by the citizens. (A community worker in a settlement house in west Toronto)

He should decide what happens to his area. He should have full decision rights over everything that affects him. The urban renewal process should begin from the level of the resident. (A community worker, Trefann Court)
I think there's always a role for citizens. It's never too soon to get them involved. Citizens need first of all to acquaint themselves with the full implications of renewal, to get an understanding of the area and its needs. This will ensure they have some say in the plans. But citizens are likely to be overruled by professional planners, and so the use of a citizens' advocate, tried in the United States, is helpful. (Former official, Neighbourhood Services Programme, St. James Town)

If it were the expectation that the decision-makers had very different views five years ago about the appropriate role for citizens in urban renewal areas, this was not realized, as the following quotations attest:

Their proper role is an active one. The politicians look to these people to point out problems which are often overlooked by the planners, social workers, and other agencies. (Member, Buildings and Development Committee, City of Toronto)

I think the appropriate role is to acquaint the renewal agency with the common objectives and problems of the people of the area. (A senior official, City of Toronto Planning Board)

It is most important for him [the citizen] to become vitally involved and to participate in neighbourhood organizations and to get direct information, not just what he reads in the newspapers. It does depend on what the plans for the area are. If it is for total renewal, then there is no point in having a residents' group. If for rehabilitation, then this is a different story. The group should not be set up then until the plan has gone through the Planning Board and Council. (Member, Board of Control, City of Toronto)

They should help the establishment understand the peculiar needs and problems of the community. Also they should help the local community to understand the aims of the broader community. They can make suggestions for solutions to the City. Most importantly, they can assume responsibility for looking after the community and keeping it up once it is renewed. (A senior planner, Province of Ontario)

Their role should be to ascertain the accommodation they will be getting and that the people in the renewal area are being taken care of. They should make certain that the renewal plan is one which will last over the years and has the assets of educational
facilities, parks, and so on, which we have learned are necessary for an area. (City councillor representing an urban renewal area)

This would vary from area to area. Toronto is lucky to have, generally, communities with some community spirit, and we need to maintain and improve this. The citizens should first ensure that where possible the community as such is not destroyed (as it is likely to be in demolition). The citizens should express to the government the quality of the community. The citizen has a responsibility to understand the aims and objectives of urban renewal and to express himself about them. (Member, Board of Control)

Among the decision-makers there were some respondents who were more circumspect or definitive in their views. They expressed reservations about the appropriate role of citizens, or delimited the role in which a way as to favour it in one situation and oppose it in another. The following are illustrations:

This is a complex question. I think the appropriate role depends on the type of urban renewal area it is. The basic principle is if the citizens are going to remain in the area after the urban renewal plan is implemented, then definitely they should participate in planning. But if they are being relocated, and not to be coming back to the area, then they should have nothing to say about how the area is to be used. They should have a say only about their financial reimbursement and relocation. (A senior planning official, Province of Ontario)

I think that the appropriate role for them in urban renewal areas is to be interested in the total progressive plans of the community; to concern themselves with the views of professional social workers and those of their elected representatives in City government. Then they should discuss in groups or singularly with social workers and elected representatives their views on what is being done concerning the scheme, such that both sides may be made aware of problems in the methods and measures possible to reach compromises--to collaborate. (Member, Committee on Buildings and Development)

The desirable role is a positive, not a negative one, not reacting in protest, but in a positive way--making suggestions that will be considered. The quality of
citizen participation depends on the quality of administrative decisions—they cannot rise above that. Bring them in at the planning stage to make them aware, and set up the modus operandi—a system where their suggestions will be analysed. (Member, Council Committee on Fire, Housing and Legislation)

If tenants are going to continue to live in an area, they should have a say in the kind of housing to be put in. Planners should show them possible alternatives—in terms of what can be afforded and so on. Homeowners have a right to know the phasing of the development—know what is planned and what will be done first, so that they will know what is happening to them. Their needs can be found out and help given in finding new places. It is often just a matter of getting fears settled. (Member, Board of Control, City of Toronto)

They should be kept informed, but they don't have a particularly creative role to play in planning. They should, however, be totally aware of what's going on and be able to express their opinions prior to the publication [of the plan]. If there is a project office in the area, then the planning staff can be physically close and afford an opportunity to identify with the final plan. The office should be the focal point for planning. When it was completed, there should be a place for its display.

They cannot provide much technical information, but they can express opinions. The worst you can do is suddenly confront them with a plan. It really is an educational process. Everyone is a planner in a sense, but you must evaluate their competency and judge it in that light. (An architect, active in community organizations)

As has been noted, the interviews moved from the general to the specific with respect to designating target areas, helping to formulate plans, reacting to proposals, and helping to implement plans. The reasons for these express tasks are easy to explain. For most persons the process of urban renewal prior to 1965 involved the presentation of a plan to the residents and seeking their reactions to the proposals. By the time the research group had begun its work this reactive task was certainly in disfavour among citizen groups and their leaders. It had not, however, been a singular task but had been associated with the notion
that once citizen groups reacted to proposals they would have to implement these plans and in that process would have a potentially creative role to play. The suspicion was that their particular criticisms or reactions--specific examples were the proposals for Alexandra Park and for Don Mount--would not be followed. It was generally believed, on the basis of past experience, that by the time the plans and proposals were presented to citizen groups the planners and City councillors had made up their minds. While these decision-makers were willing to permit local residents and their ratepayers' or other associations to assist in the implementation, the plans were not likely to be altered except in the most trivial details. For all these reasons the research group introduced two sets of tasks: "designating target areas" and "helping to formulate plans", which were relatively untried and perhaps unthinkable for some of the respondents.

In the first, "designating target areas", the reaction was mixed and the responses were by no means predictable on the basis of the specific groups. Some citizen leaders felt that they had a very important role to play in locating areas appropriate for urban renewal; others felt they had no role at all. Similarly, some leaders and their advisors were very firm in the notion that they had a right and an obligation to participate in "helping to formulate plans"; others were convinced that they had neither the knowledge nor the competence, and that they had little or no role to play in this significant potential task.

The responses are worthy of note and examples are given in numerical order as follows:

(1) Designating target areas
(2) Helping to formulate plans
(3) Reacting to proposals
(4) Helping to implement plans
(1) The City invariably names whole areas and often good homes are destroyed in the process. Therefore citizens should be involved in those areas in which they are going to be affected. (2) ...not to formulate plans--they are not technically equipped. (3) The citizens should be consulted and their ideas should be incorporated in the plan. People are not "dumb bunnies" as the City assumes. (4) If people are consulted their involvement will make it easier for the plan to be implemented. (Citizen leader, Trefann Court)

(1) None. (2) Plans should be made for the people, therefore the people should have a say in formulation. (3) I feel the Grossman statement should be taken literally here; that is, plans should not be "rammed down the people's throats". This causes hostility. (4) The citizens' associations should be consulted before plans are implemented. The mere fact of consultation will allow the people to overlook [sic] discrepancies. People will feel themselves to be a part of the process. (Citizen leader, Don Mount)

(1) A definite role--a section of the community which finds itself in need of renewal or reorganization should have some influence in bringing about the initiation of a plan. (2) The residents of a community have the right to develop a plan in co-operation with the planning authorities, that is, in directing the planners through the expression of their particular needs as well as their desires for the area. If there is an overall plan for the area, the details of the plan should be the decision of the local people. (3) The planners and the people should work hand in hand in developing the plans--therefore it is not just reacting to a plan. (4) There should be no real separation between planning and implementation. The people who plan should be the people who implement. In implementation the various resources of their particular renewal area should be utilized, e.g., contractors, carpenters, etc. (Citizen leader, Kensington Area)

(1) Maybe we should be consulted. (2) Can't see a role. (3) Think we should have our say in when we have to go and where we want to do, that is, relocation. (4) Can't see any role here for citizens. (Citizen leader, Trefann Court)

(1) I feel citizens should participate because they have different ideas than planners concerning target areas. The citizens want to bulldoze only bad houses
planners do not have the same idea of what is a bad house. (2) I feel this is a good question. The City should make a motion to say that citizens can participate. A survey should be done to see what the people really want and think. Meetings should be held in the same area—not many miles away in a strange neighbourhood. (3) The City does not want our reaction. We should have reacted early, ten years ago. Right now I feel that the Association should try to get the City to stop the present plans and formulate new ones. We must fight for a house for a house. (4) I feel that the City should encourage residents to fix up areas by fulfilling responsibility in such matters as garbage collection and street repairs. I can't see how the citizens could implement plans since they would probably not be living there, and if they were then they would not agree. In the ideal I feel they have a role if the plans were acceptable. (Citizen leader, Trefann Court)

(1) People do not have any option for deciding this. It's the City that decides what area is going to be done. But people should be taken into their confidence and shown what they want to do, (2) I do think citizens should help in planning what is going to take place and when and how. (3) Certainly there's a role for citizens here. (4) People should be responsible for doing their own repairs. I think the City should provide outright grants for repairs up to a certain point (the City shouldn't pay for very major repairs like a new roof). (Citizen leader, Don Mount)

(1) This is one of the tasks residents should be involved in, guided by staff-prepared objectives and factual material which is reacted to and checked out. (2) Citizens should be fully involved. If something goes against Planning Department policy, then they should go to the politicians and seek policy changes. (3) This is almost useless unless it is a part of the above. Citizens should be involved to help the City assess the reasonableness of proposals. (4) Again this is useless unless the residents are involved in helping to formulate plans. (Citizen leader, Don Vale)

(1) No—"experts" have to do this. I feel that maybe rundown areas would not be that way if the City had enforced minimum-standards by-laws ten years ago. (2) No—this is the experts again. (3) Yes, if the proposal is not clear and fair citizens should really give them hell. (4) I don't see this as being necessary if everything else they do is done fairly. (Citizen leader, Don Vale)
These differences of viewpoint both within and between specific urban renewal neighbourhoods were not confined to those who participated in residents' associations; the advisors to citizens' groups were no less divided. The following responses were provided by persons who held responsible positions within community agencies and were well known for their activities on behalf of citizens' groups.

(1) No. There will perhaps be disputes over geographical boundaries and the like. (2) They should create the frame of reference for the whole plan. Without citizens' approval, there should be no plan. (3) This follows from the above. The citizens should determine the course of action. (4) They should participate fully. If the above were followed this would develop as a matter of course. (Community organizer, Trefann Court)

(1) The citizens should be involved round what is happening to the neighbourhood. (2) Yes, their wishes should play an important part in the formulation of plans. Planners cannot plan in vacuo. (3) Yes--this is very important. It should be a compromise between citizens' wishes and what the City wants. (4) Yes--this will help to iron out the difficult wrinkles. (Community worker, settlement house, Kensington Area)

(1) Areas which are under consideration as target areas should be discussed with the people. This should be the first step, to prevent a hornets' nest later on. (2) As before. (3) Even though the citizens prepare their own plans with professional advice, there will always be segments who do not agree, and they should be able to react to and encourage changes in the plan. (4) If the citizens have been involved in making the plans, then they can quite easily and confidently help in interpreting them to the community. (A clergyman, active in urban affairs)

(1) When the planners designate an area as bad, they should identify it to the local people and discuss it with them before making the decisions for urban renewal. The people then feel involved. (2) Citizens could be involved in setting up the timing sequence, in terms of how long it will take them to get ready for the change. Also they should be able to comment intelligently on the facilities and layout. (3) Once a proposal is formed, then it is pretty hard for the planners to react to every suggestion. The implications of changes should
be explained as much as possible so the people understand why certain things are not possible. (4) There is no direct role here for citizens. It is mainly up to the City and the relocation officer. If the City is going into urban renewal on a big scale, a lot of the problems connected with relocation while housing units are being built—it would seem pretty logical to use movable prefabricated housing for the people during the time their houses were torn down and new housing built. (A community worker, Don Mount)

(1) Citizens should approach the government to have officials help them renew their area. Governments should not impose will on citizens. (2) Citizens should have the major role here. (3) Citizens should reject them if they disagree with them and be able to stop any proposals with which they disagree. (4) Major role here by citizens, that is, in rehabilitation and in hiring who they want to rebuild, and so on. (A community worker, Alexandra Park area)

(1) Yes. There should be real consultation and dialogue with the administration. The role of the citizen is to participate to the limit. Expert knowledge should not be expected of the citizen, and the City should play its role in educating the citizen regarding the master plan. Ultimately the decision on target areas is made by a political body. (2) There is more of a role for citizens than just to be informed. (3) There should be one hell of a lot of time to react to proposals. There is not one, and one only, perfect design for an area. (4) This depends on the plan. If it calls for slum clearance, there is little for the citizen to do. If rehabilitation is called for, there is a tremendous role. (A community worker, East Toronto area)

(1) This is a role for planners, not citizens. (2) A community worker who is not an employee of the City should be hired to identify with the citizens their real needs—to avoid the Trefann mistake. Part of the worker's job would be to aid the formation of a working committee which would be part of a joint planning process. (3) This would follow from above. (4) Once you take the second step there is no way that they wouldn't. You have to give them responsibility to implement the plan along with those who control the resources. (A clergyman active in urban affairs)

(1) No, not at that stage because it gives the active and concerned an unfair advantage over those not active. They'll plan with the motive of self-interest
rearing its ugly head unless all are involved—but all won't get involved. Maybe two per cent will. (2) They should have an equal voice with planners. They should be organized as to where planning starts—they would bring neighbourhood concerns. (3) They have a right to react, and hammer out differences, and make compromises, and go to arbitration. (4) Implementation and relocation are strictly administrative. I don't see citizens can usefully do this. (A community worker, Kensington Area)

One significant insight began to emerge at this point for the research group. The term "planning", or such phrases as "helping to formulate plans", meant different things to citizens' groups and their advisors and to those who held positions in the area of "professional planning". Planners held views that were those of most persons who require a significant investment of time and resources in order to gain theory, knowledge and practical experience in their professions. In their view the ordinary resident had something to offer but was not a planner and could not formulate plans. The following illustrations indicate the gulf existing in the late 1960s between those who were likely to be affected by fundamental changes in their physical environment and the appointed officials who staffed such departments as the Development Department and the City Planning Board.

(1) In terms of my definition of function the whole City is a target area. I don't believe in identifying "renewal areas" except as legislation requires. (2) What citizens want has to be heard. (3) Citizens act as a continuing watch-dog to see if the interests of people are being looked after. (4) They could play a valuable part in seeing that measures were carried out.

(1) The plan must have the approval of such community organizations as the Social Planning Council and local residents' associations. (2) Emphatically. There is no point in going on unless the situation exists where all are agreed on the plan or the plans were changed to create this situation. In the case of continuing disagreement, the decision then becomes one to be resolved by a political process. (3) Emphatically. The
planning staff is working in Kensington where they agreed with the residents even though the Planning Board didn't. (4) Yes.

(1) This is not a simple thing to answer. If the citizens are going to be remaining in the area after urban renewal has been completed, then they should be consulted about whether or not their area should be a target area. However, if the plan is to benefit the public good and interest, for example, the building of a subway, citizens within the area should not be consulted, that is, whether or not their area should be a target area. (2) Concerning rehabilitation, the citizens should definitely be involved here. To voice their opinions as to how, when, and what should be done. Concerning redevelopment: if people are going to remain in the area they should have a voice in formulating plans, but if people are not going to remain in the area, they should have nothing to say re plans. (3) The same distinctions as just made hold here. Redevelopment, where citizens are not to remain in the area, they should be given a good chance to react to proposals concerning to where and how they are to be moved and how much money they are to receive if a homeowner. (4) In rehabilitation people should definitely be involved here to a large extent. Re redevelopment--no role here for them.

(1) Yes--not only in designating but in recommending the kind of treatment which is required, unless, of course, there is a need for complete clearance and redevelopment. (2) The main role here is in interpreting back and forth. It doesn't make any sense that they should have their own planners. There would be too many hassles among experts at various levels. (3) Yes, and in making contributions to the proposals. (4) They can well be involved in rehabilitation and conservation--in doing and selling--but also in watching to see that the neighbourhood does not run down again.

(1) None. (2) Slight. The formulation of the plan requires analysis and consideration outside the experience of the residents as well as those that are within their experience. Therefore the general plan of strategy has to be evolved from the outside and modified and adapted by the participation of the residents. (3) Very important. (4) Very important--in certain circumstances. So much of the implementation of plans is straight administrative, engineering, etc., but most plans involve the maintenance of property where the citizens' co-operation is very important.
As a result of these varied responses by persons who should have had much the same opinion, there was some confusion on the part of the research team. Instinctively, the reaction of a group of young professionals participating in a major research investigation concerned with human feelings, attitudes and experiences is a sympathetic consideration of the impacts of change upon the individual, the family and relations between neighbours in a specific community. If the research group had to choose one significant response to this whole matter of the appropriate roles for citizens in urban renewal areas, the following from a senior professional planner, who had become a consultant in private practice, would have been chosen:

It is the responsibility of public agencies to inform the public. The City had been divided into districts, plans were produced and a precis of the plans was sent to all persons on the assessment rolls. We held public meetings, meetings with organizations before plans went to Council. It is the obligation of a public body to meet and discuss plans with anybody. Citizens act as a sounding board, a continuing watch-dog, to see if the interests of the people are being looked after. Citizens' groups can play a valuable part in seeing that measures were carried out. Many organizations do get involved in this way. And they are listened to most attentively. The first ambition of politicians is to be a politician. The citizen's power to influence elected representatives is what ought to be used. We have to be clear that Council is where decisions are made. Planners cannot make anything subservient to planning standards. As a professional I had a responsibility to make my best recommendations, although others say what they want. I have to be careful not to set up a system which doesn't have the seeds of satisfactory continuance.
Chapter VIII
Concepts and Methods of the Second Experiment in the Analysis

The second phase of this experimental analysis of citizen involvement in urban renewal deliberations took a different but complementary approach. The first phase had used relatively unstructured interviews for the collection of data and it had drawn on descriptive literature which was very specific to urban renewal. The first phase ended with empirical generalizations about indigenous and professional leadership, stages of resident organization and forms of social action. The second phase began by relating these findings to more general theory which was not specific to urban renewal. It developed a conceptual framework capable of generating hypotheses and guiding the design and implementation of further empirical study.

A Conceptual Framework

If urban renewal and citizen participation could be identified as species of a more general genus, it would be possible to draw on broader bodies of knowledge and science, and the findings of the study would have wider applicability. Accordingly, urban renewal was defined as a species of the genus social problem, and citizen participation was identified as a type of voluntary association. The problem manifested by designation of a neighbourhood as needing urban renewal could be expected to vary from one area or neighbourhood to another. In one area the problem might be perceived as social disorganization in the sense of attributing the problem to the level of the group or community. In another area the problem might be attributed to individual deviancy. Theoretically, the definition of urban renewal as a social problem can vary according to whether it is attributed to a community as a whole or to deviant individuals here and there.

The nature of citizen participation can be expected to vary from one neighbourhood community to another as well. One community may be highly developed in coping with its
social problems by means of formal voluntary associations. In another community one neighbour may have little to do with another and anomie may prevail, at least in relative terms. This gives a simple typology for citizen involvement varying from formal organized participation to individuals acting heedless of each other. Both kinds of citizen response are familiar to the elected representatives; on the one hand the cohesive approach of the organized interest group and on the other hand the individualistic petitions and communications from constituents.

When different perceptions of urban renewal problems are brought into combination with different kinds of citizen involvement, varying results can be expected. As an exercise in theory building the dimension of definition of urban renewal problem was cross-classified with the dimension of citizen involvement to produce a typology of expected results of urban renewal programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Perception of Social Problems</th>
<th>State of Voluntary Association in the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social disorganization</td>
<td>animation co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual deviancy</td>
<td>dispersion conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross-classification paradigm contains speculations about results. If formal voluntary association is not developed in a community and the official urban renewal strategy is designed for community development rather than individual improvement, the predicted result is animation of voluntary association. Concern with individual betterment might result in dispersion of the people of an old neighbourhood
as in "slum clearance". The community development approach to organize communities well might be expected to result in co-operation and the individual development approaches, such as relocation and individual rehabilitation, might produce conflict where there is a strong sense of community identity. This exercise helps to illustrate the use of theory in generating hypotheses to be tested. The practical application is better prediction of what happens in different combinations of circumstances.

**Social Problem Theory**

The first experiment found systematic differences between the way leaders of the residents' and neighbourhood organizations saw urban renewal and the way politicians, officials and experts saw it. Social problem theory is used as an aid to organizing and understanding these observed differences.

A social problem is an unacceptable shortfall between commonly accepted standards and actual conditions. The discrepancy between expectation and reality has objective aspects such as the conditions of housing and environment. The subjective aspects of perception and evaluation help determine the attribution of causes and selection of courses of corrective action. Because the way people define a problem may determine their choice of action, decision-makers, experts and residents tended to proffer different solutions to the problems of urban renewal:

A problem is not the same to all interested parties... Laymen typically define problems in ways dictated by their immediate interests as citizens...professions see problems in ways consistent with their theories and amenable to their techniques...social scientists [have a] tendency to regard problems as the "natural" consequences of the operation of society, not amenable to rational plans for change.89

---

The subjective influence of vested interests can account for some of the differences in the way a problem is perceived and thereby the selection of a solution.

A particular social problem such as urban renewal can be seen as rooted in social disorganization or as a consequence of deviant behaviour. The choice determines the kind of action to be taken as suggested in the speculative paradigm at the beginning of this chapter. In terms of system hierarchy there is a choice between intervention at the level of the individual and at the level of the community, that is, between individual therapy and social reform. If the problem of urban renewal is seen as rooted in the social structure of the community, the selection of a mode of intervention takes into consideration whether community organization within a locality is absent or too weak to act. From this perspective a disorganized locality needs a community development or animation approach and an organized community would need a strategy of co-operation and involvement of local residents through their associations.

If the problem is seen as rooted in individual pathology, such as the "personality of poverty", residents' groups and other forms of locality organization are seen as not relevant and even as obstacles to the treatment of blighted housing, poverty, disease and crime. From this perspective urban renewal is a problem of deviant behaviour in the sense that the occupants of blighted housing and slum areas have defects of character which explain their failure to succeed in establishing themselves in better class areas. There would be no point in giving them better housing without training in the life skills needed to live up to it.

This basic distinction in problem definition and type of intervention may account for some of the differences in perspective which the first experimental analysis found among decision-makers and citizen leaders. It is recommended that this be explored and tested empirically in future research.
Background of Voluntary Association

As an heuristic exercise residents' organizations have been classified as formal voluntary associations. This brings a considerable body of knowledge to bear on the task of understanding and explaining the residents' groups which have sprung up and challenged the premises of traditional urban renewal programmes.

Formal voluntary association enters into all spheres of community life and has deep roots in the history of our society. Voluntary citizen organizations with specific purposes can be traced back to the anti-slavery movement:

Wilberforce and the anti-slavery men had introduced into English life and politics new methods of agitating and educating public opinion. The dissemination of facts and arguments; the answers to the misstatements of the adversary on the pleasures of the "middle-passage" and the happiness of negro life in the plantations; the tracts; the subscriptions; the public meetings--all these methods and propaganda were systemized by methods familiar enough today but strange and new in that age...[methods] which have ever since been the arteries of English Life.90

In North America voluntary associations go back to the Committees of Correspondence which fought to have the Stamp Act repealed (1766), and the Boston Tea Party served to revive these committees. By the time that de Tocqueville toured America in the 1830s there was a vast range of associations which citizens could join:

Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive...A people among whom individuals lost the power of achieving great things single handed, without acquiring the means of producing them by united exertions, would soon relapse

into barbarism...If men are to remain civilized or to become so the art of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which the equality of conditions is increased.91

Contemporary studies have found wide variations in rates of participation in associations of one kind or another. Many if not most people are not active in formal voluntary associations but they do form part of informal communication networks. The poor and disadvantaged have been found to participate proportionately less. The young and old take less part in instrumental pressure groups.92

Some commentators see the specialization of labour and leisure in urban industrial communities resulting in a decline of neighbourhood organization.93 Nevertheless, there appear to be substantial differences in degree of community organization from one neighbourhood to another:

These neighbourhoods, whether they are incorporated suburban municipalities or simply "named places" centered on schools and shopping centres within the great city, allow for some collective action on matters of common concern...There is great variation in the social strength of such neighbourhoods. Where neighbourhoods are socially strong, chiefly in the single-family areas, they encourage community actions through voluntary organizations.94

Measurement of Citizen Participation
A theory of community development which assigns a central role to voluntary organization posits the following as sufficient conditions for development to take place:

94 H.S. Becker, op. cit., p. 524.
•• the formation of voluntary associations that seek to attain instrumental goals, which are consistent with the broad goal of development and these voluntary associations are somewhat successful in attaining their goals.95

This formulation brings out the importance of diagnosing the state of voluntary organizations in urban renewal areas.

To measure the level of citizen participation in two selected neighbourhoods (Don Vale and Niagara) a structured interview guide was designed. Questionnaire items were drafted on the reported research on formal voluntary association. An effort was made to distinguish between instrumental groups and those which were expressive. Instrumental groups have specific purposes which involve influencing and bringing about some change in the larger system of which they are a part. In this case it means a neighbourhood group setting out to influence the politicians and policies of Toronto. Expressive groups indulge in activities which are satisfying in themselves; sport and social clubs are examples. This distinction between groups can also be made at the system level of the individual; an individual may take part in an instrumental group for reasons of his own which may be expressive, that is, for the satisfaction of being active and with other people. Since citizen participation is essentially instrumental, an effort was made to distinguish between the two kinds of individual motivation, as Babchuk and Gordon did in their study of a neighbourhood improvement association in a Rochester slum. 96

95 A.E. Havens, "Social Factors in Economic Development", and unpublished research paper, No. 5, for the Land Tenure Center (Wisconsin, May 1965).

96 Babchuk and Gordon, op. cit.
The reasons people might have for joining instrumental neighbourhood associations were given particular attention. Sill's study of volunteers identified some of the internal dispositions and external influences which affect recruitment. The personal goals of the volunteer, his image of the organization, his previous experience and the events which triggered joining were all important. 97

Leadership emerged as a key concern from the first experiment in the analysis of citizen participation. The pivotal function of leaders was mediating between the interests of the neighbourhood community and the city at large. In terms of this mediating function there was an apparent failure of leadership in some urban renewal areas and contrasting success in others—a difference which cannot be explained simply in terms of a flight of the middle-class from the city core to the suburbs. Coleman maintains that specialization in the relationships people have with each other is accompanied by greater freedom from the influence of the residential community. The social group based on residence in a neighbourhood has lost functions (such as education of the young) to larger, more formal and specialized institutions (such as the metropolitan school boards). He observes that neighbours have less of a stabilizing effect on each other's behaviour and exercise less responsibility for each other's children. More people are spending their waking hours far from the residential neighbourhoods where they sleep, either spatially or psychologically, or both.

Such a bifurcation of interests is becoming more pronounced. Many kinds of communities consist of persons whose activities are wholly local and those whose activities are largely outside the community. The former ordinarily become the "locals" and the latter the "cosmopolitans"...Men who are best fitted by education and organizational experience for

positions of local community leadership have the smallest amount of their interest and activities located there. Those who are interested in the community, because their lives are bound up in it, are lower in status, have less education, and are ordinarily the men who would look to others for leadership. In such communities there is a peculiar inversion that would seem to inhibit community organization. 98

The failure to maintain integrative leadership in mediating between local and larger cities may account for some of the polarization and conflict which has obstructed urban renewal programmes.

Involvement in organization response to other issues has been found to leave a residue of sentiments in the form of positive or negative identification with the community and practical experience in organizing which can be reactivated by the challenge of new issues. Experience in successful group endeavours leaves a sense of control or power, of being able to get together with others to get things done, as, for example, in a welfare recipients' league. 99 Such experience in immigrant groups might prove transferable to urban renewal problems. It was found that the Kensington area had a history of five neighbourhood improvement groups and the largely immigrant population had also considerable experience in ethnic organizations. The people in Trefann Court lacked experience in formal voluntary associations. Such a difference could have diagnostic importance.

An examination of the social structure of a neighbourhood community would be incomplete without taking into account informal association. Interaction within the


immediate and extended family has received considerable attention from which contradictory conclusions have been drawn. Arnold Rose contends that members of strong family systems are not as free to take part in formal voluntary associations. Babchuk and Gordon found that the unattached derived more expressive satisfaction from participation than members from intact families who were more purposive and instrumentally oriented; furthermore, most of the members were married. This is contrary to what Arnold Rose has said. Opinions are also divided on whether informal interaction among neighbours is conducive to participation in more formal association. Neighbourhood cohesion has received some attention in studies of forced relocation by Key in Topeka and by Fried in Boston.

**Questionnaire Design**

To interview the residents of two contrasting neighbourhoods a questionnaire was developed by adopting and adapting items used in previous research. The responses should give a comparison of the types and levels of citizen participation in two communities. The main components of the questionnaire are listed below in summary form and in logical sequence, instead of the order in which they appear in the questionnaire as appended.

---


101 Babchuk and Gordon, *op. cit.*

102 W.H. Key, "When People are Forced to Move". Final report of a study of forced relocation in Topeka, May 1967 (mimeographed).


104 See Appendix "B"
1. **Functions of residents' groups**
   (a) Are the activities of the organization designed to provide gratification immediately or at a later time?
   (b) Are the activities oriented to the in-group or do they go beyond the group?
   (c) Are the activities ends in themselves or do they represent means to external ends?

2. **Recruitment to residents' groups**
   (a) How individuals heard about the organization
   (b) Reasons for joining
   (c) Personal characteristics including age, sex, family and tenure.

3. **Community attachment**
   (a) Length of residence
   (b) Desire to stay

4. **Organizational experience**
   (a) Memberships in residents' and all other voluntary associations
   (b) Frequency of attendance at meetings
   (c) Positions held in organizations

5. **Sense of control**
   (a) Suggestions for change
   (b) Who should make the changes
   (c) What can the respondent do

6. **Political involvement**
   (a) Voting
   (b) Membership in political parties
   (c) Direct communications with elected representatives
7. **Informal interaction**
   
   (a) Immediate family
   
   (b) Extended family
   
   (c) Neighbouring
   
   (d) Relational orientations (individualistic, lineal and collateral)

The form of the questions varied from open-ended to forced choice.

This chapter has presented the conceptual framework and design of the second experiment. In the next chapter the empirical part of the study is reported in some detail.
Chapter IX
The Sample Neighbourhoods and Analysis of the Data of the Second Experiment

The field work was conducted in two neighbourhoods, Don Vale and Niagara. They are separate from each other but both are within the older core of Toronto. Don Vale is an old Anglo-Saxon working district on the west bank of the Don River and immediately north of Regent Park which was Toronto's first venture into public housing. Niagara is some distance to the southeast of the University campus in a settlement area for immigrants. It was apparent that both neighbourhoods shared the problem of old, deteriorated housing, but how they would compare with each other in terms of social strengths and weaknesses was a matter of interest to the study group.

The interviews probed participation in residents' associations, the formal associational life of the neighbourhoods, and the meaning and strength of the sense of community. This involved a change in method from elite interviewing of leaders identified in purposive sampling to random sampling of householders in two neighbourhoods, one already designated for urban renewal and the other not yet threatened.

The Sample Neighbourhoods

The following profile of the two neighbourhoods was drawn from 1961 and 1966 Census information and the 1965 Metropolitan Profile prepared by the Social Planning Council. According to 1961 information, over 90% of the housing units in both Don Vale and Niagara were more than fifty years old; some were overcrowded and needing major repairs. Don Vale had been designated an area for urban renewal in 1963. At that time the Planning Board called it the Don Number Three Area, and the name "Don Vale" came into use sometime later. It was expected that Niagara would be similarly designated within five to ten years.
Both Don Vale and Niagara were among the lowest tracts in the City in terms of rent, family income, educational and occupational status; and among the highest in juvenile delinquency rates. In general, both were areas of old, deteriorated housing occupied mainly by poor people, but they were different in other ways. The people were different: in Niagara the majority were first generation and not of British origin (Italians and Portuguese were numerous); the majority of Don Vale residents were native born and most were of British origin.

In Don Vale almost two-thirds of the dwellings were rented, while more than three-quarters were owner-occupied in Niagara. Some of the Don Vale people had gone through the experience of being displaced from the nearby area that was redeveloped into the high-rise complex known as St. James Town; they had been relocated to houses owned by developers in Don Vale. This was reflected in length of residence in the study: the average was 16 years in Niagara but only 13 in Don Vale. Table I indicates the difference to be greater than would be expected by chance in less than seven out of 100 such samples.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence in Same Dwelling</th>
<th>Don Vale</th>
<th>Niagara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and less</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X\(^2\) = 3.41, P < .07, N=97

The Metropolitan Profile also gave a picture of substantially more transiency in Don Vale than in Niagara.

The Residents' Associations

There were residents' associations active in both neighbourhoods, and they had been formed to deal with urban
renewal matters. Don Vale had been designated in 1963 for urban renewal; the Planning Board presented its "Urban Renewal Scheme for the Sackville-Dermott Place Project" in 1966. The Ward 2 Residents' Association then formed to oppose this scheme (what was then Ward 2 is now Ward 7), and comprised both homeowners and tenants who were interested in preserving the area mainly by means of rehabilitation. Also in response to the urban renewal scheme there was formed the Ward 2 Businessmen's Association—a separate association comprised exclusively of property owners. They were interested in raising land values and initially they thought mainly in terms of clearance and high-rise development.

In 1968 the provincial government stated a new policy making the funding of urban renewal schemes contingent on citizen participation. This led the City to set up the first local "Working Committee" assigned to prepare and implement an urban renewal scheme in Don Vale. Both associations were represented on the Working Committee for a time, but there was dissension and then disaffection when the representatives of the Businessmen's Association withdrew.

This study was primarily concerned with residents' associations. However, the executive committee of the Ward 2 Residents' Association decided not to contribute to this study as a group. Nevertheless, one-third of them did grant individual interviews. At this time, a group of sociology students were also conducting a survey in the area. There had been interviews five years before and designation for urban renewal had resulted in a number of studies and surveys which were conducted by other agencies.

The Niagara Area Residents' Association had been formed two years earlier (in 1966). It was a united group of tenants and property owners who organized to resist expropriation of homes to make way for an extension of Highway 400 into the City, which had been proposed by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. It had been set up under the wing
of St. Christopher House (a settlement house) and a community worker on the staff of the House was assigned to the group.

Besides its concern with local housing conditions, the Niagara Area Residents' Association took an interest in traffic and delinquency issues. It organized summer sports for the children, held an annual dance, and published a newsletter. The stated objectives of the Association were:

1. That we act to preserve and strengthen the character of the neighbourhood;
2. That we meet the needs of the community without wasteful use of valuable land;
3. That the Toronto City Planning Board, Central District, work in close co-operation with the Niagara residents in studying and determining the needs of our area with a view to redeveloping substandard section and unused properties;
4. That the environment be improved through correction of objectionable and obnoxious conditions in the community such as excessive noise and air pollution;
5. That means be found to help those residents interested in fixing up substandard homes in sections not requiring redevelopment.105

The People Interviewed

The residents interviewed included as many executive members of the local residents' associations as possible (16 persons) and a random sample of the householders who were interviewed from door to door (81 persons).

| TABLE 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105 Memorandum circulated to members of the Niagara Residents' Association from the Executive, March 1969, p. 1.
Very few persons refused to be interviewed in the door-to-door canvas ("roomers" and high-rise apartment dwellers were not included). Adults who could not speak English were interviewed with the help of their children as translators. The interviews took up to an hour each. By varying the time of day for the interviews, almost equal representation of the sexes was achieved. Over four-fifths were living with their spouses, 72 had dependent children, and only 7% (mainly university students) were unmarried.

**Home Ownership and Participation**

Participation in these residents' associations, as well as participation in other formal voluntary associations, seemed to be linked to home ownership as well as long term residency: all except one "office holders" and more than half of the other members were homeowners. Of the 81 ordinary residents interviewed, 15 were members of the residents' or other homeowners associations; all but two of these were homeowners. The chi square test applied to the frequencies in Table 3 indicates that the preponderance of members who were homeowners was almost certainly no chance occurrence; such a distribution could be expected by chance less than one time in 1,000 such samples. The residents' associations have attracted homeowners but few tenants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>owner</th>
<th>tenant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 33.96, \, P < .001, \, N = 81 \]
The household canvas turned up a high proportion of association members—almost 20%. Those who did not belong gave as reasons: (1) not knowing about the existence of such organizations (some of these expressed interest in joining); (2) not speaking English well enough; or (3) simply not interested. When asked whether they had thought about joining the residents' association, the comments expressed by tenants indicated apathy, isolation and alienation:

No, I leave this up to my landlord to say what should be done.

No point in going to the meetings—landlords can sell any time. You have to ask the landlords if you want changes. They have all the influence.

Thought about it, but didn't think it was worth it.

Believe only homeowners can belong. Otherwise, probably would belong.

Some of the people interviewed did attend meetings regularly but were not formal paid-up members of the associations. Of the owners, 36% belonged neither to the residents' associations nor to any other voluntary association; 53% of the tenants belonged to no voluntary organization at all. One-third of the owners but only two tenants belonged to both a residents' association and to other organizations such as church groups, parents' groups for children's activities, social and recreational clubs for their own enjoyment, and ethnic associations to preserve a common heritage. The indications were strong that home ownership was correlated with participation in voluntary associations—associations pertaining to urban renewal and those concerned with other objectives. The question of whether a decline in home ownership would be accompanied by a decline in voluntary association would have implications for the strength of neighbourhood communities.
Length of Residence and Participation

Participation in associations was associated with long standing residence. Even though Don Vale and Niagara owners had been in residence an average of almost three times as long as tenants, the relationship was consistent between owners and tenants. Executive members had longer residence than ordinary members who, in turn, had been in residence longer than non-members.

| TABLE 4 |
| Length of Residence in Relation to Homeownership and Membership |
| Average in Years |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive members</th>
<th>Other members of residents' associations</th>
<th>Members of other associations</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three tenants who were members of the residents' associations had an average residence of 10 years, which was high compared with most other tenants; they were too few to be included in the table.

Both home ownership and long residence appeared to be related to membership in residents' and other voluntary associations. It would take more extensive study to separate the effect of prevalence of ownership from the effect of geographic mobility on the associational life of the community.

Participation in other Formal Voluntary Associations

People who participated in one association are likely to join others. Since residents' associations are one type of association, their members would likely be involved in others. As it turned out, two-thirds of the members of
the residents' associations were active in other voluntary associations:

TABLE 5
Participation in Residents' and Other Formal Voluntary Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other associations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Non-member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' associations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 6.58, \ P < .02, \ N=94 \]

The ten people who were members of residents' associations exclusively included some who seemed isolated from their neighbours and interested only in their own property, and there were those who were fully occupied with child-bearing. Three had attended no meetings during the past year. Four were over 50 years of age and three of these were married women with retired husbands. Only two of the ten were in Niagara. In general, the level of participation of this group of ten persons was relatively low.

However, there is much more to be learned about the dynamics of participation in the residents' associations. Do these associations serve to involve in the life of the community people who have not taken part in voluntary associations before? Do they succeed in involving low-income and low-status people who, in the past, have participated relatively little in any formal voluntary associations? The presence of ten people who were participating only in the residents' associations opens up such possibilities. Will they go on to join other organizations in the years ahead?
A further question concerns latent participation, that is, the reasons 41 people were involved in no formal association at all. Actually, of the people canvassed randomly only a little more than half said that they were participating in no association, which is a much lower rate of nonparticipation than most studies have reported. The people of Don Vale and Niagara were substantially involved in formal voluntary organization and, therefore, had developed substantial capacity for reacting to any urban renewal planning—a reaction which could help or obstruct urban renewal efforts.

There were indications that the mode of recruitment to membership in the residents' associations was related to participation. People who were encouraged by their neighbours to join attended more meetings than those who were induced to join by a stranger or by printed information.

**Participation and Attitude Towards Neighbourhood**

Participation appeared to be linked to attitudes towards the community.

**TABLE 6**

<p>| Relationship Between Attitude to Neighbourhood and Membership |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attached</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not attached</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.88, P < .01, N=80 \]

All members of the Niagara Residents' Association expressed attachment to the community in the sense that they would like to continue living there and had never thought seriously of leaving. However, there was no relationship between attitudes of community attachment and membership in other organizations.
Niagara residents who participated in both residents' and other associations made the following remarks to explain the reasons they chose to remain in the neighbourhood:

- It's a friendly area...whereas other neighbourhoods are not as friendly.
- The interesting district and the friendly people.
- It's like a small town community.
- The good community feeling.

In contrast Don Vale people who were deeply involved in voluntary associations said:

- The neighbourhood has deteriorated over the years.
- I am not pleased about the lower class coming in.
- I don't like the area very much now. It's the City's fault.

In general, the organizationally active people in both areas cared a great deal, but the people in Don Vale seemed more preoccupied with the future existence of the area than with the friendliness of neighbours. People less involved in associations tended to give more general and more apathetic comments about the areas in which they resided:

- You can't fight the City.
- What is one person going to do?
- It is the responsibility of leaders and politicians who never help anyone.

Consistent with the foregoing were the findings that participation in voluntary associations was associated with a higher degree of informal interaction with neighbours and a sense of control over the future of the neighbourhood. Non-participants had vague, often negative sentiments towards the community, they lived in isolation from their neighbours, they did not know who the local leaders were, and conveyed a sense of powerlessness about the future of the neighbourhood as a community.
Community Attachment

Involvement in organized community groups which achieve some success leaves a residue of positive identification with the community. Expressions of identification or attachment may indicate the capacity of the community to respond in an organized way to the challenges of new issues.

Those persons most strongly attached to the community answered positively when asked whether they would like to remain in the neighbourhood and negatively when asked whether they had ever seriously considered leaving it. In this sense 40% were strongly attached; attached to a lesser degree were the 31% who wanted to remain, had not thought seriously about leaving it but would consider it (for example, "I'd like to remain in the area unless I got a fair price"). Least attached were the 29% who rejected the idea of remaining there or had given serious thought to leaving; this group made such comments as:

- We're moving as soon as possible.
- We'll be moving back to North Bay.
- Yes, I'm selling.

Don Vale showed a trend towards less attachment but not to a significant extent:

| TABLE 7 |
|---|---|---|
| Attachment to Neighbourhood |
| Strongly attached | Attached | Least attached |
| Don Vale | 14 | 13 | 14 |
| Niagara | 18 | 12 | 10 |

$X^2 = 0.80$, $P < .95$ (not significant), $N=91$
Respondents were encouraged to expand their answers by discussing, in general, what they thought about their neighbourhoods. Negative and mixed feelings were more prominent in Don Vale:

**TABLE 8**  
General Attitude Towards Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Vale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 13.14, \ P < .001, \ N=81 \]

There were qualitative differences in expressions of sentiment attachment to the neighbourhoods which were not captured in the quantitative analysis. These are in verbatim form:

**DON VALE**

**Positive**
Quiet, people mind their own business.
It's great--for students, so cheap and for having parties.
I like it but it needs a lot of cleaning up
Convenient, like it here.
I like the neighbourhood because people keep to themselves.

**Mixed**
Area is alright, the people are rough.
Always like it but now deteriorated.
It's central but I would never recommend it to anyone.
The neighbourhood is alright but a lot of the neighbours aren't.
I always like it. It's changed in the last five years, deteriorated. New neighbours really don't care much.

It's a quiet area...However there's too much garbage and car wrecks left about.

Negative

It's not a nice area, traffic is beyond, getting terribly run down--dirty, filthy, disgusted with it; people are getting mugged all the time now.

It's no good. We're moving as soon as possible.

Not pleased with the lower class of people who are moving in; mainly due to absentee landlords.

There's an aura of poverty among the permanent residents who don't care about the area.

The main thing wrong with the area is the people themselves. Everyone just cares about money and nothing else. The people are not clean.

We do not like Don Vale. We live here because it's cheap. Houses are falling apart and absentee landlords make them barely liveable. The area is rough with teenagers drinking and noisy. There are not enough recreational facilities and not enough police protection. Parents losing interest in children--running loose.

Positive

It's a good place; I would like to see it preserved. It's an interesting district, a unique flavour and cheap rent; people are friendly.

I like the area. Everyone is friendly and the taxes are low.

Convenient, there is so much for the children and there are good neighbours.

Area has an identity now, close to facilities, good neighbours, low taxes, and good experience living with ethnic groups.

Good area for working people.
Nice--no fighting, no stealing, taxes are reasonable. I like it. It's clean. People keep it clean. It's friendly.

Mixed
Good neighbourhood, except some let houses deteriorate.

Not bad. Lots should not be left vacant; they should be built on. This is the City's fault and it runs down the district.

Negative
Awful. Nasty people. Not safe with Queen Street so close.

Need more place for the kids to play.

Common to a preponderance of the comments was concern about the neighbours, how friendly they were, and whether they were respectable.

TABLE 9
Attitude Towards Neighbouring Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Vale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 33.71, \ P < .001, \ N=80 \]

There was sharp divergence between the two sample areas as illustrated in Table 9. The difference between the two areas was so great that it could be expected to occur by chance less than once in 1,000 comparisons of such samples. It has been noted that more negative sentiments were expressed in Don Vale.

In Niagara people expressed far more community spirit. One man recounted that he had let his house run down (expecting it to be expropriated) until the residents organized. Then
he painted and repaired it and now stated that no one could pry him out of that house. Another Niagara resident explained that she had just refused the offer of a large unit in public housing in order to remain in this neighbourhood. The best aspect about Niagara was the neighbours; they were described as friendly and respected, even across ethnic lines. Respondents referred to community activities and the co-operation between their Residents' Association, churches and schools in arranging programmes for everyone and all ages in the neighbourhood. Residents credited the Association for improving intergroup relations across ethnic and religious lines. On the whole, positive identification with the Niagara neighbourhood was more with people than with physical amenities or appearances. Most of the criticisms from Niagara residents were levelled at physical amenities and appearances but they did not reach the level of the criticisms that came from Don Vale.

TABLE 10
Attitude Towards Physical Amenities and Appearances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Vale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 9.62, \ P < .01, \ N=92$

In these attitudes towards neighbours and physical amenities the people who participated in residents' and other associations were not different from nonparticipants; it can thus be said that they did reflect the prevailing attitudes of the areas they represented.

The comments about Don Vale tended to express a sense of isolation and even estrangement from neighbours. Some were
distressed that neighbours did not care, but others welcomed this kind of privacy and seemed to hold a fatalistic "live and let live" outlook on life. The remaining longstanding residents were ceasing to care, according to a student respondent who was living there. As he saw it, the mixture with "beautiful people" who were "free" and transient produced a liberal atmosphere. It may be that these were signs of a deviant subculture which was beginning to develop in Don Vale. There were more direct questions about interaction between neighbours which made it possible to analyse neighbouring more extensively.

Neighbouring

Informal participation in the life of the community can take the form of interaction with neighbours, friends, workmates and relatives. The following table indicates much friendly interaction but little mutual aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction with Neighbours</th>
<th>Don Vale</th>
<th>Niagara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men and Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time regularly with neighbours</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss behaviour limits for children with other parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address quite a few neighbours by first name</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own children play with others in neighbourhood (72 respondents had children)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help one another with meals and housework</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help one another by picking things up at the store 16 8
Care for each other's children 15 11
Help out when neighbour is sick 22 15
Get together for recreational activities 12 4

Men only
Help other men in the neighbourhood (painting, car repairs, etc.) 16 13
Take part in some type of social activity with men in the neighbourhood 4 8

N=81

Three questions were combined into an elementary scale: "picking things up at the store", "caring for each other's children", and "getting together for recreational activities". More than half the women (23 of them) gave positive responses to at least two of these three questions. Each one of these 23 women was disadvantaged by having many children, by low income (such as social assistance), by being a migrant without relatives on whom they could rely, or by being a single parent. In Don Vale, where people seemed to be more apathetic and cared less about their neighbours, perhaps they needed each other more even though they liked each other less than in Niagara. This raises a serious question about what happens when relocation severs these supports. It took time to get to know neighbours well enough to rely on them. People who had lived in the same dwelling for only five years or less indicated less interaction with their neighbours. Interaction with neighbours had been disrupted for some who remained when neighbours moved away:

We socialized with the neighbours, but now they have moved away, and we haven't made friends with the new neighbours.
In relational orientations Don Vale people tended to be more individualistic, even though their behaviour and personal situations showed them to be more dependent on informal supports than the residents in Niagara.

**Political Participation**

There are formal channels for individual action through voting, litigation, letters to editors and appeals to elected representatives. Some questions were designed to determine the involvement of residents in political activity. All the executives and 58% of the other residents voted in the last municipal election. In Don Vale direct political action in the form of party membership and direct communication with elected representatives were more prominent than in Niagara. This may be an indication of greater polarization of feelings in Don Vale.

**TABLE 12**

Individual Political Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don Vale</th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total interviewed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in last municipal election</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of political party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote to elected representative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke to alderman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sense of Control to Effect Change**

One residue of involvement in organized community activities is the sentiment of attachment to the community; a second is the practical experience of taking part in voluntary associations. These two kinds of residue have
been analysed, and now a third is introduced. It is the sense of control that people gain from taking part in voluntary organizations. Expressions of a sense of control are taken to be an indication of the community's capacity to respond to new issues with united action.

To assess sense of control people were asked what they would like to see changed, who should make the changes, and whether they thought there was anything they could do to make the changes. Most expressions of power were in the sense of united action. People in Niagara felt more action-oriented than in Don Vale and this corresponded with their accomplishments.

**TABLE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of control</th>
<th>Mixed feelings or nothing to change</th>
<th>Impotent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Vale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 11.86, P < .01, N=81 \]

Besides this striking quantitative difference in sense of control, there were differences in priorities for change. Niagara residents wanted improved recreational facilities, home improvements, elimination of industrial uses and, in general, improvements in the quality of life. Survival was the dominant theme of suggestions from Don Vale; suggestions stressed need for police protection, basic sanitation and demolition of derelict houses.

While most positive statements were in terms of group action, many went further to promote partnership with the civic administration. Many who possessed some sense of control stressed partnership with the City as well as faith
in residents' associations. There were indications of a desire for consultation with City officials and, particularly an acceptance of the shared responsibilities involved. Those who had little to say felt that it was the responsibility of government to make changes. While Niagara residents express pride and faith in community action through their Residents' Association, there was a sense of failure and alienation in Don Vale:

Even as a group it's difficult to bring about changes. They can't work wonders and I'm becoming disillusioned by it all.

It's useless, no good going to the City; they don't really care about the neighbourhood.

I have no power and feel like a real transient in the area.

You will not do away with slums until you do away with slummish people and you cannot do away with slummish people. Don Vale is going to become a slum and you cannot stop it.

In contrast to the Niagara view of partnership with the City, Don Vale attitudes were more polarized and alienated from civic government.

Summary

Residents in two neighbourhoods were interviewed to ascertain the nature and level of formal voluntary association in their communities. Instead of focusing on what was lacking by using the old concepts of anomie and social class, use was made of likely indicators of capacity for organized response to the problems and issues of urban renewal. These indicators included experience in voluntary associations, attitudes to the neighbourhood, their people and their amenities, feelings of attachment and power to make changes, and informal support between neighbours.
Chapter X

Predicting the Results of Citizen Involvement in Urban Renewal

Did the research interviews find differences between Don Vale and Niagara which could help account for the course that events have taken since then? This heuristic strategy is retrospective and leaves for future research the more rigorous test of a prospective design. Some of the items used in the interviews appear to hold promise for the prediction of the results of citizen involvement in urban renewal.

Don Vale Since the Survey

In 1969, not long after the fieldwork was conducted, the Don Vale Tenants' Association was formed to press for tenant representation on the first Working Committee to be organized by the City government. A second purpose of the new association was to oppose rent increases which were expected to accompany rehabilitation. The result was that the people of Don Vale were split into three associations. Eventually the Working Committee arrived at a renewal plan which was accepted in principle by the civic administration. However, the plan was too far ahead of its time to be implemented. The main thrust was comprehensive rehabilitation of the existing housing, but it could not be done under the existing legislation. It would now be possible under the 1973 Amendments to the NHA.*

At the same time, the turnover of the neighbourhood population accelerated in a process which the English call "gentrification", which is a type of "white painting". An affluent middle class appears to be returning to the City core and is inhabiting accommodation that was once occupied

* The first proposal under the new Amendments took the form of a request by a community association in Don Vale for City Council approval of a co-operative housing undertaking. Almost immediately a counter group was formed to oppose the introduction of new housing for low- and lower middle-income families.
by working class and poor people. The policy of housing rehabilitation has succeeded beyond the original hope of keeping the neighbourhood intact, and old houses have been converted into smart townhouses which few can afford. The fears of the Tenants' Association concerning escalating rents have proven well grounded and the citizens' groups have become quiescent. Thus, there appears to be a movement towards a different kind of slum clearance, whereby the poor are being dislocated and dispersed as surely as in the earlier process of urban renewal. The old houses have been saved, but what has happened to the traditional residents of Don Vale?

**Niagara Since the Survey**

The Niagara area has undergone less change in its housing stock and in its population. It still houses people on low incomes and rehabilitation has been on a more modest level, rather than a conversion to expensive townhouses which characterize Don Vale today. There has been a steady flow, not an abrupt turnover, of population, with succeeding waves of immigration; the Portuguese now form the largest ethnic group. However divided the population is among the ethnic groups of this settlement area, there is still only one residents' association.

The locus of action has shifted from the Residents' Association to two local committees associated with an urban renewal site office which has been established in the neighbourhood. Assigned to the neighbourhood are planners employed by the City Planning Board; there is a Planning Committee which meets weekly and holds open meetings monthly to prepare an official plan for land use. What began as a spontaneous residents' association has become institutionalized. Although the old association remains in form, the substance has been co-opted and made a legitimate part of civic government. The Planning Board is providing staff in other neighbourhoods also, to encourage citizen participation at
the neighbourhood level in the preparation of Toronto's new official plan for land use. This plan is intended to define objectives for the next twenty years.

The City Department of Development also has staff members in Niagara and has created a Housing Committee which meets weekly; this Committee also holds open monthly meetings for the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme (N.I.P.). The concerns of the Planning Committee and the Housing Committee overlap and echo the structural conflict of the departmental division of responsibility for planning at the City level.

Residents are kept informed by flyers and newsletters and are invited to attend the open committee meetings. Whereas the old Residents' Association comprised homeowners almost exclusively, more tenants are participating in the deliberations of these new working committees. However, participation is not proportionate to the ethnic groups in that few Portuguese take part.

Zoning for residential and industrial uses is the main current issue. Efforts are being made to conserve some homes by changing the zoning from industrial to residential, and there is also pressure to remove some of the existing industries on the grounds that they are noxious to the neighbouring residents. There are complaints of the danger of truck traffic to children, noise, smoke, odours and parking congestion. The strongest objections are to a foundry which processes lead; levels of lead regarded as dangerously high have been found in the blood of residents and their children in the vicinity of this factory and even several blocks from it. This is one of two such lead smelting operations adjoining residential areas in Toronto. In Niagara there has been a petition and use of regular channels rather than the more spectacular confrontation tactics; the reaction has not been to "fight City Hall". Nevertheless, there are conflicting interests--between jobs and children's health--but the neighbourhood has not polarized
to the extent of forming splinter groups, nor has it pitted itself against the civic administration.

The pressures of change and the threats against the continued existence of such neighbourhoods seem to be increasing the raising of the question concerning where the breaking point of the social strength of these inner city neighbourhoods may lie. For the present there appears to be substantial co-operation between the organized resident and the larger City interests.

**Predictive Differences Between Neighbourhoods**

What differences in citizen participation between Don Vale and Niagara were found which could account for the outcomes: division and dispersion in Don Vale; internal cohesion and co-operation with the City in Niagara? The people of both communities were substantially involved in formal voluntary associations and, therefore, had developed the capacity for reacting to urban renewal proposals. But what accounts for the difference between obstruction and co-operation between neighbourhood and City? Some popular opinion has blamed political activists moving in from outside. The study indicated that people are induced to join residents' associations most effectively by their neighbours; members who are induced to join by strangers and impersonal media take less active part in association affairs. These findings suggest that professional leadership originating outside the neighbourhood has little impact. This gives small encouragement for a social animation approach to disorganized neighbourhoods.

Neighbours had a direct effect on recruitment and participation in residents' associations, and they also played a large role in the attitudes residents expressed towards their neighbourhoods as a whole. In Niagara respondents gave friendly and respectable neighbours as the prime reason for wanting to remain living there. Comments from Don Vale people tended to blame neighbours for the
deterioration of the area. In Niagara there was community spirit and positive identification, more with neighbours than with the physical aspect of the neighbourhood.

Nevertheless, the physical amenities and appearances received considerable criticism from Niagara residents. This sense of attachment and concern for the community could account for the cohesiveness of the residents' association and the resolution of conflicting interests at the neighbourhood level, thus clearing the way for co-operation with the City. In Don Vale, however, there was a highly significant difference in attitudes towards neighbours. Neighbours were described as not caring about others, not being respectable and clean, and there was a sense of isolation and estrangement. The level of criticism of physical amenities and appearances was even higher than in Niagara, although both areas had many physical shortcomings. The difference in attitudes towards neighbours would seem, therefore, to hold the most promise of diagnostic and predictive value for the future course of citizen involvement.

There are two further indicators of capacity for organized action which seem to have some predictive value. It will take further research to sort out the respective effects of type of tenure and length of residence. For instance, homeowners and long-term residents were, with few exceptions, synonymous and constituted the majority of members of the residents' associations. On the other hand, non-members were apathetic, isolated and alienated. In both respects Don Vale and Niagara differed. Three-quarters of the houses in Niagara were owner-occupied, compared with only one-third in Don Vale. In the sample interviewed the average length of residence was 16 years in Niagara and only 13 in Don Vale. This may indicate a capacity for effective formal voluntary organization, which favoured Niagara.

The people of Niagara became more experienced in organized response to community issues, which was reflected
in another possible diagnostic indicator—the sense of power to effect changes in the neighbourhood. People in Don Vale had significantly less sense of control; survival dominated their suggestions for change, for example, police protection and basic sanitation. In contrast, Niagara residents wanted physical improvements to enhance the quality of life.

In summary, Don Vale and Niagara differed in attitudes towards neighbours, attachment and desire to remain, proportion of homeownership, length of residence, sense of power to improve the environment, and the kinds of change desired. It is proposed that these be considered in further research as indicators of neighbourhood capacity for organized response to predict the results of citizen involvement in urban renewal programmes.

Changing Forms of Tenure and Community Organization

In the two sample areas there was a strong connection between home ownership and membership in the residents' associations. Tenants expressed apathy about the fate of their neighbourhood and alienation from their neighbours. The changes taking place in forms of ownership and in relations between landlords and tenants give rise to questions about residents' associations under these emerging conditions. Will they cease to exist? Will they be divisive and militant or will they be cohesive and integrative? A focus of future research could very well be on formal voluntary association in settings where new forms of tenure prevail.

Modifications of home ownership are taking several directions. Condominiums have become commonplace, building co-operatives and neighbourhood-based housing co-operatives are to be subsidized for low-income people under the 1973 NHA Amendments. There have been a few rent-purchase opportunities in the public housing field and they may become more plentiful. Some provincial programmes are making building lots available for privately-owned homes while retaining ownership of the land. Community corporations have
been instituted as non-profit demonstrations, some in remote areas to assume ownership of new housing for native people and some in urban areas to purchase and rehabilitate houses for people on low incomes; for example, Don West Neighbours in Toronto. These manifestations suggest that the traditional institution of home ownership may be undergoing some fundamental changes which are not yet sufficiently developed to be fully understood.

Changing legislation is reflecting changing relationships between tenants and landlords, whether they are public housing authorities or private entrepreneurs. These basic social changes in tenure may be accompanied by changes in the pressure groups which form to promote residents' interests. The mode of analysis developed in these two experiments could be carried forward into these new situations.

Hidden Costs of Social Disruption

Urban renewal, which takes the form of relocating and dispersing people, runs the risk of demolishing neighbourhood identities and relationships. Physical improvement of housing and environmental amenities may incur the hidden costs of social disruption. We have seen that low-income people, dislocated from what became the St. James Town high-rise development, moved into Don Vale and are now being displaced again. What happens to these uprooted people? The behaviour of alienated and apathetic people is less predictable and more deviant than that of people who influence and are influenced by neighbours whom they know well. There may be cause for concern about the political instability and social pathology in deteriorating city cores.

Perhaps Don Vale had no more than a superficial identity and community spirit when the field work was done for the second research experiment; perhaps labelling the neighbourhood as an urban renewal area had already eroded much of the identity and spirit. Relocation and dispersal may have been inevitable. Even so, there was a hidden cost in the
disruption of the informal support network which was found to exist there and which has been found among people in many low-income communities. The classic example of this is East London:

Yet even when the town planners have set themselves to create communities anew as well as houses, they have still put their faith in buildings, sometimes speaking as though all that was necessary for neighbourliness was a neighbourhood unit, for community spirit a community centre. If this were so, then there would be no harm in shifting people about the country, for what is lost could soon be regained by skilful architecture and design. But there is surely more to a community than that. The sense of loyalty to each other amongst the inhabitants of a place like Bethnal Green is not due to buildings. It is due far more to ties of kinship and friendship which connect the people of one household to the people of another. In such a district community spirit does not have to be fostered, it is already there. If the authorities regard that spirit as a social asset worth preserving, they will not uproot more people, but build the new houses around the social groups to which they already belong.106

There is need for more research along the lines of Zurcher's study of board participation by poor people in Community Action Programs in Topeka. Maximum feasible participation by the poor was the stated policy for War on Poverty programmes and a conscious effort was made to include them on the boards and committees of the respective formal voluntary associations:

A maximum assumption of the OEO "maximum feasible participation" mandate seemed clearly to be social-therapeutic in nature. By their participation, the poor were to be "socialized" out of the "cycle of poverty" and were to acquire "middle-class skills". Zurcher took this assumption to be an hypothesis and tested the impact of "maximum feasible participation"
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in a poverty board upon some social-psychological characteristics of the poor participants. In brief, he found that the representatives of the poor over a period of seven months increased in activism and achievement orientation, and decreased in anomie, integration with relatives, isolation, normlessness, alienation, and particularism. The degree and even the direction of change were seen to be related to the quality and intensity of participation.107

Is it possible to involve in neighbourhood improvement associations people who have not been involved before in any kind of organization and get the kind of results claimed by Zurcher? If this kind of social rehabilitation is attempted it might warrant as substantial an investment in evaluative research as the Topeka programme received. Such research could go beyond the personal changes which Zurcher noted, and examine the community changes. Can the community factors which differentiated Don Vale and Niagara be changed by experimental social measures, such as the programmes which Zurcher evaluated? Can new ways of planning and participation bring about improvements in attitudes towards neighbours, in attachment and desire to remain, in sense of power to improve the environment and the kinds of change desired? The Toronto studies suggest that it is possible to predict and gain further understanding of the results of citizen participation in urban renewal.

Chapter XI

Citizen Participation: Fact, Fiction or Fraud?

No clear method of measuring citizen participation existed in 1968; nor does it exist today. Moreover, it seems difficult to conceptualize the kind of research instrument which would make it possible to undertake either quantitative or qualitative measurements. Yet many social scientists, planners, social workers, and elected officials persist in appraising what they term to be citizen participation from one point of view or another, without always realizing or admitting that what they report or infer is primarily a judgement—often a value judgement.

The Measurement of Participation: Quantitative Aspects

There is surely one group of persons (including some citizen participants in neighbourhood improvement areas, their professional advisors, their elected representatives, and students drawn from a variety of disciplines together with their teachers) who would consider the first essential of the process of measurement to be quantitative. In their view a public meeting of a residents' association which attracts 400 persons is an overwhelming success; whereas a similar meeting with an attendance of 25 or 50 persons is a miserable failure. The assumption is that citizen participation can be measured in numbers—the number of members who perhaps pay a modest annual fee to belong to a voluntary association, the number of persons who participate in a public meeting, the number of persons who attend a rally in the City Hall Square, the number of persons who march to the office of a Housing Authority or to the City Hall—and that it is the most significant criterion.

It must be admitted that this point of view is not without some merit, because it is a well understood proposition that elected representatives do take numbers into consideration in the decision-making process. A small delegation of 12 or 15 persons representing the Social Planning Council or the Community Planning Association in most major metropolitan
areas in Canada does not appear to influence the judgement of elected representatives in the decision-making process. On the other hand, an overcrowded Council Chamber, a tightly-packed Board of Education meeting room, a completely filled committee room in City Hall--these visual impressions do seem to influence elected representatives. In fact, one might speculate that smaller rooms, in terms of accommodation within which important hearings are conducted--by a committee of City Council, the Planning Board, and even by the Ontario Municipal Board--create an illusion of serious and substantial public concern. This is not so apparent in a large Council Chamber, where hundreds of seats are filled and perhaps another hundred or more are vacant. In the latter situation there are far more participants, but the overall impact of the process does not appear to be as clear and as substantial.

Whatever the validity of a quantitative appraisal of participation, as measured by numbers of persons who belong to an organization or who attend a particular meeting or hearing, there is no question that some observers have drawn quite improper conclusions. For example, the question, "Whom do you represent?", has been raised on many occasions by elected representatives, by members of a planning board, and by members of other public administrative commissions. The implication is that the particular delegation cannot possibly be taken seriously because it may be insufficient in numerical strength to represent widespread support within the particular neighbourhood.

This judgement may very well be true, but it may equally be untrue. It is conceivable that the executive committee of a citizens' organization has a clear mandate or an understood responsibility to present the case for the neighbourhood before elected or appointed officials. It may, however, be a correct judgement for such officials to assume that the presentation is being made by a small group which has appropriated power unto itself and which, for a number of
reasons, may derive great satisfaction and additional prestige in the whole neighbourhood from newspaper publicity, particularly if the presentation is considered tough, harsh, and perhaps approaching a confrontation.

In any event there is no question that, if quantitative considerations are important in a judgement concerning the degree and effectiveness of citizen participation in urban renewal, the research group of 1968-69 did not find such participation important or impressive. In Don Vale, for example, a substantial proportion of the respondents not only were not members of the Residents' Association but had never heard of it. It was the research team that communicated information to both homeowners and tenants that there was an organized group, or several citizens' organizations active in the neighbourhood with respect to the proposals of both city planners and City Council itself. If the assessment of citizen participation in several neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto at the close of the 1960s and into the early 1970s were to be based on quantitative considerations alone, the overall judgement would have to be negative.

The Quality of Citizen Participation

Unfortunately the participant observer, the appointed or elected official, and the researcher drawn from the social sciences or other disciplines does not fare any better with respect to qualitative considerations. The quality of citizen participation can scarcely be measured; it is very difficult to conceive the collection of data other than through the process of semi-structured research interviewing which would shed important light on the matter of the quality of participation.

The very term "quality" raises a good many difficulties. For some members of the previously listed groups citizen participation must be "responsible", by which is presumably meant a quality of interaction between neighbourhood residents
and officials that falls within an understood set of rules, and a form of debate or dialogue that takes place on what might be called "a gentlemanly level". In short, the "rules of the game" must be observed in the interaction between citizens and their public servants and elected representatives.

If this form of appraisal is to be taken seriously, those who began to organize in residential neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto in the 1960s behaved abominably by comparison with the experience during the first 15 years of the post-war period. The Buildings and Development Committee of the City was accustomed to delegations, sometimes on behalf of potential developers and sometimes on behalf of local ratepayers who felt that they were threatened by the proposed development. These deputations were held not without argument, but in the sort of debate that goes on before a Court of Appeal and not in a manner that would impel a justice to invoke the rules of contempt. The same can be said with respect to the rarer appearances of delegations before the Planning Board which, although its meetings were theoretically "open", was seldom approached by individuals or groups until the mid-1960s.

About 1962-63 the climate of these dialogues seemed to change drastically and at the very time that the question of the persistence of poverty in an affluent society came to the fore in the United States and Canada. More particularly, from the point of view of this report the change in style came when it appeared that the programme of urban renewal, which had languished in Canada during the 1950s and into the early 1960s, appeared to be slated for a strong revival with the presentation of amendments to the NHA. It has already been pointed out that the phrase "urban renewal" first appeared in the NHA in the 1964 Amendments, which were introduced into the House as early as 1963.

In brief, appearances before several City Council committees and particularly before the Board of Control became more heated. There were more arguments, and in harsh
abusive language. Elected officials expressed shock and disappointment at the way in which their position seemed to be demeaned by the behaviour of their constituents. The quality of citizen participation—if measured in terms of loudness, rudeness, boisterous behaviour, marches to City Hall, and the occasional demonstration and disruption—was in the form of behaviour for which both the appointed professionals and the elected representatives were unprepared. This was a new game in which they were participating; and they did not know how to play it because there was no rule book. The old rules were gone and no one had written new rules for the new game, which some obviously thought was still "the old game".

There is a much more important way of examining the quality of participation and it is rooted in the assumption that participation is of personal value to the individual who participates. The observations of social scientists have been noted several times in this report and will not be repeated. However, there was a most important question in the research interviews: "What does a citizen gain when he participates in urban renewal?" When the respondent was a citizen leader the question was expanded somewhat and ended as follows: "What do you gain?" In the responses lies some modest verification or negation of the argument that those who participate are better for it; those who do not participate are worse for the lack of it and constitute a large proportion of those described as "alienated" within our urban society. The following are some specific responses:

He learns a lot about politics, and gets more interested in people running for political office. He learns more about economics. It's like getting an education—although it does not make you blissfully happy. You get to know your neighbours better. (Official, Trefann Court Residents' Association)

He tries to maintain his rights. Every person has rights, even if it is in his own mind, and this cannot be easily counteracted on a piece of paper. (Official, Don Mount Citizens' Association)
If there is hope for "gain" then there is no participation. What he gains is what he is struggling for. Gains for "activist types" may be different from that of the average resident in terms of satisfaction. (Member, Don Vale Residents' Association)

He gains a sense of belonging, a sense of importance and a sense of responsibility in the development of his environment. It makes for a more mature citizen. This is particularly true for newcomers from Portugal who have had no experience of this kind. (Executive member, Kensington Area Residents' Association)

Probably a nervous breakdown--there is a lot of tension and pressure. Even after participating, I know nothing more about when I'll be moving; where we'll go. My husband is really upset about it. I guess I have gained a sense of doing something about our plight--but sometimes I wonder about just what I have done. (Executive member, Trefann Court Tenants' Association)

I gained financially nothing. Takes a lot of time, gives me grey hairs, and abuse. I am considered a trouble maker. But I have gained knowledge concerning community and civic functions. (Executive member, Kensington Area Residents' Association)

A great deal--I wish I could tell you everything. I myself have witnessed a real growth in people, an understanding of their value as human beings and a sense of responsibility as they realize that they can influence events. They feel ten feet tall when they have met the establishment and their cause has prevailed. (Member, Executive Committee, Kensington Area Residents' Association)

As far as me, I've never gained anything, and I don't want to. I've only gotten information about what can be done to a person. Three years ago I began going to Don Mount meetings to get my answers, in case something happened here. (Member, Don Mount Residents' Association)

They get very little response from the City in respect to having their needs met. They get some sense of satisfaction out of working for something especially if one is successful. Sometimes in some areas there is satisfaction out of developing a neighbourhood unity. (Former official, Alexandra Park Residents' Association)
Ulcers mostly—a few have had heart attacks. I feel that it is so frustrating trying to even find out what the plans are that it is hard to find anything positive. It is so bad I am "soured" on Toronto, and when expropriated will move to a small town away from this place. (Executive member, Don Vale Residents' Association)

They feel that they gain their rights, for example, a decent home at reasonable prices or rents. They gain a sense of respect, people are known as individuals, not just as a "pack of animals". Sometimes personal sacrifices are not rewarded but the feeling is that somebody has to do it. (Former official, Housing and Residents' Committee, St. James Town)

If one is to accept the views of the citizen leaders in this research (and there is no reason to doubt their veracity) it would appear that participation meant a great deal to them and to their colleagues. However, not all the "gains" made by citizen participants are positive in their nature. Some of the above responses were bitterly expressed, as the interviewers noted in their personal comments. Moreover, there is a further question which is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. If it is true, as several citizen leaders expressed, that there is a feeling of achievement gained by participants, that there is a personal feeling of satisfaction to be derived from participation, that some persons do indeed feel "ten feet tall", the question might well be asked, "How many among the citizens in urban renewal neighbourhoods do get an opportunity to make these gains?"

This may not be the nub of the matter, but when one considers the reality of citizen participation the question cannot be begged.

If the entire exercise, involving tremendous effort on the part of a citizens' organization and requiring equally great effort on the part of appointed and elected officials at substantial expense to the general taxpayer, is restricted to very few persons, what is its justification? In this form of analysis it can be argued that citizen participation is a form of social therapy available to a privileged few
and not to the mass of neighbours in improvement areas. As in other forms of therapy, the individual very often chooses to present his problem for examination by a therapist and thus those who come forward for help may receive a benefit, may derive a gain; but those who do not come forward with their problems to members of the helping professions cannot derive the available benefits through the various methods of treatment. In this case, however, there are no therapists as such, but there is a process of debates, dialogues, controversy and, perhaps, conflict in which a few participate intensively, a larger number occasionally, and the largest group of all among neighbourhood residents participate not at all. This is indeed a very serious commentary on the process of citizen participation and yet it is difficult to know how far this argument should be carried.

In the trades union movement there was a monumental decision handed down by Mr. Justice Ivan Rand some years ago, in which this learned arbitrator insisted that the union existed and worked for the benefit of all employees and it was fair and just that union dues be deducted from the wages of all, whether or not they were members of the union. It is possible to generalize from this approach by arguing that the residents' associations were working on behalf of the entire neighbourhood and that, whatever benefits they derived as individuals, the successes of the total enterprise were shared among all. It would be arguable that this judicial view could be generalized, but this author has very little faith in the applicability of the "Rand formula" to the matter of citizen participation. And yet the analyst must make a whole series of mental concessions unless he is to condemn the entire process as a selfish exercise on behalf of a few who are described earlier in this report as "fighters", "persons who know their rights" and, from time to time, as "selfish homeowners".
It is interesting, therefore, to examine the response of the decision-makers to the question, "What does a citizen gain when he participates in urban renewal?" The following are some of the responses:

If the urban renewal project is a good one, he gains a better city and the other improvements which follow as a result, for example, elimination of delinquency, better schools and education for his children, better housing and so on. (Member, Buildings and Development Committee, City of Toronto)

Primarily he is likely to gain a more thorough consideration of his particular position and therefore personally more satisfactory results. Once the initial purpose is served, the main goal is likely to be lost, and then he focuses on something else. (Senior official City of Toronto Planning Board)

A lot of people enjoy the publicity. A lot of others are very sincere and just want what is coming to them. Homeowners are usually very sincere in their intent. (Member, City of Toronto Board of Control)

It could be anything. Likely to get some feeling of importance. Often he gets more money or saves his home. He may get rid of neighbours that he didn't like anyway. (Planning Official, Province of Ontario)

He gains knowledge, a sense of worth as a human being, greater understanding of economic, political, social manifestations of living, that make him a better citizen. (Member, Committee on Buildings and Development, City of Toronto)

Influence (at least some degree) our proposals--to be more advantageous to him. Secondly, he gets a sense of being involved. He may not be conscious of this but it gives him an enhanced self-esteem and allows him growth as an individual. (Planning Official, Province of Ontario)

Very little. If expropriated, the citizen gains nothing except perhaps an exercise in futility. He gains if he stays and his dwelling is rehabilitated. There is little gain per se. The reason for this is that self-interest is the citizen's basic motivation and if this is met he gains. If not, he does not gain. (Member, Committee on Buildings and Development, City of Toronto)
While it is different in different areas, the citizen (whether he stays in the area or leaves) must gain improved housing conditions, or else urban renewal is a failure. He must gain improved conditions of parks, street layouts, roads, and "city housekeeping" services. As parks are enlarged, sewers improved, etc., his horizons should enlarge and he should become able to be concerned about duty in a new way. Urban renewal should even improve his personal standard of housekeeping, since he will have an incentive for taking care of his home. (Member, City of Toronto Board of Control)

He gains an education. He gains complete knowledge of what is going to take place in the future of his neighbourhood. He learns how to deal with City Hall red tape. He may be able to make a better deal for compensation for his own house. He becomes able to present his own argument and those of his neighbours better than any outsider could. (Member, Committee on Housing, Fire and Legislation, City of Toronto)

He doesn't gain that much personally, but the wider community gains some understanding of the problem. Here in my office I can work in a vacuum. We should therefore encourage participation, not in a technical sense, but on the human level. Every planner should be a sociologist. Our firm doesn't do a study without some consultation with a sociologist of some kind. (An architect, prominent in urban affairs)

Some gain prominence and enjoy how wonderfully important they can be. (An urban planner engaged in private practice)

A helluva thrill for bringing down the high and mighty politicians and planners. They get satisfaction out of fighting for their rights. (A development manager for a private building firm)

This recital of responses illustrates every range of opinion, from enthusiastic acceptance of the benefits to the individual and to the community through participation to great scepticism and even derision. They are probably the most accurate reflection of the diversity of public opinion in the City of Toronto during the late 1960s and early 1970s on this entire matter of neighbourhood influence in decision making.
Some planners and some politicians were angry and upset by the disruptive and difficult tactics employed by citizens' organizations in the years 1966-1969; others took a more realistic view of the situation and, in effect, were extending the role of politician to the citizen participant. They saw themselves in similar roles some years before when they were arguing various positions within their constituencies, partly to gain attention, partly to present a viewpoint opposing that of sitting representatives, and all in the hope that they would gain an opportunity to stand for public office themselves. It was not that they felt that citizen leaders were necessarily incipient politicians--although some of them were and have become elected representatives--but they sympathized with the process because it was not strange as far as they were concerned. It was not a fact, however, that the appointed officials of city government were harder hit by the process. Some planners were able to take the pressure in their stride; some became very bitter and left public service. Some politicians were able to understand the situation and "roll with the punches"; others could not accept this new socio-political phenomenon which began to gain increasing strength by the end of the decade, and they too have for the most part retired from elected office or were defeated in the elections of 1969 and 1972.

Conclusion

The first phase of the research project was strongly conclusive in demonstrating the validity of the "failure-of-communication" hypothesis. The massive series of responses incorporated in this research report were designed to bring out the flavour of the reality experienced by trained researchers examining a new phenomenon in the history of development within a major urban centre in Canada. The City of Toronto went through a series of almost cataclysmic experiences by comparison with its previous quarter-century.
It was the core city of one of the most rapidly expanding metropolitan areas in the world.

It would be fantasy to insist that the residents of older downtown neighbourhoods conceived more than a decade ago how convenient, how potentially desirable, and how significant their residential areas were and would become as the older commercial facilities in the urban core were replaced by some of the tallest skyscrapers in North America. The neighbourhoods under study have, by the mid-1970s, lost almost every suggestion that they are blighted slum areas; they are being described in glowing terms of real estate advertisements as "town house areas" or "rehabilitation areas", and are desirably located with respect to the commercial and cultural facilities in the heart of a metropolis of two-and-a-half million persons. Houses are being purchased by middle- and upper middle-class members of professional groups, they are being reconstructed and rehabilitated, and are offered on the market for prices that would have purchased an entire street in many of these neighbourhoods not more than a dozen years ago.

The relation of the current situation to citizen participation is even more difficult to fathom. Nevertheless, it can be argued that participation was a fact for a few well organized, well managed and determined residents of half-a-dozen or more neighbourhoods. It was fiction for the great mass of people who lived in these neighbourhoods and many of these persons were quite unaware of the dangers facing them in continued residence, particularly if they were tenants. There have been many suggestions during the past two years that the whole process of participation was a vehicle whereby certain aspirants to public office achieved success. The election of December 1972 is a particular landmark in the history of Toronto because it appeared to place in power a majority of persons who were devoted to what was called "civic reform". Their main slogan was the preservation of neighbourhoods, and the real question that
has arisen during the past fifteen months is essentially, "preservation of neighbourhoods, for whom?"

A substantial proportion of those who lived in the six neighbourhoods which constituted the basis for research in 1967-68 have gone. Tenants have been forced out, homeowners have been bought out; but the neighbourhoods persist, although many streets and many portions of other streets present a different visual appearance than was evident some six or seven years ago. It is this, perhaps, that constitutes the possibility of fraud, because behind the change in visual appearance is not the citizen participant enjoying his improved neighbourhood. All the potential gains of urban renewal—improved civic housekeeping, rational street patterns, additional social and recreational facilities, housing rehabilitation, more adequate urban planning—were promised and may even have been delivered, but they were not delivered to those who apparently fought for them against very severe opposition a few years ago.

The studies here have indicated that organized citizen participation can facilitate urban renewal, resist it and even bring it to a halt. Citizen involvement is no panacea and no unmixed blessing. Different people inevitably have different goals, and the interest of a few at the neighbourhood level may defeat the interests of many at the larger city level. Attempts to produce the public housing desperately needed by many have run into the protests of small numbers of well organized, well housed people, and have ended in stalemate. Citizen participation benefits some and penalizes others, especially when homes and private property interests are at stake.

However, residents' associations may have some potential for social rehabilitation as a means of social animation. Some persons believe fervently that it has such potential but there has not been sufficient research in this area to be objectively convincing. There is much room for doubt
whether more than a minority of residents can ever become involved in formal voluntary association, and whether the self-selected few really do represent the interest of the many. Residents' associations are not yet a clear and easy way to participatory democracy. This is said by way of caution to distinguish what has been proven from what is hoped for.

There is one further source of disillusionment which has seriously affected the activities of the residents' associations and the views of many influential persons concerning the whole concept of citizen participation and its implementation. The election of 1972 appeared at first to be the fulfilment of the aspirations of many spokesmen for citizen groups who placed great stress upon citizen participation. In the first flush of victory members of the so-called "reform group" on Council (which apparently held a majority of the seats) stated publicly that they would consult citizens' groups, ratepayers' associations, and residents' groups within their constituencies before taking a decision by formal vote on Council motions and by-laws.

It was not long before the newspapers and political analysts pointed out that there was a fundamental conflict in these expressions of the responsibilities of an elected representative. On the one hand, the media pointed repeatedly to Edmund Burke's statement in 1790: that, once elected, the representative of the people owes to them only his judgement. On the other hand, the "reformers" in Council were indicating that they expected to be instructed by their constituents on every issue and that they would attempt to ascertain a collective will or judgement on the part of the citizens.

Although this may have been their intention, many councillors found that it was impossible to serve on City Council and to carry on their appropriate activities while
attempting at the same time to attend weekly, monthly, or even nightly meetings in their constituencies to ascertain the views of the people whom they represented. Moreover, when they did attend such "mini town meetings" they learned that there was not only one collective viewpoint on most issues. They found themselves having to accept the Burke-ian stipulation that the elected representative must exercise his own judgement. The result was a substantial degree of disillusionment for citizen leaders and members of neighbourhood associations.

A second form of disillusionment which recently affected influential and sympathetic persons residing outside such neighbourhoods as those under examination in this research project came when the new City Council in 1973 began to consider appointments of so-called "public representatives" to a variety of administrative boards and commissions; these included the City Planning Board, the City Parking Authority, the Canadian National Exhibition, and other similar organizations. In very rare cases were leaders or members of citizens' organizations in urban renewal areas offered an opportunity to sit on these administrative bodies. Rather, two simultaneous events occurred.

In the first place, the majority of the new Council was strongly of the view that the voluntary character of membership by "public-spirited citizens" was inappropriate, and they introduced the payment of honoraria to members of the City Planning Board and other bodies where such payments had not previously existed. Simultaneously, members of Council called for broad community nominations for these posts and at first held long hearings at which all aspirants to office were interviewed. The result was usually the appointment of persons of upper middle-class status or members of professional groups, as well as persons who had worked very hard as campaign managers or organizers for "reform" councillors in the recent election. These persons, however, were not necessarily residents of neighbourhoods.
affected by intergovernmental renewal proposals of the 1960s, nor were they leaders of citizens' organizations other than in the more affluent areas of the community. In short, Council apparently stood for the removal from a variety of boards and commissions of one group of upper middle-class members and their substitution by another group of non-representative citizens who were their friends rather than their apparent enemies.

As this report reaches its conclusion in the early part of 1974 the process of citizen participation appears to have moved full circle. In its second year of a two-year term the Toronto City Council is re-examining the role of citizen representatives on all boards and commissions and is questioning very seriously, particularly in the case of the City of Toronto Planning Board, their presence at all. It is now being argued that significant developmental functions should not receive a citizen input through representative appointments drawn from the public, but that these functions should be carried by staff and much more closely supervised by the elected representatives. It would appear that the Planning Board will become a department of the civic administration.*

It is not, however, a question of legislative change but the entire approach to participation that has been questioned. Under these circumstances it may easily be understood why groups of citizens in a variety of neighbourhoods, members of residents' associations, and ratepayers' groups are thoroughly confused. Tragically, such confusion

* In 1972 the government of Ontario amended The Planning Act to permit municipalities to appoint the majority of members of Planning Boards from among elected representatives.
is rampant at a time when the Province of Ontario has concluded a master agreement with the government of Canada to implement the new Neighbourhood Improvement Programme formulated as an Amendment to the National Housing Act in 1973.
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Category of Respondent:  A  owner       tenant
                         B
                         C
                         D

Respondent's Name

Respondent's Position or Title
1. What does urban renewal mean to you?

2(a) What would you say are the goals of urban renewal?

(b) Please rank in order of importance the goals listed on this card and any others you would add:

(CARD #1)
- [ ] increasing the supply of low cost housing
- [ ] revitalizing the central business district
- [ ] creating a planned city
- [ ] clearing slums
- [ ] building a better neighbourhood
- [ ] improving quality of life
- [ ] other (specify)
3(a) (For local leaders and advisors)

Do you feel that those responsible for preparing and for approving urban renewal schemes have the same primary goals as you have?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

(b) (For decision-makers and opinion influencers)

Do you feel that those who live in urban renewal areas perceive the primary goal of urban renewal schemes as you do?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

4(a) How extensive are Toronto's needs for urban renewal?

(b) How do Toronto's needs compare with those of other cities (probe for specific comparisons)?
5. Have your views of urban renewal changed over the past three years (specify nature and direction of changes re goals and Toronto's needs)?

B NATURE OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

6(a) What are the basic concerns of citizens and citizen groups who involve themselves in urban renewal?

(b) Please rank in order of importance the citizen concerns listed on this card, and any others you care to add (use both sets of boxes only when tenants are distinguished from owners):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social-recreational</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Some citizens become more involved than others. What makes them more interested?

8. What sort of person participates in residents' or neighbourhood associations? (Prompt to deal with such factors as the following)

   - sex
   - age group
   - social group
   - size of family
   - origin: New Canadian or native
   - occupational status

9. What kinds of people take leadership positions?
10(a) What are the more important reasons for differences in citizen participation from area to area?

(b) Please rank in order of importance the reasons for more citizen participation listed on this card, and any others you would care to add:

(CARD #3)

☐ neighbourhood residents' unrest
☐ outside organizers
☐ news and other media
☐ administrative policies and practices
☐ concern for the wider community
☐ home ownership
☐ other (specify)

Comments:
11(a) What is the appropriate role for citizens in urban renewal areas?

(b) What role is there for citizens in the following tasks?
   (i) designating target areas
   (ii) helping to formulate plans
   (iii) reacting to proposals
   (iv) helping to implement plans
(c) If citizens were involved in the above processes, would there be more or less citizen resistance?

☐ more ☐ less

Comments:

12. What value, if any, is there in having a layman or group of laymen with no expert knowledge criticize the proposals of professionally trained planners?

13. If citizens do participate, should every citizen of the city have a voice or only those directly affected by the proposal? Why?

14. How fully do residents' or neighbourhood associations reflect opinions of the areas they represent? Do they represent all segments?

15. Citizens in urban renewal areas can use various channels to influence decisions. Which channels have you found most likely (or least likely) to influence decisions, e.g., newspaper stories, television, public meetings, lobbying through elected representatives, voting, protest marches, etc? (If respondent is decision-maker, ask "What influenced j
16. What does a citizen gain when he participates in urban renewal? (If respondent is citizen, ask "What do you gain?")

C PROCESS

NOTE: Suggest that the respondent think of a particular urban renewal area of his choice among the six areas listed. Check the choice which applies to all the questions in this section (C).

- Kensington
- Don Vale
- Trefann Court
- Don Mount
- Alexandra Park
- St. James Town

17. Indicate when and how the respondent became associated with the chosen area.

18. What was the process by which the local residents were informed about the urban renewal plan?

19. Why was this area chosen for urban renewal?
20(a) What was the initial reaction of local residents to proposals for the area? (Interviewer classify response)

Comments:

- □ positive
- □ negative
- □ group
- □ individualistic
- □ high intensity feeling
- □ low intensity feeling

(b) What were the reasons behind the residents' initial reactions?

21. Did a residents' organization begin to take shape at this time? When did the residents first respond as a group? (Trace the steps by which groups were formed and their early development.)
22(a) At what point did the residents become aware of the full implication of urban renewal for them?

(b) When did urban renewal become a definite reality to the residents?

23. Who did most of the work in organizing the local group of residents? (E.g., local residents, community workers, other persons or professionals)

24. What was the main activity carried out by the local residents through their groups?

25. Did outsiders help the local residents in their group activity? (Specify who they were and what they did)

26. Who were most active in keeping the residents' groups going after they had been organized?

27(a) How should a residents' group select its officers and representatives? Indicate your order of preference among the following:

☐ Is it best to call a meeting where everyone discusses things until they are all agreed, so that when a vote is taken most people agree on the same person?

☐ Is it best that professionals and community workers take the main responsibility for selecting, since they have training and experience in such matters?

☐ Is it best that a meeting be called where names are put up and those are elected who get a simple majority of votes, even if there are many people who are still against them?

(b) What actually happened in the case of the organization in this area? (Clarify regarding nominations and elections)
28. Last October the Hon. Alan Grossman, speaking in the Kensington Market area, said that no urban renewal plan at the present or in the future should be carried out unless a local citizens' committee participate from the beginning.

(a) How do you feel about such a statement?

(b) If this statement were to be followed exactly, do you think that urban renewal plans could be accomplished and in what manner?

29. Rehabilitation of housing means the physical improvement of existing structures. It has been said that housing rehabilitation is the key to most future urban renewal activity. What is your opinion?

30 To what extent do the following affect a homeowner's motivation to make improvements to his house? (Interviewer to rate response: mark negative - and positive +)

(i) the labelling of the homeowner's neighbourhood as an urban renewal area

(ii) the availability of home improvement loans

Comments:
31. When a homeowner allows his house to fall into disrepair, what action if any, should be taken and by whom?

32. From where should initiative come for a rehabilitation programme?

33. Should private developers be permitted to demolish buildings in a basically sound area where rehabilitation would be possible?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

NOTE: The interviewer is to read or interpret the following statement as a prelude to the next two questions.

In Dr. Rose's study of the Rehabilitation of Housing in Central Toronto, for the City of Toronto Planning Board, it was discovered that in "pockets of poor housing" the median age of homeowners was 55.7 years (Toronto's is 32.3) and their median annual family income was less than $3,600 (Toronto's median was $4,900).

34. The study also shows that the home improvement loans, which are available, are not being used by homeowners. Why?

35. The study recommended that home improvement grants be made available.
   (a) What do you think of this recommendation?

   (b) What other suggestions do you have for financing home improvements?
36. It has been said that residents may have a strong sense that an area belongs to them and many feel a sense of loss, and grief, even as long as two years after moving. How much weight would you give this argument in choosing between slum clearance and rehabilitation?

37(a) Which set of interests do you think should prevail when those of a neighbourhood clash with the interest of the City as a whole?

(b) Should the homeowners in neighbourhoods have the right to stand in the way of big private developers?

 Comments:  

 Yes  No

(c) Do you see a difference in the rights of homeowners to resist City plans and the plans of private developers?

38. It has been said that "urban renewal still does not mean the renewal of and area by and for the people who live there". What do you think?
Notes to the Interviewer:

Record general and unsolicited comments by the respondent.
Indicate appropriateness of rapport and frankness.
Rate reliability of the responses, comprehension, conviction, fatigue.
Indicate extent of probing and techniques used.
Describe respondent's attitude and the nature of his involvement in the interview.
Describe the situation and place of the interview in general and, in particular, any intrusions or diverting influences.
Note length of interview.
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I INSTRUMENTAL-EXPRESSIVE

A. 1. Do you belong to a residents'/owners'/ association in this neighbourhood?

   YES______NO______

2. i. (Don Vale Residents' Association______)
   ii. (Don Vale Property Owners' Association______)
   iii. (Niagara Residents' Association______)

3. How many meetings have you attended in the last year____(approx.)

4. Have you thought about joining (if answer in A.1 is "NO")?

B. 1. Long-Range vs. Short-Range Satisfaction

   (If answer to "A" is "NO" then skip section "B")

   Which of the following statements best represents a reason for your belonging to the association?

   i. Because of the satisfaction I receive from taking part in something now, regardless of how it turns out _______

   ii. Mainly because of the satisfaction it gives me now, but also because of what I will get out of it in the long run_______

   iii. Because of the satisfaction it gives me now, as well as in the long run _______

   iv. Mainly because of the satisfaction I expect to get out of it in the end, since I don't get much out of it now_______

   v. Because of the satisfaction I expect to get out of it in the long run since I don't get anything out of it now_______
2. **In-group - Out-group Focus**

What, in your estimation, is the most correct statement about the purpose of the organization to which you belong?

i. To help its own membership

ii. Mainly to help its own members, but also to make Toronto a better place to live

iii. To help its own members, as well as to make Toronto a better place to live

iv. Mainly to make Toronto a better place to live, and help its own members

v. To make Toronto a better place to live

3. **Means - Ends**

Which statement would best describe a reason for your belonging to the association?

i. Because of the meetings and some of the things we are doing now

ii. Mostly because of the meetings and some of the things we are doing now, but also because of what we hope to accomplish in the end

iii. Because of the meetings and some of the things we are doing now, and because of the things we hope to accomplish in the end

iv. Mostly because of the things we hope to accomplish in the end, but also because of the meetings and some of the things we are doing now

v. Because of some of the things we hope to accomplish in the end
II COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT

A. Community Sentiment

1. How long have you lived in (Don Vale) (Niagara)?

2. Have you always lived in this residence? Where else?

3. Would you like to stay in (Don Vale) (Niagara)?

4. Have you ever seriously thought about leaving (Don Vale) (Niagara)?

5. What do you think in general about this neighbourhood? Discuss.

B. Organizational Residue

1. To what other organizations, or clubs, have you belonged in the past five years?

2. How often do (did) you attend and what positions have you held in these organizations?

III RECRUITMENT TO CITIZEN GROUPS

1. How did you hear about the organization(s) to which you belong?

2. What interested you enough to join? (Probe background, events lead up to joining.)
IV LEADERSHIP

1. Who (would you say) are the leaders on which this neighbourhood de; (would most people say)

2. To which person would you go
   if you needed a job __________________________
   for family trouble __________________________
   about someone being evicted___________________
   if you thought your taxes were too high____________
   if you got a notice of expropriation__________________

V LIFE CYCLE

1. Do you live on your own, or is there someone living with you? Who?

2. Do you have children living at home? YES_______ NO________
   If so, how many?__________
   Children's ages______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______

3. Marital status:
   Single_______
   Married_______
   Widowed_______
   Separated_______

4. Age
   Husband  Wife
   18-24 ________    ________
   25-29 ________    ________
   30-39 ________    ________
   40-49 ________    ________
   50-64 ________    ________
   over 65 ________    ________
5. Are you employed?__  Where?__________________________
   yes/no                                             (place and address)

   If "YES", what kind of work do you do?

6. How far did you go in school?  ________________________
   (grade or years)

VI  FAMILY INTERACTION

A. Immediate Family

1. How often do you spend evenings at home with your immediate family
   when no outsiders are present?
   i. 6 or 7 evenings a week____
   ii. 3 to 5 evenings a week____
   iii. 2 or fewer evenings a week____

2. How much of the average day during the work week do you spend with
   some member of your immediate family?
   i. one-half a day or more____
   ii. one-fourth to one-half day____
   iii. less than one-fourth, never, no family____

3. How often do you engage in activities, besides work away from home,
   when no member of the immediate family is present?
   i. less than once a month, never____
   ii. once a month, but not once a week____
   iii. at least once a week____

4. To what degree do you and your family participate in the following
   activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Extended Family

1. How often do you see your parents? Children?
   i. never, or parents not living
   ii. several times a year or less
   iii. several times a year or more

2. How often do you see most of your brothers and sisters?
   i. never, or no brothers and sisters
   ii. once a year or less
   iii. several times a year or more

3. How often do all or most of the relatives get together?
   i. never, or no relatives
   ii. once a year or less
   iii. several times a year or more

4. How often do you borrow things from, or lend things to relatives?
   i. never, less than once a year, no relatives
   ii. once a year or more
   iii. several times a year
VII NEIGHBOURING

1. (male or female) Are there any neighbours with whom you spend some time regularly?
   i. quite a few ________
   ii. very few__________
   iii. none ____________

2. (male or female) Do you discuss behaviour limits for your children with the other parents of the neighbourhood?
   i. Yes________
   ii. No ______

3. (female) Do you and any of the other women help one another with meals and housework?
   i. Yes_______
   ii. No ______

   by picking up things at the store?
   i. Yes_______
   ii. No ______

   by caring for each other's children?
   i. Yes_______
   ii. No ______

   by helping out when the other is sick?
   i. Yes_______
   ii. No ______

4. Do you and any other women get together for recreational activities?
   i. Yes_______
   ii. No ______

5. Are there any neighbours whom you address by the first name?
   i. quite a few__________
   ii. very few___________
   iii. none______________

6. Are there any children in the neighbourhood with whom your children play?
   i. quite a few__________
   ii. very few___________
   iii. none______________
7. (males) Do you help other men in the neighbourhood? (Probe: direct-indirect help.)
   i. Yes____
   ii. No____

8. (males) Do you take part in any type of social activity with men in neighbourhood?
   i. often____
   ii. sometimes_____  
   iii. never________
VIII RELATIONAL ORIENTATION

Two situations will now be read to you. We are interested in learning what individuals think about each of these situations. There are no right or wrong answers; it is your own opinion that is being sought. Following each situation there are two or three situations that might be dealt with.

A. Help in Misfortune

1. A man lost his job or, let us say, had lost most of his money. He and his family had to have help from someone if they were to get through the winter. There are different ways of getting help. Which of these three ways would be best?
   i. Would it be best if he depended on his brothers or sisters or other relatives to help him out as much as each one could?
   ii. Would it be best for him to try to raise money "on his own" from people who are neither relatives nor employers?
   iii. Would it be best for him to go to a boss or to an older important relative who is used to managing things in his group and ask him to help out?

(a) Which way of getting the help do you think would be best?
   (i).... (ii)...... (iii)......

(b) Which way of getting help is second best?
   (i).... (ii)..... (iii)......

(c) Which way do you think you yourself would really follow?
   (i)..... (ii).... (iii)......

(d) Which way do you think most other people in your circumstances would think best?
   (i).... (ii)..... (iii)......
B. **Business Inheritance**

1. Some sons and daughters have been left a business in the estate of father or mother who has died. All these sons and daughters are grown up and live near each other. There are three different ways they could run the business.

   i. In some groups of people it is usually expected that the oldest be the person (son or daughter) who will take charge of, or manage, all the estate.

   ii. In some groups of people it is usually expected that each of the sons and daughters will prefer to take his or her share of the estate and run his or her own share completely separate from all the others.

   iii. For some groups of people it is usually expected that all the sons and daughters will keep the estate together and work together and decide among themselves who is best able to take charge of things, not necessarily the eldest, when a boss is needed.

   (a) Which way do you think is usually best in most cases?

      (i).... (ii).... (iii)....

   (b) Which of the other two ways do you think is second best?

      (i).... (ii).... (iii)....

   (c) Which of all three ways do you think most other persons in your circumstances would think is best?

      (i).... (ii).... (iii)....
IX  POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

1. Did you vote in the last municipal election?  Yes____  No____

2. Are you a member of a political party?  Yes____  No____

3. Can you give the names of your aldermen?  1.____________________
   2.____________________
   Cannot__________

4. Have you ever written a letter to an alderman, member of Parliament, or member of the Legislature?  Yes____  No____

5. Have you ever met, and spoken to an alderman?  Yes____  No____
   During election campaign_______  other time__________

X  SENSE OF CONTROL

1. What are two or three things that you would like to see changed around here?

2. Who do you think should change these things?

3. Do you think there is anything you could do to change these things?
XI ADDITIONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

Owner ___________________________ Tenant ___________________________

Background: ______ urban ______ rural
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INTRODUCTION

The Fundamental Proposition

In reviewing the study aims I have been seeking out the main underlying concepts and the relationships between them. The material is so rich, so broad and so unstructured that another scholar could easily derive a quite different set of basic concepts. My selection is conditioned by a background in social work as a profession and sociology as a discipline. I have arrived at three basic concepts which relate to each other in an equation:

URBAN RENEWAL + CITIZEN PARTICIPATION = THE GOOD DEMOCRATIC LIFE

This reduces to a very simple form what many people appear to be saying in reporting their observations and prescriptions in this area. I do not apologize for the obvious normative involvements; they constitute legitimate and very important subjects of study.

In defining these basic concepts I will not dwell on extension; examples of urban renewal in Toronto have already been clearly identified, as have examples of citizen participation. It is citizen participation in the form of voluntary associations that is of interest, not isolated individual behaviour. The formal residents' associations are readily identified but informal association is much more difficult to discern. A decision will have to be made whether to consider informal association, but this can be done better later in relation to operational considerations.

Here Aristotelian definitions are more to the point. If we can identify urban renewal and citizen participation as species of a more general genus, then we can draw on broader areas of knowledge and science and our findings
will have wider applicability and validity. Urban renewal, then, is a species of the genus, social problem and citizen participation represents voluntary association. On the other hand we must make the assumption that there are more than one subspecies of each, of citizen participation and of urban renewal. The simplest case is that of two subspecies and this we shall use for the present in developing a conceptual framework. In developing the research operations we shall, of course, try to develop scales with even more than two values in order to get more sensitive measurements. Now, in exploring the basic concepts, we shall treat them as dichotomies with urban renewal as a social problem varying along one dimension and citizen participation assuming varying values along a different dimension. This can be presented in the figure of a two by two table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Participation</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This cross classification yields four logically possible types of "the good democratic life". Of course, some outcomes might very well not merit such a nice epithet as the "good life". However, our concern now is not with outcome but rather with measurements of citizen participation and urban renewal.
URBAN RENEWAL AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

The 1967-68 Master's research group found important differences between citizen leaders of residents' and neighbourhood groups on the one hand and decision-makers, planners and officials on the other. To establish a frame of reference for these important differences we move from the particular to the general. Urban renewal can be understood as one social problem among many.

The central criterion of a social problem is a discrepancy between standards and conditions. For urban renewal the standards are concerned with housing and the urban environment. This is the general standard as stated by an English writer:

The norm of "one-family house" is an important source of social motivation and of identity satisfaction for the sexually active male in the family. Most European societies accept this norm as a matter of social policy, and English law specifically lays on local authorities the duty of providing a house for every family that "needs" one. The concept of housing "needs" is defined by law, too, largely in terms of overcrowding, age, and structural condition of the existing shelter (Nogey, 1964, p. 52). Conditions do not measure up to this standard. The discrepancy has objective aspects which are the actual conditions of housing and the urban environment, and subjective aspects which involve perception and evaluation. The subjective aspects are of special interest to us because they account for important differences about what to do regarding a social problem.

The concept of social problem as used here is much the same as Seeley's concept of social need. Seeley's social need comprises the unmet needs of individuals and families which "have been socially determined and accepted through a process of collective or community judgement...which the community has acknowledged as a need and for which it has accepted some measure of collective responsibility" (1961, p. 2). However, following Merton's perspective on social problems we are including needs which people have as social groups, particularly in neighbourhoods and localities, along with the needs which people have as individuals.
Definition of the Problem

The way people define a problem is an important determinant of the action they take to meet the problem. Thus there are differences in the solutions proffered by citizen leaders and by decision-makers:

The same observable phenomena of social conditions may be viewed differently by those who feel the impact most directly, by those professions organized to deal with the impact of such social conditions on the individual, and by the "decision-makers" who have the responsibility of determining the allocation of resources for dealing with the social conditions (Cohen, 1964, p. 363).

A problem is not the same to all interested parties...Laymen typically define problems in ways dictated by their immediate interests as citizens...professions see problems in ways consistent with their theories and amenable to their techniques. Thus social work has traditionally seen the locus of most problems in the individual, in part because the techniques of casework developed over the years are suitable for work with individuals. Since they lack the techniques to deal with problems of social structure (such as segregation), social workers are unlikely to define social problems in ways that take account of the structural context of their clients' problem behavior...Social scientists (have a ) tendency to regard problems as the "natural" consequences of the operation of society, not amenable to rational plans for change...The problem will be redefined, so far as possible, by the personnel of the organization to conform with their more general opinion of the character of social problems (Becker, 1967, pp. 7-12).

Thus one's vested interests, one's position in the structure of social positions, is a key determinant of definitions of the problem. This subjective influence on problem definition can account for seeing problems which really are not there (e.g. witches, marihuana, physical aggression on the part of juvenile gangs has been grossly over-emphasized, Becker 1967, p. 24), and for ignoring problems which are there (rural poverty, police violence). Becker has a typology which uses subjective aspects as one dimension and objective as the other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instigating Behaviour</th>
<th>Obedient</th>
<th>Rule-breaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived as deviant</td>
<td>Falsely accused</td>
<td>Pure deviant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not perceived as deviant</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Secret deviant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Becker as cited by Merton 1967)
This typology is in terms of deviant behaviour, which is a more particular context than that of social problems. But the point is the same in the general context; some problems are overlooked while other problems are seen where there is no objective discrepancy between standards and conditions. However, urban renewal is clearly a problem based on objective discrepancies and it is no longer overlooked or taken for granted, although this might recur. This aspect, the change in problem definition through time, is taken up in a later section.

Social Disorganization or Deviant Behaviour

In choosing a definition of a social problem there is a basic choice between social disorganization or deviant behaviour. The choice of definition determines the kind of action to be taken. Sixty years ago Edward T. Devine, a social work pioneer, recognized that treatment of the poor depended on how poverty was defined. Poverty could be defined either as "personal depravity" or as "social maladjustment". Those who attributed poverty to personal depravity saw the poor as authors of their own misfortune. Need was explained by personal faults or shortcomings, improvidence, perversity and ignorance. Those who attributed poverty to social maladjustment took account of the barriers, misunderstandings and prejudices created by class, race, language and religion. It was this latter definition of the problem which characterized the Progressive era:

The truth is that industrial accidents and sickness and widowhood and orphanage and insufficient food and insanitary dwellings, are conditions which accompany dependence on charitable relief so frequently as to lead to the just suspicion that they are fundamental causes. The truth is that many families which are not now self-supporting except for irregularity of employment for which they are no more responsible than their children in the kindergarten, that others would be self-supporting if in growing youth they had been given an entirely different sort of education, education which in a few enlightened communities we are now trying to give their children, that others would be self-supporting if wages in industries which are undeniably profitable to their proprietors paid a living wage to employees, that others would be self-supporting if there had been some safe, widely known, and remunerative opportunity for investing their savings (Devine 1908, p. 142).
Later a related theme was embodied in the residual versus institutional debate. Current statements place the distinction within the framework of systems theory:

Theories may run the gamut from a concept of the problem as residing in the individual to an emphasis on the cause as residing in the society. Projected solutions, therefore, vary in terms of their focus on changing and reforming the individual, or the society, or on letting nature take its own course (Cohen 1964, p. 364).

Other writers consequently speak of "levels of intervention" (Specht and Riesman 1963).

Urban Renewal as a Problem of Social Disorganization

Discrepancies between standards and conditions arise through rising standards or deteriorating conditions. An objective discrepancy is a latent problem until recognition makes it manifest. Recognition embraces an action orientation:

Unwanted discrepancies between social standards and social reality qualify as manifest social problems only when people believe that they can do something about them...The social problems most completely manifest encompass those frustrations of human purpose on the large scale that are being subjected to active efforts at prevention and control...The active dissatisfied society will have the more manifest problems...the difference between fatalism and social problems (Merton 1967, p. 796).

Definition of urban renewal as a problem of social disorganization implies commitment to social reform rather than to individual therapy. The therapeutic orientation is discussed in the following section on deviant behaviour. Social disorganization draws attention to inadequacies in meeting one or more of the functional requirements or imperatives of the social system:

The type of problem involved in disorganization arises not from people failing to live up to the requirements of their social statuses, as is the case with deviant behaviour, but from the faulty organization of these statuses into a reasonably coherent system (Merton 1967, p. 504).

Examples of problems defined by general consensus as problems of social disorganization are replacing slum housing by public housing, manpower effort to rescue talent, and the city planning movement to control urban sprawl and traffic. Kahn, in a lucid discussion of prevention, associates "developmental provision" with the institutional view of social welfare. He clears developm
provision of any association with prevention or pathology, terms which invoke the concepts of deviant behaviour and residual programmes. Examples which Kahn gives of developmental provision are retraining, day care, family life education, homemaker services, urban renewal and children's allowances (1962).

Coleman's treatment of "community disorganization" includes the problem of urban renewal. His main idea is locality specialization which is linked with specialization of labour, segmentation of roles and the growth of formal organizations, i.e. the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft theme:

As he became an individual, his common activities and common interests were spread over a more and more diverse range of groups: those persons with whom he shared one activity were not the same ones with whom he shared another. Thus, the processes that tend to make a community out of a geographic locality are interrupted and diverted...In these ways at least the urban housing project and the suburban development are alike. They have become segmented, specialized parts of the adults' lives, devoid of many of the institutions that could make them complete communities. Though these dormitories may be in part the consequences of ill-conceived planning by developers, they represent also an advanced stage in the organizational structure of society—a movement away from total institutions in which a person is embedded, toward voluntary, specialized, segmental associations (Coleman 1966, pp. 696 & 70).

The social group based on locality has lost functions, such as education of the young, to larger more formal and specialized organizations, such as the Metropolitan School Board. The decline of community organization has given freedom but not without costs. There have been consequences for the stabilization of adult personalities and for the socialization of the young:

This historical trend toward free choice of community and toward locality specialization...bring freedom and a greater measure of democracy than could otherwise exist. The other side of this coin, however, is not so bright. Freedom and mobility cut away the bonds of mutual identification and solidarity before they can fully develop. The psychological sustenance provided by such bonds is withdrawn. The result is social isolation and anomie, with their attendant discomforts and debilitating effects...One special set of problems created by this historical trend toward community specialization has to be with children. Though suburban residential communities are only living-places for parents, they are total communities for their children. Thus there is a proliferation of community among the children, as community among parents disintegrates. One result of the highly developed adolescent community and minimal adult community is a relative powerlessness of adults to control their children (Coleman 1966, pp. 704-706).
This point of view traces the problem to be attacked to community organization at the level of the locality, community organization which is either absent or too weak to act.

These neighbourhoods, whether they are incorporated suburban municipalities or simply "named places" centered on schools and shopping centers within the great city, allow for some collective action on matters of common concern. Across the array, from apartment house neighbourhoods in the center to the single-family tract developments farther out, there is great variation in the social strength of such neighbourhoods. Where neighbourhoods are socially strong, chiefly in the single-family areas, they encourage community actions through voluntary organizations. These organizations are concerned with maintaining public order, carrying out community tasks, and representing the community before governmental agencies. In some areas of the metropolis we find a dense network of voluntary community organizations caring for many needs of the household as a unit (Greer 1967, p. 524).

This point of view would draw attention to intrinsic merits in citizen participation and residents' groups as integral contributions to the quality of urban life; the opposing point of view would tend to see locality organization as an obstacle to the treatment of blighted housing, poverty, disease and crime. The 1963 Master's research group did not use this kind of axis in analysing the differences in perceptions which they found between decision-makers and citizen leaders. This conceptual lack makes it difficult now to order their observations and discover a more general meaning.

In the context of urban renewal definition as a problem of social disorganization focuses attention on differences in the social structures of urban renewal areas rather than on individual pathologies and ego strengths. It would base decisions about urban renewal actions on differentials in community organization rather than on individual differences. This point of view has been gaining ground, although conceptually it is not as clear or as easily recognized as the psychological approach which is discussed next.

Urban Renewal as a Problem of Deviant Behaviour

This is the dominant and traditional view of social problems, although terms more refined than "personal depravity" are used nowadays. The social
work profession tends to assimilate all social problems to this perspective. From this point of view urban renewal is seen not as a problem of community disorganization but as a problem of individual maladaptation:

Deviant behavior is the individual's failure to live up to the socially defined expectations of those with whom he is in direct relationship (which) makes life miserable or difficult for them. They cannot count on him, although in fact they must. Whether so intended or not, deviant behavior interferes with the measure of predictability required by social relations and so provides a punitive experience for the associates of the deviant. They, in turn, respond by penalizing him, a familiar and important kind of social control (Merton 1966, 805).

Examples of social problems which are usually defined as aberrant behavior are crime, drug addiction, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency and prostitution. To these we could add poverty and slums; this is the way in which they are perceived although objectively only a minor fraction of poverty and housing blight is confined to ghettos and pockets. "Culture of poverty" as most often used could better be called the "personality of poverty".* Habitually one thinks of the personal characteristics, the weaknesses of character associated with poverty and slums, weaknesses usually treated as causes. Actually these correlations leave much poverty unexplained, i.e., a substantial proportion of the poor do not display the personal characteristics of the poor and many slum dwellers do not fit the image assigned to them. The point is that there is a choice in defining the problem and consequently there is a choice of action; no monolithic approach can completely account for and deal with a social problem such as urban renewal. This leaves scope for significant differences in emphases, such as the differences observed between politicians and citizen leaders.

The psychological approach focusing on personal characteristics has roots in the Protestant ethic. These moralistic origins are evident in traditional lore about cities:

* See Sandra Gorman's thesis for an acute discussion of the "culture of poverty".
It is fascinating to consider the disparate views held by persons whose backgrounds are essentially non-urban regarding urban society and its residents. It is well known that most national, state and provincial legislatures in North America are dominated by representatives whose geographical base is rural or small-town. It is clear that the majority of legislators regard the large city or metropolis as the embodiment of evil. They demonstrate strong reluctance to pass the legislation and to create the programmes which are required to meet the needs of the urban dweller (Rose 1968, 27).

Beshers expands the theme of unfavourable sentiments towards the city in his opening chapter on values (1962).

The ideology of the mental health movement is in the main a psychological approach, as is the "Psychiatric World View" (Riessman and Miller 1964). Merton's theory of anomie also has the individualistic focus, a focus which fails to account for social change. In the theory of anomie there are different modes of individual adaptation to discrepancies between the cultural goal of monetary success and the institutionalized means. Merton recognizes nonconforming or rebellious behaviour which aims at social change as distinct from the three kinds of aberrant behaviour. It is aberrant behaviour which is usually meant when reference is made to deviant behaviour. The three types of aberrant behaviour are innovation, ritualism and retreatism. Retreatism is a nonproductive liability which is heartily condemned and which invokes the mechanisms of social control, including therapy. There is no need to say more about the theory of anomie here; it is already so well known.

Definition of urban renewal as a problem of deviant behaviour means that the occupants of blighted housing and slum areas have defects of character which account for their failure to establish themselves in better class areas. The whole personality is involved. There is no point in providing better housing unless other therapeutic services are provided to enable them to live up to better housing.
Different reform programs might be envisioned that depend upon the importance attached to the social structure of the city in these propositions. If the city is merely made up of individuals and is a passive locus for their activities, then considerations of the psychology of the individual are sufficient to evaluate these propositions. But if particular forms of behavior are specific to the city, more than these psychological considerations must enter in; further social and cultural characteristics of cities would have to be considered (Beshers 1962, 9).

Changing Definitions of the Problem

Up to this point we have been looking at differences among the definer of social problems in cross-section. This is consistent with the outlook of many scientists who regard the situation as a natural one. However, human service professionals need knowledge which will enable them to predict and control. Thus we have a special interest in change. It is generally acknowledged that the definitions of social problems do change but little attention has been given to this. One exception is Kahn's account of changes in approaches to the delinquency problem. I have abstracted at length his account of five stages. The earlier stages treat the delinquency problem as deviant behavior while the later ones shift to the perspective of social disorganization:

1. delinquency control and treatment
In 1957 or 1958 a local planner, asked what should be done about delinquency, would have talked about neighbourhood saturation by social services and therapeutic resources and about devices for program co-ordination and case integration in the attack on multiproblem families. Whatever the philosophy and objectives of the juvenile court movement or of individual agencies and treatment facilities, for the parent and child brought into the network of delinquency services the impact is largely one of punishment, deprivation, and control. What is defined as social control through individual help and therapy emerges as control through threat, separation and surveillance. Where individual psychologically oriented therapeutic processes are needed, they should be undertaken only in relation to previous or parallel efforts to improve the individual's social conditions...achieve a sound balance.

2. delinquency prevention. The President's Committee on Delinquency and Youth Crime created in 1960 aimed initially at delinquency control. 1961-1963 the Kennedy administration sought to bring a new approach to delinquency prevention and control by stressing the need to open opportunities to the lower class youth previously closed out, "opportunity mobilization". There were much broader public-voluntary
action coalitions than the local community councils which had taken the lead previously.

3. **youth development**

Broad youth development programs launched by the President's Committee. The Opportunity hypothesis (reflected in Mobilization for Youth) gave new emphasis to schools and to the world of work, major segments of the institutional structure which had somehow not generally been encompassed by social-welfare planners, particularly those based in local community welfare councils. Even though the target might be the most deprived youth in high-delinquency areas, one could not think of planning in the worlds of education and work as affecting only a small segment of clients. New strategies, concepts, resources, would inevitably affect the whole-interest in social planning as it affects all members of the community and not the disadvantaged alone.

4. **community development**

The once narrowly conceived social-agency-co-ordinated planning of the welfare councils has become aligned with broader measures in an urban community development movement. The arrival of the Community Action Programs under the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, an American version of urban community development.

5. **political action**

The attack on a local community's "powerlessness" as the central objective of its social planning. Whereas most of the planning endeavours involve the vesting of power in existing structures, which themselves undergo some change, or in new structures involving new combinations of existing groups, the Haryou report sees need for a basic change in the controlling local power group. The realities of the subsequent struggle, to which insight has been added by the civil-rights revolution, now highlights the issue of social power -- a subject certainly inherent in the anomie formulation, but not put originally as a central issue by those who helped generate the opportunity approach. (Kahn 1967.)

Several of the 1968 Master's research group commented on historical changes in the perceptions city fathers held of urban renewal areas. Apparently they approached Trefann as if it were merely made up of individuals and was the passive locus for their activities (using Besher's words). They were stunned by organized protest and this is thought to have led them to take quite a different approach to Kensington Market, a community-oriented approach. The Kerwin thesis outlines three models representing stages in the evolution of citizen participation:

No group of citizens in the future will begin in the passive pose of Alexandra Park... As urban renewal evolved over time, citizens began to demand more of a voice. Often, though, as in Trefann Court this voice was directed to an obstructionist model of citizen participation.
The partnership model of Kensington is similar to the relationship between the government and the people in community development programs in underdeveloped countries (pp. 59-78).

For descriptions of the three models as exemplified by Alexandra Park, Trefann Court and Kensington Market see pp. 68-75 of the Kerwin thesis.

A remarkably similar time sequence was observed by Davies in New York City:

In Seaside and Hammels, Moses ignored the neighbourhood groups as much as possible. In the West village, the neighbourhood groups succeeded in blocking the proposed renewal study. In WSURA the city made a deliberate effort to include neighbourhood groups in the renewal process (Davies 1966, p. 205).

However, the focus of research at this point cannot be the mechanisms of change, although prediction and control may be the ultimate objective. This stage in the research programme might develop more rigorous instruments which could later be used in a direct approach to the problems of change. Knowledge from this present stage could nevertheless make the definers of social problems more accountable:

The sociologists who demonstrate the "wastage of talent" that results from marked inequalities of opportunity for the training and exercise of socially prized talent bring to a focus what was experienced by the diffuse many as only a personal problem rather than a problem of society...As our knowledge of the social, economic and psychological consequences of racial segregation is enlarged advocates of alternate policies will be brought increasingly to account for their distinctive positions. In this sense and in this way sociological knowledge eventually presses policy-makers to justify their social policies to their constituencies and the larger community...Sociological enquiry does make men increasingly accountable for the outcome of their collective and institutionalized actions (Merton 1966, pp. 789-790).

Research Operations

The task is to construct questionnaire items which will distinguish those who orient to urban renewal as if it were a problem of social disorganization from those who orient as if it were a matter of deviant behaviour. How to discriminate between those who prefer action in the realm of social change from those who would prefer personal change or control? Who would deal with residents as communities and who would deal with them as individuals?
Neal's work will serve as a model. She needed to develop four sets of items which would reveal orientations to value, interest, change and non-change. We need two sets, one having to do with social disorganization and the other with deviant behaviour.

One hundred and twenty cliche-like statements expressing attitudes toward change, values, and interests were formulated from suggestions culled from spontaneous remarks, current periodicals, other attitude scales, and more formal literary sources. These were administered to several pretest samples for which the subjects were chosen because of their conservative or liberal orientations. Sixty items were selected, fifteen for each of the four orientations. The selection was made in favour of those items that best discriminated between known conservative and liberal subjects (Neal 1965, p. 48).

We have two main sources for items; first, the literature is an obvious resource and second, we have the interviews done by the 1968 Master's group. The interviews have some important advantages: they report the comments of the key groups of problem definers and they are in language which the problem definers understand best.

For measurement operations let us conceive of a continuum:

- clear cut orientation to social disorganization view;
- predominant orientation to social disorganization view;
- balanced orientation between views;
- predominant orientation to deviant behaviour view;
- clearcut orientation to deviant behaviour view;

Items must be designed so that the responses will reveal where a respondent falls along this continuum. We may not be able to arrange the respondents in 5 ranks but even a simple "either/or" dichotomy serves to measure. These points influence the design of the items. We draw an example of this kind of deliberation from Neal again:

Many of the original set of value items had to be rejected because despite good meaning content they failed to discriminate between "highs" and "lows". The following item illustrates this point.

For creating a better world wherein justice, peace, freedom, responsibility, and charity would have real meaning far beyond anything we now imagine, I think man could do so much more than he is now doing.
Everybody could accept this item. Perhaps this is so because it asks or expects no personal commitment to action on the part of the respondent. Items...that demand action from the one who agrees with them, were more discriminating...They require the individual to go beyond the statement of the platitude, and man finds it hard to accept them if he is doing nothing about the situation (Neal 1965, p. 107).

Thus items have to be phrased and rephrased until they discriminate around that part of the continuum which is the key watershed. Items with which the great majority agree or disagree have little measurement value.

Another problem bound to arise is the item with heterogeneous meaning content; these items evoke muddled responses with some reacting to one aspect and others to another. For example, an "old fashioned-modern dimension" is likely to contaminate some of the items as is the political distinction between liberal and conservative. Statistical item analysis will identify some of these faults in items so that they can be reworded or discarded, but much can be done by careful composition, which is all the more important because we must rely so heavily on face validity.

As a beginning I have selected these two statements from the literature. Greer's statement suggests to me a balanced point of view. My guess is that many would be able to disagree with Kristol's diatribe; if not, it would have to be softened.

The older goal of increasing low-cost housing, of eliminating and preventing slums, is mixed with the newer goal of revitalizing the central city; to both has been added the more recent goal of creating the planned American city through the community renewal program (Greer S., Urban Renewal and American Cities: The Dilemma of Democratic Intervention, 1965, p. 165).

The rich present themselves as progressive reformers of our urban condition, and mute the true implications of their reforms, which is to get the poor out of the city so that they, the rich, can get seriously down to the business of gracious living (Kristol, I, "It's Not a Bad Crisis to Live In", New York Times Magazine, Jan. 22, 1967, p. 72).

The next 6 items are excerpts from interviews with "planners". The interviews with decision-makers and citizen leaders should provide more fertile material for items, so I left them deliberately for the new research team. The first
three items appear to spring from a concern with social disorganization, while the last three are concerned with deviant behaviour.

The official goal is to clean up obsolete land and redevelop it. It is contrary to the facts of life. It is often better to live in a poor building but where there is a strong sense of community rather than vice versa. Urban renewal is usually physical planning. Urban renewal should be community renewal (D19).

There need to be changes in administration, enabling legislation, methods of financing and our political ethic regarding expropriation. We need to move away from the concept of the sanctity of private property -- to recognition of the need for public use and precedence (D3).

I cannot tolerate the idea of tearing down houses just to erase slum areas without good adequate provision for relocation, child-care facilities and regard for the "community feeling" that is often broken up. I don't think planners, etc. consider these factors enough (D5).

A goal of urban renewal is to eliminate the cost to City departments of combatting the costs of blight (e.g. fire, police) (D7).

I've become concerned that people like me are inclined to be tidy-minded, and the slums appear untidy. People there don't (or can't) adhere to "lace-curtain values", though they are aware of these values. They live from day to day and week to week and can't afford to look ahead or to think on a community basis. We who have mobility are able to make choices which they can't make (D14).

Residents of urban renewal areas should be dispersed to the suburbs where land costs make low cost housing a possibility without unreasonable subsidies. Let those who can afford it live in the central area (D17).

For developing and testing items the Likert technique seems most economical. However, once a good set of items is at hand a modified paired comparison technique might be most appropriate. For this the set would need to be small and the items quite concise.
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Part II

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AS VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION

General Background

Voluntary association has strong historical roots in North America.

These are some illustrative excerpts from our history:

If each citizen did not learn, in proportion as he individually becomes more feeble and consequently more incapable of preserving his freedom single handed, to combine with his fellow citizens for the purpose of defending it, it is clear that tyranny would unavoidably increase together with equality...Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons and schools. If it is proposed to inculcate some truth or to foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society. Wherever at the head of some new undertaking you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association (p. 10).

A people among whom individuals lost the power of achieving great things single-handed, without acquiring the means of producing them by united exertions, would soon relapse into barbarism (p. 107).

If men are to remain civilized or to become so, the art of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which the equality of conditions is increased (p. 110).


Associations are created, extended and worked in the United States more quickly and effectively than in any other country. In nothing does the executive talent of the people better shine than in the promptitude wherewith the idea of an organization for a common object is taken up, in the instinctive discipline that makes everyone who joins in starting it fall into his place, in the practical, business-like turn which the discussions forthwith take (p. 278).


Wilberforce and the anti-slavery men had introduced into English life and politics new methods of agitating and educating public opinion. The dissemination of facts and arguments; the answers to the mis-statements of the adversary on the pleasures of the 'Middle-passage' and the happiness of negro life in the plantations; the tacts; the
subscriptions; the public meetings -- all these methods of propaganda
were systematized by methods familiar enough today but strange and
in that age. The quiet force of the Quakers was brought out of its
long hibernation and launched into public life, taking the party
politicians in the flank. The methods of Wilberforce were afterward
imitated by the myriad leagues and societies -- political, religious,
philanthropic and cultural -- which have ever since been the arteries
of English life (pp. 496-497).

Trevelyan, G.M. English Social History.
London: Longmans, 1942.

Some Basic Propositions

More recently Havens has formulated a theory of community development
which accords a central role to voluntary organizations. According to Havens
the sufficient conditions for economic development are:

1. formation of voluntary associations
2. that seek to attain instrumental goals
3. which are consistent with the broad goal of development and
4. these voluntary associations are somewhat successful in attaining
their goals.

Havens formulation could well be adapted as an hypothesis for the
study of citizen participation in urban renewal.

Arnold Rose has a somewhat similar formulation which is of interest
because he has taken a special interest in voluntary associations, devoting
a chapter to them in his sociology text;

The hypothesis is that the voluntary associations have three important
functions in supporting political democracy in the United States:

(1) They distribute power over social life among a very large
proportion of the citizens, instead of allowing it to be concentra-
ted in the elected representatives alone, so that the United States
has a little of the character of the ancient Greek democratic
city-state, as well as of the modern European centralized republic.

(2) The voluntary associations provide a sense of satisfaction with
modern democratic processes because they help the ordinary citizen
to see how the processes function in limited circumstances, of
direct interest to himself, rather than as they grind away in a
distant, impersonal and incomprehensible fashion.

(3) The voluntary associations provide a social mechanism for
continually instituting social changes, so that the United States
is a society in flux, constantly seeking to solve long-standing problems
and to satisfy new needs of groups of citizens as these needs arise.
(Arnold Rose 1954, p. 51. See pp. 68-71 for a more detailed restatement
of these propositions.)
The next five sections represent approaches to measuring citizen participation. These approaches are at a sufficiently high level of generalization to draw on a large body of sociological knowledge and they lend themselves to the formulation of interesting and useful hypotheses. Together they form a scheme for diagnosing the state of community organization in urban renewal areas. Specific choices of hypotheses are left to the research analyst who will pick up where my exploration leaves off.

**The Instrumental and Expressive Functions of Groups**

This is the best of three parts of typology of voluntary associations suggested by Gordon and Babchuk. The other two parts or dimensions which I am not picking up are accessibility and status. Gordon and Babchuk make the point that associations which mix instrumental and expressive functions are quite common, hence they suggest three types: instrumental; instrumental and expressive; and expressive. Merton makes the point that for a social group to function at all well it must achieve a balance between instrumental and expressive functions. This has been expanded by Parsons into the four categorical imperatives of social systems or, in Bales' terms, the four system problems which confront the small group. It is very difficult to operationalize all four but the simpler distinction between instrumental and expressive is quite practical.

Arnold Rose has formulated the distinction specifically in relation to voluntary associations:

Some associations act only to express or satisfy the interests of their members in relation to themselves -- these include the recreational and sports associations, the social and hobby clubs, and the scientific societies, which may be especially numerous in the United States but which are also found in large numbers in all literate societies. Other associations are directed outward; they wish to achieve some condition or change in some limited segment of the society as a whole. The former may be called "expressive" groups and the latter "social influence" gr

(Arnold Rose, 1954, p. 52.)
Now quoted in detail is the Gordon and Babchuk conceptualization of their three types of groups:

Instrumental: Certain groups do not exist primarily to furnish activities for members as an end in itself, but serve as social influence organizations designed to maintain or to create some normative condition or change. Such groups exist in order to attain goals that lie outside of the organizations themselves (p. 25).

The major function and orientation of the instrumental organization are related to activities which take place outside the organization. It seeks to maintain a condition or to bring about change which transcends its immediate membership... Members identify with the group, at least in part, because of its commitment to goals which do not contribute directly to their own personal and immediate satisfactions. Of course, this tendency does not preclude the possibility of "expressive functions" being found in the instrumental type of organization (p. 28).

Instrumental-expressive: The apparent expressive character of any organization is consistent with the view in organization theory that activities and sentiments tend to develop above and beyond the requirements of the formal system. Hence, whatever the purpose of the organization, it will incorporate expressive characteristics for its maintenance and provide a framework for personal gratification. Although an instrumental organization might meet the expressive needs of its members, its principal requirement is that it focus on activity and goals that are outside the organization itself (p. 26). Standing between predominantly instrumental and expressive associations are those groups that incorporate both functions self-consciously... Members identify with the organization both for the fellowship it provides and for the special objectives it seeks (p. 28).

Expressive: Provides the framework for immediate and continuing gratification to the individual... These groups perform a function primarily for the individual participants through activities confined and self-contained within the organization itself. More specifically, they provide the opportunity for carrying on activities, such as recreation, of direct interest to the participants or help to provide satisfactions of personal fellowship. Also included in this category are honorific or status conferring organizations... In the main, the orientation of the group is not to the attainment of a goal anticipated for the future but to the organized flow of gratifications in the present (p. 27).

Finally Arnold Rose's conceptualization which focuses on the instrumental:

Social influence groups: Since the social influence groups have a specific and limited purpose, they also tend to have a limited life. When the purpose is accomplished, or the need which gave rise to the association changes, the association usually dies. Since change is
rapid in the United States, and many social problems get solved while new ones continually arise, the turnover in voluntary associations of the social influence type is great. Even when an association continues in full vigor, there can be a large turnover in its membership (pp. 52-53). For the achievement of specialized and diverse interests (p. 53).... Many of these voluntary associations are pressure groups or reform groups and therefore have power over the community as a whole...In a largely decentralized democracy, such as ours, many political activities -- in the broad sense of that phrase -- take place in nongovernmental groups (pp. 66-67). Contact with persons of other classes and...power in the community as a whole...power and personal satisfaction obtainable from social participation (p. 68).

Expressive groups: For expressive or status-securing purposes (p. 53). Arnold Rose 1954)

From the foregoing conceptual formulations Jacoby and Babchuk derived the following measurement operations. There are 3 questionnaire items, each consisting of a forced choice between two statements. Each item samples in specific concrete form the common, more general instrumental-expressive continuum:

1. The degree to which the activities of the organization are designed to provide gratification either immediately or at a later time (i.e. after the activities in question have concluded):

   (i) Taking part in the activities of the organization is fun in itself. I get a big kick out of doing these things.

   (ii) My chief satisfaction from participating in the activities of this club comes not as much when I do these things as later when I see worthwhile and desirable results accomplished.

2. The degree to which the activities are oriented to and confined within the group or to persons outside of the group.

   (i) This group is organized primarily to promote activities for members and others interested in these activities. The group is not concerned with changing the actions of others.

   (ii) Some of the activities of this group are directed toward modifying, controlling, or changing in some way, the actions of persons outside the organization.

3. The degree to which the activities of the organization are ends in themselves or represent means to external ends.

   (i) The activities of the group in which I take part are valuable in and for themselves. I do these things just for the sake of doing them; I do not expect to achieve any other purpose.
We cannot use the Jacoby and Babchuck questionnaire items as they stand. Their task was to distinguish between predominantly expressive and instrumental organizations. The citizens' groups in which we are interested are clearly instrumental but with some variation. We are working with a narrower range of variation, although we are still interested in differences between groups along the expressive-instrumental continuum. Our working hypothesis could be that more effective and enduring action is achieved by groups which have a satisfactory balance between expressive and instrumental functions; conversely groups which go to either extreme are less able to act. For example, a committee of local residents appointed by city officials or a social planning council would likely be at the instrumental extreme while a youthful protest movement would be at the expressive extreme. This is an attempt to predict outcomes of residents' organizations, outcomes such as the stalemate in Trefann and apparent progress in Kensington. Admittedly, this is a crude oversimplification but it is necessarily so to serve as a starting point for the next stage of investigation.

The questionnaire items need to be rewritten so that the choices fall within that part of the expressive-instrumental continuum where most residents' groups would fall. For example, the simplest alteration would be the addition of third choices consisting of balanced combinations of the existing extreme choices. Also, additional items should be constructed based on Babchuk's study of a Rochester slum (1962).

In the Rochester study the life cycle of the individual member and leader emerges as an important concomitant of the expressive-instrumental distinction in group functions. (See Chapter 4 on the "Savannah Improvement
Let the following terms define the individual's life cycle in primary group affiliation:

- family of orientation
- family limbo state in youth
- family of procreation
- family limbo state in maturity

In families of orientation and procreation both the expressive needs of the individual are largely met within the family; for the children this is in the sense of socialization, and for the marriage partners this is in the sense of social control meaning stabilization and tension management. For the person in family limbo state "his orientation to primary relationships is non-family centered but sought in the context of his identification and participation in formal groups" (Babchuk 1962, p. 55). Thus, Babchuk found that the young and very old belonged mainly to expressive groups. Within the Improvement Council he found indications that the unmarried and the more recent residents (i.e. less integrated) were the more expressively oriented group members. They were recognized as more expressively oriented by more regular attendance, greater participation in leadership activities and by tending to be recruited through personal influence by friends. Voting behaviour appears to be implicated too, that is, related to the instrumental. By building questionnaire items from these findings and interpretations we should be able to measure the proportions of expressively and instrumentally oriented members in different residents' groups. Statistical analysis would determine whether these items and the Jacoby and Babchuk items are sampling a single dimension of content. The next section makes use of recruitment data to get at the expressive-instrumental dimension.

Recruitment and Primary Group Orientation

One of the best case studies of voluntary organizations is Sills' study of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis (once better known as the polio Foundation or the March of Dimes). The main contribution of this study
to research is a typology of recruits. It is very promising as a way of getting at the less manifest organizational goals which are neglected in formal statements of aims. My strategy is to use Sills typology to comb the existing citizen participation data and, in so doing, deriving a more appropriate typology for use in prospective data collection. Thus, what follows is an abstract of Sills' discussion with a view to applying the typology of our data.

The Foundation made use of relationships which were established for other purposes rather than relying on a general impersonal appeal for volunteers. There was a difference between the recruiting procedures used and those recommended in the Foundation's manuals; so Sills asked volunteers how they themselves actually became members.

Humanitarianism is popularly cited as a major determinant of participation in organizations. Humanitarianism means a desire to help others. But Sills did not feel that such motives were adequate explanations for joining the Foundation. In addition to internal dispositions, external influences must be taken into account.

In deriving his typology empirically Sills first distinguished the "polio veterans", individuals who had had personal experience with the disease in themselves, a member of their family, or as therapists with direct intimate contact with victims. Their reasons for joining were directly related to these prior contacts with polio. Four-fifths of the volunteers had had no such contact, but they did have a wide variety of experiences in other community organizations.

The second dimension used in developing the typology is that of personal goals with a distinction between self oriented and other oriented goals. It confirmed the separating out of the polio veterans.
Self oriented goals  
- fulfill binding obligations to the community  
- fulfill job obligations  
- advance personal status  

Other oriented goals  
- help others  
- eliminate polio  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polio Veterans</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulfill binding obligations to the community</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulfill job obligations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance personal status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminate polio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Binding obligations mean paying back benefits received as victims or a binding sense of civic duty. Humanitarian impulses included diffuse struism, protective fervour, moral precepts, and vague idealism. Volunteers with other oriented goals, and who were not polio veterans, were delineated as the second type of recruit, the "humanitarians", since their fundamental concern was with the welfare of others.

The third dimension was the recruit's image of the Foundation before joining. Here the distinction is between those whose major image was one of people belonging to and supporting an organization and those who regarded it as an organization with certain specific purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
<th>Humanitarians</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an organization with goals</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an organization with a programme</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual members</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsoring organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most volunteers with the people image were attracted simply by the personality of the individual who asked them to join. Sponsoring refers to fund raising links. This third dimension enabled Sills to divide the residuum into two more types -- good citizens and joiners, between them comprising 70% of all the volunteers. These are the people without personal contact with polio and with self oriented goals. Good citizens have a purpose image and are more likely to have desired to fulfil a sense of obligation to the community or had
a sense of identification with their community. Joiners are more likely to have regarded the opportunity to become a volunteer as a chance to further their own interests, and their people image is interpreted as linked to the decline of the primary sources of intimate stable group support.

In summary, there are three underlying dimensions, dichotomies, from which the typology is derived. Logically, three dichotomous dimensions yield 8 types. However, empirically two types did not occur at all, a third type occurred to infrequently that it was combined with another, and two others were combined, leaving 4 types:

18% polio veterans -- direct experience, self and other oriented goals, purposes image  
12% humanitarians -- participation in community organizations, other oriented, purposes and a few people images  
28% good citizens -- participation in community organizations, self oriented, purposes image  
42% joiners -- participation in community organizations, self oriented, people image

The three dichotomies are:

previous experience -- direct experience with polio participation in community organizations  
goal orientation -- other oriented self oriented  
image of the Foundation - people image purposes image

Note that the first dimension,"previous experience", really comprises two independent dimensions:

(1) direct experience with polio / no direct experience with polio  
(2) previous experience in community organizations/ no previous experience in community organizations

Experience with polio was treated as dominant and among the remainder were hardly any without previous experience in community organizations.

Sills used a supplementary approach to recruitment in terms of trigger events. For 90% of the volunteers some trigger event was a necessary component
of their joining the Foundation.

52% asked to join by a friend, response to an invitation extended by someone whom they knew personally;

20% asked to join by some other member of the community;

18% asked to join by an organizational or occupational colleague;

10% volunteered on their own initiative.

Polio Veterans are more likely than other Volunteers to have volunteered on their own initiative; Humanitarians and Joiners are more likely to have been asked by an organizational or occupational colleague; and Good Citizens are more likely to have been approached by a community member whom they may not have known personally (pp. 102-103).

A large proportion of social behavior can be described as the fulfillment of obligations which derive from various role relationships. In fact, it is generally difficult to persuade people to take any specific course of action, including joining a voluntary association, unless they view this action of a necessary component of the proper fulfillment of some role obligation...Those relationships which this research has revealed are most frequently utilized...in order to obtain new recruits: friendships, community membership, and organizational membership (p. 110).

In Rochester the professional community organizer recruited a quarter of the members of the Savannah-Manhattan Improvement Council. He was the "trigger event" who induced instrumentally oriented persons to join. Only he was not restrained by sex proprieties, for he was able to recruit a number of married women:

The social worker (community organizer) was attracted to individuals who themselves later become influentials. On the other hand, those influenced to join through personal influence did not appear to have the same potential for bringing others into the group...Those who entered the group through personal influence ordinarily did not influence others to join. This suggests that such persons become members to obtain immediate personal satisfactions and often were not oriented to the instrumental goals and activities of the organization. Instead they were more inclined toward the person who introduced them to the organization and to the fellowship with others which would be developed within such groups. Those, were attracted to the group goals, sought to extend these goals through recruitment, and derived their major interest from the achievement of instrumental goals. Such persons saw recruitment as one form of implementing the goals of the group and often influenced their friends to become affiliated with the organization. The members viewed the organization as being instrumental irrespective of how they became affiliated and irrespective of their motivation for remaining in the group...The member who joins through personal influence...is more likely to be in the nonmarried category, does not influence others to join or influences, at most, one other perso
attends church with greater regularity, and is somewhat more likely to be involved in leadership...The individual subscribes to the aims of the Council, which provides him with affective linkage as a substitute for primary group needs (Babchuk 1962, pp. 43 and 55).

Babchuk's interpretation distinguishes family centered primary group affiliation from organization centered primary group satisfaction, that is, the instrumentally oriented from the expressively oriented. This interpretation extends readily to Sills' distinctions between other oriented and self oriented re goals, and between the purposes image and the people image of the organization. The dimension of previous experience is not related to the expressive-instrumental interpretation but it does relate, very usefully, to community cohesion, which is dealt with in the next section.

From this review of the studies of recruitment by Sills and Babchuk I would suggest that questionnaire items be constructed to represent each of the dimensions listed below:

1. previous experience with urban renewal
   - direct experience
   - indirect experience
   - no experience

An example of indirect experience would be Trefann people observing what happened in Don Mount. Direct experience might be limited to actual relocation.

2. previous experience in community organizations
   - substantial (active participation)
   - slight (passive affiliation)
   - negligible

3. goal orientation
   - self oriented goals
   - mixed (neither predominate)
   - other oriented

4. image held of the organization
   - purposes (emphasis on goals and programme)
   - people (personal influence)

5. trigger events
   - asked by a personal friend
   - asked by community organizer (professional & organization-bound)
   - asked by some other member of the community
   - asked by organizational or occupational colleague
   - volunteered on own initiative
Note that these meanings may not be amenable to direct structured questions. They can be coded from semistructured interview material, from what Merton called the "focused interview". Open-ended questions can be used and then the particular answer the coder is seeking may occur anywhere in responses to a number of questions. Quite effective coding can be done with taped interviews. The main point is that focused interviews without rigidly worded questionnaire items and without forced choices can yield data for the 5 dimensions above.

Local, Cosmopolitan and Mediating Leadership

The 1968 Master's research group produced two outstanding theses on leadership: Gorman's, on indigenous leaders; and Cornish's, on professionals or community workers. Our focus regards leadership as a facet of community social structure. My search for a conceptual scheme which would embrace both community workers and indigenous leaders led to Merton's local and cosmopolitan influentials. I have given three references to articles in which Merton expounds these concepts. Like the instrumental-expressive distinction, this one between locals and cosmopolitans is consistent with Parsons' system theory.

For definition I have selected this provocative passage, which contrasts the expertness of the cosmopolitan welfare worker with the sympathetic understanding of the political ward bosses:

The two patterns are reflected in...the difference between the "impersonal social welfare worker" and the "friendly precinct captain". It is not merely that the local political captain provides food baskets and jobs, legal and extra-legal advice, that he sets to rights minor scrapes with the law, helps the bright poor boy to a political scholarship in a local college, looks after the bereaved -- that he helps in a whole series of crises when a fellow needs a friend, and, above all, a friend who "knows the score" and can do something about it. It is not merely that he provides aid which gives him interpersonal influence. It is the manner in which the aid is provided. After all, specialized agencies do exist for dispensing this assistance. Welfare agencies, settlement houses, legal aid clinics, hospital clinics, public relief departments -- these and many other organizations are available. But in contrast to the professional techniques of the welfare worker which often represent in the mind of the recipient the cold bureaucratic dispensation of limited aid following upon detailed investigation are the unprofessional techniques of the precinct captain who asks no questions, exacts no compliance with legal rules of eligibility and does not "snoop" into private affairs. The precinct captain is a prototype of the "local influential" (Merton 1963, 162).
The mere distinction between locals and cosmopolitans explains rather little scope for empirical research in the urban renewal setting. All renewal areas have both types of leaders. The idea of a third type, the mediating leader, suggests more interesting hypotheses. Thus, although a community may have both local and cosmopolitan leadership, it will fail to act on its problems unless it also has mediating leadership. Kensington and Don Vale, which appear to be achieving a greater measure of control over their destinies, do have mediating leaders who combine cosmopolitan expertise and indigenous understanding. Cornish observed a relationship between the role of the community worker and the kind of citizen leadership available (that is, how sophisticated the local leadership was). In Trefann community workers tried to make up for the lack of sophisticated citizen leaders:

The role of the worker, about which both leaders and workers expressed the most discontent, was that of a mediator between the City and local people. Here, there was a good deal of confusion and mixed loyalty.

Many felt that the job was impossible, where the goals of the urban renewal plan were so different from the wishes of the local people. Workers generally felt that they had to make a choice when placed in this position.

Most chose the side of the people. Where they did not, citizen leaders expressed many doubts about the worker's role, seeing him as a city "spy" who was there to "sell them down the drain". As a result, several workers have left the employ of the city, in order to devote their full energy to the cause of the local people (Cornish 1968, p. 104).

The mediating function appears to be the pivotal one.

Cornish has used the term "mediating" in a concrete sense but one which is quite consistent with its more theoretical use in sociology. The mediating leader has a special role in mobilizing group interaction:

The Mediating leader is so termed because he is polymorphic, possessing overlapping memberships and informal relationships in both local and Cosmopolitan groups. The Mediator may come from a diversity of occupational fields: small business, public service, education, politics, religion, social welfare, or the mass media. However, all of these occupations provide him with a common orientation -- an interest in larger social processes and their implications for the local community... They are in the unique position of being able to exercise power and
influence in the community on the basis of both ascribed and achieved characteristics. Confrontation of local cosmopolitan interests can relate the small community to the larger society while, at the same time, preserving a local sense of community.

Only the Mediating Leader can facilitate this leadership interaction. If he does not do so, the differentiation can cause ineffective and disruptive community leadership processes (Lowry 1965, pp. 232 and 235). I would suggest that the stalemate in Trefann could be interpreted as a failure in mediating leadership, whereas Kensington is an example of the converse.

Coleman subsumes the differentiation of locals and cosmopolitans under locality specialization and notes the following disorganizing consequences:

Such a bifurcation of interests is becoming more pronounced. Many kinds of communities consist of persons whose activities are wholly local and those whose activities are largely outside the community. The former ordinarily become the "locals" and the latter the "cosmopolitans". Men who are best fitted by education and organizational experience for positions of local community leadership have the smallest amount of their interest and activities located there. Those who are interested in the community, because their lives are bound up in it, are lower in status, have less education, and are ordinarily the men who would look to others for leadership. In such communities there is a peculiar inversion that would seem to inhibit community organization (Coleman 1966, pp. 707 and 708). With increasing polarization and specialization there may be a failure to maintain integrative leadership in the middle.

The questionnaire items which Lowry used to distinguish the three types of leaders in a community setting would be in his dissertation. Unfortunately this dissertation is not listed by University Microfilms, hence it is not available from them in the form of microfilm or photocopy. However, it can probably be borrowed or copied through the university interlibrary loan service. These concepts are well described in the literature and are easily operationalized. Again, one could use structured questionnaire items, a focused interview, or both.

Community Residues: Sentiments and Organization

If you can get people to feel they are living in the neighbourhood and can play an active part in it, they can grow roots and acquire a basic strength which they may never need but which will always be there (Paul Ringer, interviewed by the 1968 Master's Research Group).
Studies of downtown areas have too often taken a negative approach concentrating on what is lacking in using the well worn concepts of anomie and social class. This preoccupation with pathology might account for some of the surprise at the emergence of citizen organizations in urban renewal areas, in spite of the tradition of voluntary organization. Such organizations are generally short lived or are transformed but they leave a residue which facilitates the formation of new groups:

When collective action does take place and the problem is solved, two types of residue are left. One is a residue of sentiments, whether identification or hostility... The second is an organizational residue. The organization of effort that resulted in solution of the problem continues. Organizations, once in existence, tend to perpetuate themselves (Coleman 1966, p. 698).

A measure of these residues in a newly designated urban renewal area could be an aid to planning. Kensington, with substantial residues from past collective efforts by immigrant groups under the auspices of St. Christopher House, demanded a partnership approach, according to Kerwin. Trefann's undeveloped capacity for partnership called for some different community organization approach.

A simple but effective measure of community sentiment has been used by Gold and associates. It consists of three questionnaire items which have a cumulative property:

1. Would you like to live in Rivertown the rest of your life?
2. Have you ever seriously thought about leaving Rivertown?
3. If the opportunity arose, would you consider leaving Rivertown?

Three "natural" response patterns accounted for 90% of the respondents:

A. The strongly attached hard core who would not even entertain the notion of leaving accounted for 25%.

B. The attached, who would like to live the rest of their lives, have not thought seriously about leaving but would consider leaving - 33%.

C. Those who reject the idea of living there the rest of their lives and/or describe in detail a specific period when they were thinking seriously about leaving and give the reasons - 40% not attached.
Note that these items were treated as open-ended questions and there was probing.

This scale correlated positively with age and with number of "gripes". The probes seeking out reasons for the answers given to the questions revealed the importance of primary group affiliations:

Those who wanted to remain in Rivertown the rest of their lives invariably gave as reasons family, friends, and people they know. On the other hand, those whom we classified as "not attached", who did not want to live in Rivertown the rest of their lives and/or had thought seriously about leaving, rarely mentioned family and friends as a reason for not having left Rivertown. These latter respondents were much more apt to rationalize their remaining in "economic" terms...jobs, owning a home (Gold et al. 1965, p. 224).

I have misgivings about taking geographic immobility as an index of community attachment. Are mobility and cohesiveness incompatible? I doubt it. It has been observed that communities retain their distinctive characters in spite of highly mobile populations. It might be better to treat mobility and attachment as independent dimensions, if at all possible. An urban sociologist has concluded that mobility is not disorganizing among the mentally mobile who are adapted to mobility:

The pattern of settlement of recent migrants to the city is not consistent with previous theories of the relationship between mobility and social disorganization. It is not consistent with the classical ecological gradient pattern...A high rate of mobility has been (newly) postulated to be a normal component of urban life, not necessarily disorganizing in its effect on persons habituated to urban life. The hypothesis has been advanced that in so far as the types of social disorganization typically concentrated in central areas are related functionally to mobility, the relationship involves inexperience with mobility and not the quantity of mobility alone (Freedman 1964, p. 199).

This leaves me dissatisfied with this choice of measure of community sentiment but without a better suggestion. It should, however, be possible to devise questions about members' identification with the community without commitment to spending the rest of their lives in it.

Organizational residue seems easier to uncover. The 1968 group found that Kensington had a history of five community groups formed under the auspices of St. Christopher House and there were intimations that the largely immigrant population had experience in ethnic organizations. In contrast,
Trefann had very little history of voluntary organization, a difference to which Gorman attached considerable importance. Coleman cites a study by Merton et al. which illustrates this residue factor very well:

A new community was constructed during World War II for shipyard workers. Because of the contractor's malfeasance and wartime problem the community was beset by problem after problem: sidewalks caved in, electricity did not work, and so on. Because these problems involved similar interests, because they could only be solved by joint action, and because they were important and repetitive problems, they generate an extremely strong nucleus of community organization. After the problems were solved, the organizations became engaged in various social, civic, and other activities on which voluntary community group subsist. But like a volunteer fire department, they also constituted standby organizations which could mobilize to meet problems as they arose. Merton and associates, in studying this community at a later time, found that its rich community organization contrasted strikingly with the unorganized state of another development that had not been faced with such problems. The second development had been well constructed, was well managed, and offered no difficulties to be overcome. Its management, in fact, provided few opportunities for organizational activity to develop. Government was administered from above, not generated from below (Coleman 1966, p. 688).

A look at the organizational history of a community, then, should help in predicting its response to new challenges such as urban renewal plans. A little different approach would be to tally the organizational experiences of the individual members of a community, a count of memberships and of offices held. Organizations can be classified according to instrumental and expressive functions.

Relational Orientations: Individualistic, Lineal, and Collateral

Family and kin relationships and informal friendships underlie community organization. There are many observations and opinions about how these informal associations affect community life but they are rather contradictory and confusing. Family and small group relations are a special interest of social workers and so we have included some scaling operations for measuring a few aspects.

First we will review some of the findings. Dotson interviewed families in a working class area of New Haven:
Additional evidence is presented in this paper that the majority of urban working-class people do not participate in formally organized voluntary associations. The more original contribution lies in the attempt to discover the forms of social organization which structure the leisure-time activities of workers in the absence of formal associations. The central fact which emerges in this connection is the important role which family and kinship continue to play in providing for the companionship and recreational needs of the persons interviewed (Dotson 1951, p. 693).

Dotson's point is that among the stable working class voluntary association has not displaced family and kin activity. However, all the voluntary associations which he lists are expressive ones and none are instrumental. Citizen participation means voluntary instrumental associations. Previous studies had shown that the lower classes were not "joiners" to the same extent as the middle classes. Does this mean that strong families, immediate and extended, are incompatible with the strong associations necessary to democracy?

Arnold Rose suggests this connection:

The hypothesis is, then, that because the American extended family, church, and community are weak, each individual feels a need to turn relatively frequently to voluntary associations for self-expression and satisfaction (achievement) of his interests, if these two functions are to be fulfilled at all. If this is the case, the voluntary association would tend to contribute to the democratic character of American society, since strong family systems, churches, and communities tend to be totalitarian in their influence over the individual, whereas voluntary associations distribute and diversify power and influence (Arnold Rose 1954, p. 59).

This presumed negative correlation between family and voluntary associations can be tested within an urban renewal area. The working hypothesis would be that those who are active in citizens' organizations have a lower rate of interaction with either immediate or extended families than other members of the same community who are not members of citizens' organizations. This should be refined to distinguish expressively oriented members from the instrumentally oriented. Note that Babchuk and Gordon in studying the Savannah-Manhattan Improvement Council in a Rochester slum found that the expressively oriented tended to be single and unattached while the instrumentally oriented tended to have families of procreation. The classification of members was covered in an
earlier section. Disagreement about the relationship between the life cycle of family roles and participation in voluntary association leads me to suggest that family life cycle be treated as a control variable. On the one hand Mogey cites these findings:

At the child-rearing stage of the family cycle, participation is least and it should be noted that households of spouses, children, and another adult, where parents presumably could engage in outside activities, do not rate high in participation. Social-class differences do not enter into this interpretation. The post-child phase of family life is also marked by considerably lessened participation in formally organized activities and by a restriction of such activities as are maintained to the immediate locality of residence (Mogey 1964, p. 518).

On the other hand Babchuk and Gordon emphasize that most members of the instrumental association which they studied were married and the average age was 54. Children, young adults and the very old tend to concentrate in expressive associations and most voluntary associations are expressive. Our interest is in the instrumental associations and within these it would seem wise to keep track of the distinction between members and leaders who are in familial limbo state and those who are in families of procreation.

To measure family interaction there are two Guttman scales developed by Key for a study of relocation in Topeka:

**Immediate Family Interaction Scale**

A. How often do you spend evenings at home with your immediate family when no outsiders are present?

1. six or seven evenings a week
2. three to five evenings a week
3. two or fewer evenings a week, never, no family

B. How much of the average day during the work week do you spend with some member of your immediate family?

1. one half or more of the average day
2. one fourth to one half of the average day
3. less than one fourth, never, no family
C. How often do you engage in activities besides work away from home when no member of your immediate family is present?

1. less than once a month, never
2. once a month but not once a week
3. at least once a week

D. Does your family celebrate birthdays?

1. always or sometimes
2. never or no family

(Key 1967, p. 126).

Some of these items were used previously by Fried in Boston.

A separate scale for extended family interaction is suggested because of indications that it is independent of immediate family interaction:

The present data indicate persons high in family integration are not necessarily high in kinship orientation and vice versa. Familism may be a useful concept, but ambiguity is likely to result in a research application unless a distinction is maintained between its measurement in the nuclear family and in the extended kinship group (Rogers 1962, p. 3).

The extended family interaction scale below was also used by Key in the Topeka relocation study:

Extended Family Interaction Scale

A. How often do you see your parents?

1. never or parents not living
2. several times a year or less
3. once a month or more

B. How often do you see most of your brothers and sisters?

1. never or no brothers and sisters
2. once a year or less
3. several times a year or more

C. How often do all or most of the relatives get together?

1. never or no relatives
2. once a year or less
3. several times a year or more

D. How often do you borrow things from or lend things to relatives?

1. never, less than once a year, no relatives
2. once a year or more

(Key 1967, p. 126)
A very useful review of research findings bearing on the network of immediate and extended family and neighbouring relationships underlying community organization is to be found in Mogey 1964, pp. 518-527. Mogey concludes that

The coincidence of extended families with closed, corporate, homogeneous community systems is generally supported. Nuclear corporate families appear most frequently in communities that are open and homogeneous... Communities with associations present as a structural entity are mainly inhabited by conjugal families and have a moderate rate of family mobility. They are characterized by divisions between kindred or ethnic groups and associational interests.

Unstable families seem to be typical of social areas where community structures, other than the domestic group and the peer group, are absent. It is doubtful if in these areas anything properly called a community exists. Mobility rates tend to be high. This generic type is the slum of much of the literature of social reform.

But it has to be carefully distinguished from the working-class area with low mobility, stable families, and much kindred interaction (Mogey 1964, p. 527).

The quotation above and the article from which it comes are rich with possibility for hypotheses in our area of interest. Enough has been said about the immediate and the extended family and next we deal with the informal neighbour group. Mogey attaches neighbouring and formal voluntary association:

Both kindreds and neighbourhoods, as membership groups, are often the sources of influence explaining the behaviour of different community role players... A principal component of both house satisfaction and community satisfaction is a sense of cohesion among next-door neighbours... Neighbouring has been found to be an active force in explaining participation in community organizations with the United States (Mogey 1964, pp. 519 and 521).

Sentiments about the local neighbourhood have received considerable attention from investigators such as Fried who were principally concerned with consequences of relocation (see Wolf and Lebeaux 1967). Neighbourhood cohesion is not always considered a building block of community organization. Neighbourhood ties may be a barrier to participation in the more formal associations which represent modern urban society:
The central change may be interpreted as the emergence on the housing estate (Barton in Oxford) of a family-centred society (nuclear) in place of the neighbourhood-centred society of St. Ebbe's... The inhabitants of Barton have lost their ties to a neighbourhood and gained in return citizenship in the wider and freer atmosphere of the varied associational life of a city (Mogey 1956, pp. 152 and 156).

Mogey also noted that ties to the kindred declined along with dependence on neighbours (see also Mogey 1964, p. 522). Schorr has presented the opposite trend as pathological and associated with poverty; social relations affected by inadequate housing tend to spread out into the streets and lots of the neighbourhood rather than deepen within the family (Schoor 1963, p. 31). Do neighbourhood cohesion and interaction among neighbours make for citizen participation in community organizations or not? The answer has a strong bearing on relocation policy. I have not reproduced attitudinal questionnaire items here but below I have given Key's neighbouring scale, which, like the family scales, is based on self reported interaction:

A. Are there any neighbours with whom you spend some time regularly?
   1. quite a few
   2. very few
   3. none

B. Do you and any of the other women help one another with meals or housework?
   1. yes
   2. no

C. Do you and any of the other women help one another by picking up things at the store?
   1. yes
   2. no

D. Do you and any of the other women help one another by caring for children?
   1. yes
   2. no

E. Do you and any of the other women help one another by helping out when someone is sick?
   1. yes
   2. no

(Key 1967, p. 149)
The scale above was designed for women. Since men are an important component of voluntary associations we would have to design another scale for them. I suggest items including discussing behavioural limits for children, any form of mutual aid or consultation in house maintenance, shared recreational activities, and forms of address.

A different approach is to treat relationships at a higher level of generality. This could be a very useful supplement to the more specific scales which deal with immediate and extended family and neighbourhood. Kluckhohn has distinguished individualistic and collectivistic relational orientations, with the latter divided between lineal and collateral. The 1968 Master's research group used one questionnaire item which was derived from Kluckhohn's item:

27 (a) How should a residents' group select its officers and representatives? Indicate your order of preference among the following:

☐ Is it best to call a meeting where everyone discusses things until they are all agreed, so that when a vote is taken most people agree on the same persons?

☐ Is it best that professionals and community workers take the main responsibility for selecting, since they have training and experience in such matters?

☐ Is it best that a meeting be called where names are put up and those are elected who get a simply majority of votes, even if there are many people who are still against them?

(b) What actually happened in the case of the organization in this area? (Clarify regarding nominations and elections)

There was a useful division of responses between the first and third categories but the second was hardly used at all. In retrospect it appears that the second response category, intended to represent the lineal orientation, should have referred to community leaders, the powerful elite who are automatically ascribed leadership positions in the various community activities. The distinction between the first and third response categories did prove useful where analysis took account of the probing and narrative comments which followed.
the simple categorical responses:

All of the Trefann Court executive members interviewed maintained that selection of leaders had been by simple majority. The majority of the Kensington Area executive members interviewed stated that selection of their officers had been by simple majority, but then added information designating that there had been a consensus vote (Gorman 1968, p. 73).

The meanings of individualistic, linear and collateral are to be found in these two statements, the first by Kluckhohn and the second by Turner who adapted it for his dissertation research with clients of family service agencies. The original instrument was designed for cross cultural use among American Indian tribes and so it is not suitable for use in urban renewal areas. Turner developed a modified instrument specifically for use with urban clients of varied ethnic origins, hence it would likely be suitable for our purposes either as it stands or with some modification (I have not seen it but Turner has invited readers of his article to write him for it). There are seven questionnaire items. First, I have given Kluckhohn's account of the meaning of the three concepts and then Turner's interpretation:

When the individualistic principle is dominant, individual goals have primacy over the goals of specific Collateral or Lineal groups. This in no sense means that there is license for the individual to pursue selfishly his own interests and in so doing disregard the interests of others. It means simply that each individual's responsibility to the total society and his place in it are defined in terms of goals (and roles) which are structured as autonomous, in the sense of being independent of particular Lineal or Collateral groupings. For example, the man who joins a business firm in the U.S. is expected, in pursuing his own goals of money-making and prestige, to be co-operating with other similarly oriented fellow workers and, in addition, is expected to have a positive attitude toward the overall goals (purposes) of the organization. Yet it is not expected that this man will remain in co-operation with these particular workers or dedicated to the goals of the particular firm if he receives an offer from another firm which will increase his salary or prestige.

A dominant Collateral orientation calls for a primacy of the goals and welfare of the laterally extended group. The group in this case is always moderately independent of other similar groups, and the problem of a well regulated continuity of group relationships through time is not highly critical. The Navaho extended families and the loosely articulated combination of these which Clyde Kluckhohn calls an "outfit" are illustrations of such groups. Even though the individua Navaho always has some autonomous roles and goals, and also always has some roles and goals which are Lineal in nature, the roles and goals
have primacy for him are those which are representative of his Collat. extended household group or "outfit".

If the Lineal principle is dominant, group goals again have primacy, there is the additional factor that one of the most important of the group goals is continuity through time. Continuity of the group through time and ordered positional succession within the group are both crucial issues when Lineality dominates the relational system. Though other patterns are possible, it appears to be the case that the most successful means of maintaining a Lineal emphasis are either those based squarely upon hereditary factors such as primogeniture or those which are assimilated to a kinship structure...And wherever Lineality is dominant, roles are also representative, but they differ from the Collaterally defined ones in that they always relate to a definite position in a hierarchy of ordered positions.

(Kluckhohn and Strodbeck 1961, pp. 18

When the individualistic orientation is dominant, the person's own goals or ambitions have primacy over those of either his family or his peers. Such a person tends to seek his own goals even if he must separate himself from his peer group or family in order to do so. When the collateral orientation is dominant, the person identifies himself with a social group and its goals rather than with individualistic goals. The goals of the extended peer group are of first importance to him, and he accepts the "one for all and all for one" theme. In this instance, the group is a present-oriented group that does not necessarily continue over a long period of time. When the lineal orientation is dominant, the person also stresses group, rather than individualistic, goals. However, the group is one that remains in existence and is seen as continuing through time as in kinship situations, family lines, and a succession of positions (Turner 1964, p. 274).

Turner found that so few clients preferred the lineal orientation that he dropped it leaving a division of 23 individualistically oriented and 17 collaterally oriented. Obviously the dominant orientation in our culture is individualistic but, of course, never to the exclusion of the others. This needs to be taken into account in writing questionnaire items; items should be written so that on the average respondents divide about fifty-fifty on a two-way choice or 33/33/33 on a three-way choice. The distinction between individualistic and collectivist can be regarded as a more general form of the distinction between a self regarding and a community regarding political ethos, J.Q. Wilson's terms, which most of the 1968 Master's research group used in explaining differences between Trefann and Kensington. The hypothesis to be
entertained would have to do with a relationship between relational orientations and citizen participation in the form of voluntary associations. The collectivist orientation subdivides into lineal and collateral. In spite of the 1968 research group's negative experience with the lineal, which has been discussed above, and Turner's dropping of the lineal aspect, I think an effort should be made to retain this distinction. The lineal emphasis could represent those old stable working class areas which are often ethnic communities; leadership is largely ascribed, there is continuity between generations, there are kin networks, and the community is relatively closed (e.g. the "urban villagers"). Quite different are other downtown areas which house the collaterally oriented who organize in peer cohorts with rapid turnover in membership, who are adapted to change and geographic mobility, and whose communities are relatively open (Mogey 1964, p. 527). The implied model distinguishes three kinds of slums -- organized individuals, lineally and collaterally organized communities.
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