

SAMPLE
ONLY

CHESTER HARTMAN
360 ELIZABETH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94114

Nov. 6, 1975

Dear Networkista:

I'm sorry it's taken so long to put together the second mailing to the network. The response was quite large (about 115 letters), and it will take me a while to structure a more regular timetable and mailing schedule into my own work life.

I'm happy to report that the responses were really encouraging qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Lots of letters began with such enthusiastic outcries as "fantastic", "exciting", "sounds great", "fine idea", and similar effusions. One much repeated theme was the value of the network as an antidote to isolation, which many people in agency jobs and outside the big cities feel most acutely. Rich Eisner wrote from Lawrence, Kansas: "I think what is most wanting... is a network that could allow us to share experiences, frustrations, successes and failures. I think we have more in common than our isolation, and a bit of informal interaction through a network, however it is ultimately defined, would help get me through the doldrums." Judith Transue wrote from Lansing: "It's good for morale, if nothing else, to know there are more out there like us -- and there are days on which that knowledge may be the only thing that keeps us going." Jeff Baloutine wrote from Austin that "I often feel very isolated in the planning profession and have a need for reinforcement of many of my ideas and stimulation to think further in new directions." Rachel Bratt wrote from Princeton, Mass.: "I've had a great sense of loneliness for day-to-day interactions with like-minded planner types. It can be a very frustrating experience to be in a rather conventional, conservative planning agency and to have to confront and deal with some rather thorny political and philosophical issues alone... Even though a network can't replace day-to-day discussions, it certainly gave me a sense of connection to people and ideas which I feel close to." Richard Glance wrote from Pittsburgh: "I was starting to believe I was the only radical planner in the US." Without attempting to come on like an ad full of endorsements for Preparation H, I think the responses clearly show that this kind of network is really needed.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE FIRST MAILING

What I've done is to pluck out from various letters the more interesting and salient comments, grouping them under various headings. (In a few instances I've simply clipped and pasted to reduce the typing task.) At the end of each section I've appended my own reactions to the comments received. These at least should be a start toward structuring further discussion and some eventual decisions. (I'm assuming, by the way, that quoting from or paraphrasing your letters without prior permission is an okay practice, unless you specify otherwise. I regard myself as a facilitator and depot for communications which are aimed at the entire network.) The question of a name for the network, and the related question of our political identity and identification, elicited the most comments. First name:

Lu Pearman (Hennepin Co. Health Coalition, Minneapolis): "Network of Radical Urbanists leaves me shuddering... It's frustrating to dwell on urban as a focus... The human problems contained in both rural and urban areas are interdependent in

cause and solution... A more inclusive and constructive tone is needed." Suggestions: Planners for Social Development; Planners for Social Change; Planners for Human Development.

Herb Gans (Columbia U.):

On the matter of names and self-definition, which I see as related. I'm not especially happy with radical urbanists, since radical stereotypes us too easily, and I'm, myself, not an urbanist - more a nation-alist. (Incidentally, it's interesting that you advertised for people in Social Policy and Working Papers, neither of which are "urban" journals.) I would favor planners - by which I mean people who are concerned with rationality in the choice of means and ~~with the consequences of such means, as long as they don't have to have professional degrees. And as long as they generally favor my kind of goals, is that help the less affluent rather than the more, the less powerful...~~ ~~shame~~ and that list could be expanded. Perhaps, in short hand, that help the underdogs. I suppose the name of my organization would be the National Organization of Professional and Other Planners that favor the underdog. More seriously, I'd favor a name that left out political adjectives like radical; how about Organization of National and Urban Planners, ONUP, or Organization of Planners and Urbanists - or something to that effect. Leaving out the political adjective enables people to forego having to decide if they are radicals or left liberals or liberals, and they may be different on different issues; besides, the virtue of the organization must be in its ideas, proposals, actions etc., and not in the label it gives itself. P.S. the name might also note the inclusion of organizers, or activists, tho I sometimes suspect that there is a vast difference of perspective between planners and organizers.

Tom Angotti (Rome) likes the word "urbanist" in the tentative title (it's widely used in Italy); "urbanologist" he finds too clinical.

Law Lubka (N. Dakota St. Univ.): " 'Urban' or 'urbanist' might well be included. Whether we work in neighborhood, regional or state planning, or in sewer, school or transportation planning, ultimately we're into problems of people in urban situations. 'Network' describes the group for the present. We are 'planners', so that (or 'planning') might be in the title. 'Radical' I associate with Weathermen, or with loners like Thoreau and Jill Johnson. I much prefer 'revolution' or 'revolutionary' in the sense of organized, ongoing, politically-hip transformation of society/social system. But 'revolutionary' would, at this point anyway, turn off many more than it would attract, and the people we now need in the network are a broad group with diverse outlooks -- those strongly aware of the limitations of the existing situation, with an understanding that things are definitely getting worse, and a genuine commitment to be part of a movement for a new society." Possible names: Network of Radical Planners for a New Society; Network of Urbanists for a New Society.

Renee Toback (U. Iowa): "Is the network intended to exclude planners in non-urban areas? I'm not entirely convinced there is an 'urban' as opposed to 'rural problem', or that a line can be drawn."

Roger Montgomery (UC, Berkeley) suggests Left Planners Union. He suggests we keep "planners" in the title, although he responds warmly to the words (in the Aug. 4 letter) under "planned city".

Morris Zeitlin (NYC): "It matters little what we tentatively call ourselves. Network of Radical Urbanists is as good as any name."

Ruth Friedlander (San Jose) was involved in the (NYC) Urban Underground and suggests that as a possible name. Robert Jacobson (NYC Pl. Commn.) also puts forth the poss-

ibility of Urban Underground, although it has connotations of resurrecting a defunct group.

Jeff Baloutine (Austin) is not excited about "urbanist". It isolates rural activists even further.

John Friedmann (UCLA): "Network of Radical Urbanists is probably as good a name as we're likely to find and still maintain the network."

Albert Mayer (NYC) feels "urbanist" doesn't cover the ground. City/urban are no longer adequate concepts, too narrow. When asked for suggestions about the Univ. of Wyoming's new School of Urban Planning, he felt a more appropriate name might be School of Community, Regional and Resource Planning, or School of Community, Regional and Environmental Planning.

Paul Daniels (Natl. Urban League, NYC) suggests that the word "radical" be dropped from the group's name. "This should be done first of all because there is nothing really radical about what we propose, and second, it tends to alienate segments of the population from which we may derive valuable support." Suggests Planners for Social Change.

Robert Eidus (N.C. Dept. of Transp.) likes the term "radical urbanist" but is not excited about the term "network".

Alan Rabinowitz (U. Wash.) puts forth TASK (I gather not as an acronym; it was the name of a post-World War II planning periodical, which he thinks Martin Meyerson edited). "I am terribly uncomfortable with the word 'planner'. We are virtually never in a position to 'plan', and we should not be represented, in the public's mind, as generators of the mess."

Carl Sussman (Camb. Policy Studies Inst.): "Network of Radical Urbanists sounds good to me. Since I'm not a degreed planner and since I still wonder about what planners really do, I particularly like the term 'urbanist'."

ing

(The following two comments I'm present/anonymously, since these are people who do not necessarily see themselves as part of the network outlined in the Aug. 4 letter; see also the related comments below under the section "Some Criticisms....")

"My only concern is the label that you have attached to the network, which certainly doesn't fit me, and I would be amazed if it fits various friends of mine [listed in the Aug. 4 mailing]. I never considered myself a radical and don't want others to put me in that box. Thus, unless you happen to decide to change the name, I must with apologies ask you not to include me in the network."

Firstly, I seriously object to being called a "radical urbanist," a "radical planner," a "left liberal planner," or any other label that relates planning to any political movement, organized or unorganized. I have spent all of my adult life trying my best to achieve better housing, better communities, and a better way of life for all Americans. That is the only label that I can ideologically accept.

Secondly, I have no objections to sharing my thoughts and ideas with any group of fellow planners, whether they agree or disagree with all or any of my views.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that perhaps you might want to have two lists; one, of your so-called "Radical Urbanists;" and another of "Socially Motivated Planners" with whom we can correspond. The latter list ought to be broadened to include a great many more people who fall in the same category. I could only agree to be included on the latter list. If this is not agreeable to you, then I would have to bow out of any participation with your network.

Peter Marcuse (Columbia U.) prefers "planners" to "urbanist", "which has to me a slightly academic and perhaps even pompous ring. I'd be content to use the word 'planner' -- and let anyone who wishes to associate him or herself with the label be welcome."

Jerry Horovitz (SF) feels the current name is good unless "urbanist" is too amorphous. Prefers "radical" to "socialist".

Stan Wenocur (U. Md.)

The cast of the material as outlined in the newsletter somehow seemed to me a bit restrictive as to focus. Social problems are interrelated and while it's hard not to get overwhelmed with complexity, it's too easy to avoid it by sticking to traditional city planning concerns or even simple urban planning. After all you can't talk about urban problems without talking about rural problems. These go hand in hand. And you can't talk about housing without talking about education, etc. etc. Therefore I'm for keeping the network as open as possible-- for taking the urbanist out of the name of the group, and for moving away from stressing physical problems. AIP identification should not be central within the membership. I realize this confuses the issue of how the group will cohere. I'd like to postpone that issue for now. It may prove to be more academic than real.

Pat Morrissy (Shelterforce, E. Orange): "In terms of defining your membership, I think it's important to retain the term 'radical' in the title. This will begin a self-selection process. The content should at a minimum be anti-capitalist, which will further the self-selection."

Rachel Bratt (Princeton, Mass.): "I'm not wild about the name, but haven't come up with anything better. So if we're NRU's, okay -- it's better than being a GNU."

Political Identity/Identification:

Bruce Dale (Rome, on his way to NY): "I am very pleased to see the word 'socialist' used repeatedly in open discussion. After five years of living and working in Italy, where the Communists have 30% of the vote and the Socialists 12%, I have been apprehensive about my decision to return to the States."

Bob Beauregard (Rutgers): "I worry about... labeling oneself radical when one functions as a professional or academic within planning, itself an activity with conservative biases; the emphasis on urbanism when people in both rural and urban areas suffer (are not the really important categories race, sex and class?)"

Roger Montgomery: "I favor an explicit socialist perspective, yet I would not feel out of place if the network followed the sage advice of Linda and Herb [Aug. 4 mailing]."

Morris Zeitlin: "It matters little at this point what kind of 'radicals' or 'planners' members of the network may be, if only because it is impossible to define either until we have communicated for a time and developed a majority consensus or both."

Ultimately, when we move into action, as we must or fall apart, experience will lead to differentiation of views, clearer identification, cohesion and organization. But we must begin with communication among as many anti-establishment radical urbanists as feel the need to band together."

Tom Angotti:

First, I would agree with those who feel that the network should have an "explicit socialist perspective." This can be done without becoming "cultish" as Gans warns. It seems to me that the network should function as a means for criticism of current government policies in the fields of planning, housing and urban development. We should be reviving and nurturing the spirit of left-wing criticism of capitalist growth, a spirit which has important precedents in the progressive, radical and working class movements of the US. We may also be concerned with presenting some alternatives, be they reforms within a capitalist framework or revolutionary changes in socialist countries. But it seems to me that the crying need is for the development of some good left-wing, basically Marxist criticism forged by sound theoretical labor.

We don't have to call ourselves socialists, but we should be socialists. The name of the network should be non-sectarian and catchy--that's all.

Criticism of urban development in the US should be moving beyond the partial liberal efforts, and the limits of the "planning profession". Let us concern ourselves with some more fundamental questions: private property, racism, monopolies, etc.--rather than fiddling around with de-goeder hustles or engaging in ritualistic pleas for more federal money--you know, all the things AIP does. There are enough people around who can identify with socialism in any one of its many variations so that the least we could be is a socialist group. Away with euphemisms and cold war anxieties: the climate is right for removing the taboos. The problem with the "radical" focus is that it can cover just about any position on the political spectrum (except the center of course), and we may just wind up with no identifiable principles and ideas which can unify us--mere amorphous liberalism. Now, if we are left-wing radicals, ~~we're not socialists~~ and we're not liberals, are we not socialists of some sort anyway?

Peter Marcuse agrees with Herb Gans that "we shouldn't get hung up on the issues of defining 'radical'. The main thrust is clear enough from the newsletter and will become even clearer as the network develops. Let those who like what it's doing stay and those who don't, leave. Let's fight about real issues, not names."

Rich Eisner (U. Kansas) feels we ought to avoid the issue of definition; at the moment he's not sure he's a radical or a planner.

Michael Rancer/Paula Silberthau (Oakland): "We're not sure that giving in to the inevitable term 'radical' is the best solution -- it's a pretty vague and imprecise

word... A name and concept employing the term 'radical' frankly doesn't grab us. Some other definition must be available somewhere; unfortunately, we're at a loss to come up with anything better for the moment."

Lu Pearman:

Radical - This is a red flag word regardless of what connotation is placed on it by the membership. It is also a input or process word rather than outcome word. In my own experience I prefer not to dwell on the personal or philosophical characteristics of the committed professionals, or on the procedures and goals they implement. The major focus after all should be outcome of these efforts for clients. Therefore rather than dwelling on a descriptive term such as radical, I would prefer to see emphasis on an outcome goal such as "social development." For in the final analysis there is no purpose or justification for radicalism if it does not effect a social climate that is conducive to the development of individual clients.

Jerry Horowitz: "An organization with a socialist perspective is essential... But it is important not to alienate potential participants by making the network become dominated by ideological debate or dogmatic rhetoric. I would recommend an open membership with action/issue-oriented broadly defined socialist perspective. No principles of unity at the start..."

John Hancock (U. Wash.) feels the network should be built as much as possible on a clear radical perspective and identity.

Louise Taylor (Syracuse U.):

I can't deal with the term radical in light of a) the composition of the group (those known to me on the list - including myself); b) the setting within which we would be functioning. That is, I think it unlikely that any extreme political stance can (will) be taken by such a group beyond that captured in print or mulled over at conferences. It seems important, then, to decide if the focus will be on an exchange of radical ideas or on radical action.

Richard Glance: "Keep the network very loose and informal at this time. After it has been able to mature and develop, it will take on a personality of its own."

Mimi Rosenberg (Homefront, NYC): "I feel the network should raise issues and evoke discussion around strategies which challenge the concept of private ownership and private financing of property... I feel it is important to eliminate the fear and misinformation stigma attached to the word 'socialism'. A socialist perspective need not be 'cultish' or 'restrictive'."

Tony Schuman (NYC):

My basic response is that the network should define itself explicitly as socialist. At this time it is imperative to disabuse the public about the mythology of the red menace, and to dispel the notion that it is planners, or urbanists, who actually do the "planning" in this country.

An explicitly socialist organization or network need not be narrowly sectarian or irresponsibly revolutionist. This question was the subject of nine months of discussion at Homefront, before we decided that it was important to identify ourselves as socialists. By positing the replacement of capitalism by socialism as the essential condition for the solving of housing and urban develop-

ment problems, we in no way cut ourselves off from the very real problems people face day to day. Rather, we address these problems in the context of available tools and programs and attempt to interject an analysis which helps people to understand the root causes of their difficulties and their relation to other aspects of daily life (unemployment, inflation, poor mass transit, etc.)

It is also my view that liberal and left-liberal responses to "the urban crisis" already have adequate outlets and communications networks; indeed, they are often sanctified by the New York Times and the major broadcasting networks. A professional planner of radical persuasion, in addition to struggling against the domineering aspects of bourgeois professionalism, ought to exploit this contradiction by using whatever forum he/she may have to demystify the planning process. Anything less is class collaborationist.

My primary interest is not in improving "urbanism" per se but in helping to construct a socialist society where rational planning is a basic cornerstone. That is the source of the meandering thoughts about the current level of political consciousness in the U.S. It is a question that very much occupies our debates at Homefront, in political study groups, and in general political work. How can we raise issues relating to housing and neighborhoods in such a way that demonstrates the inadequacy of reform approaches without forsaking the present miserable conditions in the name of the glorious future that none of us may be around to see? But we are finding, as I mentioned in the letter, that people are receptive to a radical analysis when it corresponds to their own experience. For example, the focus on banks rather than landlords as the villains of the piece. For another example, we oppose simplistic calls for "community control" (or neighborhood planning boards and the like) because the communities never have the means to implement what they might propose, and their advisory role is tolerated only to a point. The result is that the government is able to turn around and accuse the communities of not bringing about results.

Having a specifically socialist orientation would not mean an avoidance of traditional planning issues; nor would it mean working totally outside the framework of "reformist" politics. It simply means that reforms are evaluated for what they are, and their merit determined by whether or not they are in contradiction with the real solutions which require a total revamping of our socio-economic system.

Chester Hartman (SF): Wow, that's quite a set of responses. Obviously, it's going to be hard (impossible?) to settle on a name that we all can live with. I agree mainly with the comments that say we ought to go light on the question for the time being and not push it too hard before we've had a chance to develop a real identity, through further communication and through common work. As we move along, various tendencies will begin to group together. That separating process will also, I hope, involve people dropping out who do not feel comfortable with a basically radical group. I see a real distinction between those who feel, for strategic reasons, that words like "radical" or "socialist" should not be in our name, and those who reject those words because they feel totally distant from and hostile to that kind of identification. Those in the latter camp really ought not to be part of the network, in my view. At any rate, we all ought to try to bounce some reactions off of the various comments I have excerpted. The various comments about "urban" being too restrictive have real validity.

Geographical Scope:

Tom Angotti feels we ought at least make contact with working groups in other countries that more or less share our basic commitment. European radical urbanists, he notes, are all explicitly socialist.

Lew Lubka feels we ought to get ourselves rolling now and plug into a larger network later. We should be aware of international conferences; soon we should be in a position to send delegates, present papers, etc.

Richard Glance feels that Canadian-US contacts are especially crucial, in part because of the geographic-environmental relationship of many border urban areas (Vancouver-Seattle, Toronto-Buffalo, etc), and he also wants more information on the Canadian "state of the art".

Michael Rancer-Paula Silberthau suggest that Mexican urbanists/planners be included, as well as Puerto Ricans and Cubans.

* At the moment, because of expense and practical difficulties involved, I think it makes sense to have a modest approach to non-N. American contacts. Tom Angotti's proposal seems sound, and I would like to request that any of you who knew of groups or key individuals in other countries (including Mexico, Puerto Rico and Cuba) send me their names. Michael Nerton, a community organizing consultant/technical assistance provider from London, who dropped in to see me on a US trip over the summer, has indicated he might be able to undertake distributing network mailings in the UK, financing it through reader contributions. He also might act as a clearing house for submitting materials from the UK. This sounds like a really good idea, and he and I will explore it further. Also on the foreign front, I've learned of an English housing and community action network that's recently been organized by people at the Architectural Assn. It seems quite similar to what we're doing, and I'm in the process of exploring how we might relate the two efforts. AA also held a Community Action and Social Change Conference last May, which attracted people from all over Europe. I'm asking Hans Farms, who coordinated the conference, to prepare a short report for our network, including a list of the papers presented and how they can be ordered.

(That * in the margin above is a technique I'm going to use from now on to flag any items that specifically are in need of some feedback response from network members. In a lengthy newsletter, this will permit you to pick out easily the items where a quicky response would be useful and desirable. Obviously, not everyone is going to feel they want to respond to everything raised in these newsletters, but this will be one way that you can get back a pinpointed response on items we should be sharing views about.)

Conferences and Meetings Among Ourselves:

Bob Beauregard, Louise Taylor, Peter Marcuse and Valerie Menager (UCLA) all feel regional network meetings are most important initially and that initiative for these must come from persons throughout the network. Peters stresses the need for such meetings to be well organized in advance in order to be successful.

Ruth Friedlander feels national meetings are difficult for the less mobile of us. "Only after viable local networks have been established would local representatives able to attend have local organizations to report to."

Richard Glance stresses the need for regional meetings to develop comradeship and face-to-face contact; we should, however, aim for a national conference annually.

Lew Lubka urges that we think of national get-togethers as soon as possible.

My view is that local and regional meetings should be the first priority. The only way this will happen is if someone in each area takes it upon her or himself to organize such a gathering. The next mailing will contain a list of everyone's name and address; after that, there's no excuse for not doing it. If such meetings are held, reports should be submitted for circulation to the entire network.

Forming an Organization:

Carl Sussman writes:

Having been involved in a study of a group that was essentially socialist urbanists (the RPAA) during the 1920's and '30's, I believe the development of a journal and some semblance of organization is important. The RPAA remained small and localized. Perhaps they would have been no more successful had they been large and national given how far out of the mainstream they were. But like them, I don't think we have a chance unless we try to be visible.

/RPAA - Regional Planning Assn. of America/

John Friedmann feels a communications/mutual support device is better than a formal organization, membership, dues, annual meetings, etc.

Al Wroblewski (Minneapolis) expresses some apt cautionary words about the dangers of an organization: "My only fear of all those rallying of the troops is that it not become a little elite of hotshot planners who think they're pretty smart radicals getting \$15-20,000 a year. I believe a major push of the network must be populist in nature, geared to demystifying expertise and knocking down the false god of credentials."

It would seem that transforming the network into a formal organization is at best way down the pike, and may never be a good idea. I'd like people to address themselves to the question periodically, nonetheless.

Starting a Journal:

Rich Eisner: "Academic journals (JAIP, etc.) repeatedly leave me asking myself just what the hell 'they' are talking about. And the professional oriented material bores me to tears. Where is there a radical 'participants' view? The last thing radical planners need, regardless of how we/they define ourselves/themselves is another 'journal' that will become the 'vehicle' for the publish or perish syndrome. Save us from our own rhetoric!"

Bob Beauregard: "Staughton Lynd once wrote that once organizations are formed they are more conservative than their founders. Establishing a journal might accelerate this process. On the issue of a journal I am undecided. Certainly there are few outlets for writing in this area, particularly in planning. On the other hand, that journal could easily be coopted into the academic publish or perish function and lose any orientation it might have initially had to serve other ends."

Tom Angotti agrees with Morris Zeitlin about the needs for a progressive planning journal and would like to help get one started when he returns to the US next year.

Jerry Horowitz feels a journal should be action oriented rather than just an intellectual exercise, but that this is a later task.

John Friedmann thinks it's not too early to be thinking about a journal. In fact, "Barclay Hudson and I have been toying with the idea for some time; as a source of ideas and experience, and as a journal that would awaken critical consciousness in

all of us." He even has a tentative name, Social Practice.

Alan Gartner, publisher of Social Policy magazine, has offered to make his journal available to us in any way that would be helpful: e.g., producing a special section derived from network generated material, or helping to give birth to a new journal within Social Policy (in the way Ms. began as a special section of New York.)

Herb Gans:

on the matter of activities, I'd go along with Morris Zeitlin on the idea of a journal, because this gives the organization something quite specific to do, and would indicate whether it is an organization or a committee of correspondence. Moreover, as you probably know, there is a possibility that ~~in~~ the JAIP will become part of JAIP's "communication package" - which means it will be taken away from its current editors and many of its current contributors - in which case there is an important vacuum to be filled, at once. Perhaps such a journal might coalesce with Social Policy or Working Papers, both of which could use some financial help to stay alive.

Lew Lubka feels an organization and journal may evolve, but we should get something going first and work from there.

Michael Rancer/Paula Silberthau like the idea of a journal or other publication, but down the road. "A modest, solid, well thought out beginning probably is the preferable course for now."

Richard Glance: "I hope within a year or two we will be able to create a radical planning journal."

Peter Marcuse is ambivalent about formal articles. Circulating "working papers" for comment prior to publication elsewhere makes excellent sense. Decent magazines suitable for formal publication now exist: Social Policy, Working Papers, Socialist Revolution. "I'd rather see us strengthen them rather than compete, I think."

I see a radical urban/planning journal as real need, although most of the cautionary words about excessive academicism, etc. are well taken. The best route may indeed be some tie-in with an existing journal. At any rate, I'd like to see any proposals people have, now or in the near future, circulated to the entire network.

Including Organizers in the Network:

Everyone who responded to this question felt organizers definitely ought to be part of the network. Renee Toback perhaps summed it up best: "A radical planner to some extent is an organizer. Probably organizers who consider themselves also planners are whether they are so educated and labeled or not." A real question, as Roger Montgomery notes, may be how to reach them (although closer working ties with the Shelterforce Collective and Homefront in NY may provide us with a great many contacts.)

Let me just record a few more comments and suggestions that didn't fit into the above categories:

Mimi Rosenberg suggests that we might compile a resource list of local network members' skills, as a way of touching bases with and providing assistance to grass roots struggles. That's a first-rate idea, one which should be done locally, and I invite people to take the initiative by either circulating a specific proposal and mechanism through the network as a whole, or by taking it upon yourselves to contact people in your area (as soon as the list arrives.)

* Stan Wenocur, anent the issue of picking a name (but with more general applicability) asks how and by whom the winning idea for a name will be selected. I don't know and would like to have any ideas people have as to how decisions might get made among this kind of a group. I suspect and hope that there will be few things that call for decision among the network as a whole (as opposed to local actions); but we ought to have some agreement as to how these decisions should be made.

* Susan Sternberg, a planning student at Wisconsin, writes that "some of the people in the network are the kinds of authors I read in classes, and it's a little intimidating to me at this point to think of writing in the same newsletter as one of them. What I have mostly are questions... As a student I would like to know where radical urbanists are teaching and how they feel about the programs they are in." The network currently is quite short on students and recent graduates, something I hope we can soon remedy. I understand what she is saying but think we should all strive not to allow differences in age, experience, reputation, etc. get in the way of good communication and collective action. It would be good if some of the academic types could respond to her specific question, too.

SOME CRITICISMS AND ISSUES OF PERSONAL SECURITY

Not all responses were so positive and constructive. Several persons objected to being labeled "radical" and were distressed to find themselves recipients of such a mailing (one even went so far as to threaten a lawsuit if his name was not removed from the list.) This raises several issues.

First, I think it was a mistake on my part to have circulated the list in the first mailing. I did so because I wanted recipients to get an idea of the number and kind of people who were receiving the Aug. 4 letter. But I did not realize that might aggrive some people, and I'd like to apologize to anyone who felt damaged or insulted in any way by being labeled "radical". Beyond that first round, however, I feel strongly that circulation of a list of names, addresses, kinds of work we're involved in, etc. is essential to the network idea; for part of that idea is to facilitate people getting in touch with each other directly, bringing together city- or region-wide groupings for discussion and action, and personal contact. One respondent (a supporter of the network proposal) felt there were dangers that such a list could be used by government agencies, as an AIP blacklist, or for some other fell purposes. That may be a risk (although in my view a small one), but I think the benefits far outweigh that risk, both in terms of practicality and the symbolic-political step of a few hundred urban planning types openly defining themselves as radicals or openly associating themselves with such a group.

Because some people may not want their names to appear on such a list, I am holding up until the next mailing a full list of network members and addresses. There may be people who want to receive network mailings and even define themselves as radicals or socialists, but who for a variety of reasons (most likely, not wishing to run a personal or professional risk) don't want their names to appear on that list. For example, one person phoned to tell me that, on the advice of his lawyer, he felt he had to send me a disclaimer letter, asking to be "publicly removed from the mailing list" because he had US government agencies among his clients, but at the same time, in his phone call and in a hand-written note accompanying the disclaimer letter, he expressed great interest in the network and asked to be invited to any Bay Area meetings.

I am unsure how we ought to handle situations of that kind: is it an acceptable and legitimate way to relate to the network? It's not an easy problem to answer, particularly for those with good memories and personal experiences of the McCarthy witch-

* hunts, and I'd very much like to solicit people's views on this matter. The second
* of the two anonymous quotes is the Name section suggests a two-tier mailing list:
* people might want to react to this idea as well. And there is also the question of
* anonymous or pseudonymous reports -- there may be instances in which a network mem-
* ber would like to discuss an issue or personal situation but not reveal her/his
* identity. Is that an acceptable practice?

A related question which already has come up, and which probably will come up more
frequently in the future, is whether and under what conditions to allow others to
use our mailing list. I already have had two such requests: from the Shelterforce
Collective, and from the Small Towns Inst. in Ellensburg, Wash., which wants to
mail informational material on STI, an organization that promotes small communities
as alternatives to recent US development patterns. In part because of the possible
sensitivity of some of issues I raised above, I'd like some guidance on this sub-
ject. One way to proceed is to ask anyone who wants to communicate with our members
to submit the materials, and we'll include them in our packets. But that means more
work at this end, and in some cases (e.g., the Shelterforce people, who want to send
their newsletter to our list regularly) doesn't really meet the request. Another
method is to poll people each time (not very rapid, among other defects). A third
possibility is to leave it to my judgement, in consultation with other Bay Area
people who are, or will be, helping to put out the network mailings. (My judgement
on those two requests would be to grant them.) I've decided not to act on either re-
quest until I get some feedback from you people, so if anyone feels strongly one way
* or another, please let me know.

LOST SOULS

* About two dozen envelopes from the original mailing were returned "addressee un-
known" (most from the PEO list). I'll list them (with the city I had for them), and
if any of you know or have leads as their whereabouts, let me know. Also, while I
got from you information on how to contact several of the people I listed as "lost"
* in the first mailing, I still would like to locate Frank DiGiovanni, Don Mazotti,
and Nelman Hill -- any leads?

Jay Bitkower, NYC	Elizabeth MacKintosh, NYC
T'Ing Pei, Brooklyn	Wayne McCabe, Edison, NJ
Bernard Choden, St. Louis	Eli Comay, Toronto
Felix Obinani, Bklyn	Dean Armstrong, E. Lansing
Moreland Smith, Atlanta	Jeffrey Swain, Rochester
Edwin Finder, Bklyn	D.G. Millstein, Rye, NY
Roslyn Diamond, NYC	Robert McCabe, Cincinnati
Donald Lenz, Madison	Michael Joroff, Cambridge
William Toole, Warren RI	James Cleaveland, NYC
Carl Byers, Bklyn	Geraldine McNerry, NYC

\$\$\$

On the cash-flow front, 28 people sent in contributions (totalling \$290). While
money is not a problem at the moment, a steady influx of contributions will help
keep the operation afloat that much longer and postpone the day when a letter has
to go out saying we're going under unless \$1000 is raised in the next two weeks.

PUBLICATIONS, REQUESTS AND PROJECT SUGGESTIONS

Marie Kennedy sent me a copy of an article she wrote on the Open Design Office (Cambridge), an experiment in creating a women's architecture and planning office, begun in 1973, based on the principles of non-hierarchy, flexible working schedules, and elimination of the profit motive. It's very much worth reading, and I'll be glad to send copies to anyone who requests one. Marie can be reached at 373 Broadway, Cambridge 02139, for more direct contact. I'm hoping that she, or others who helped organize or participated in last summer's Women's School of Planning and Architecture will write up that experience for the network.

Alan Gartner, publisher of Social Policy, is interested in exploring the possibility of an article on the growth-control ordinance controversy, particularly as it was highlighted in the recent US Circuit Court opinion upholding Petaluma's ordinance. If anyone feels they'd like to tackle this important subject, get in touch with Alan directly (184 Fifth Ave., Suite 500, NYC 10010).

For those of you who haven't seen it, the March, 1975 issue of Cuba Review is devoted to a good 19-page report by Tony Schuman on how the Cubans have been handling their housing problems. It's available for \$1.25 from the Cuba Resource Center, PO Box 206, Cathedral Station, NYC 10025. (As a general suggestion on publications of this sort, those of you connected with universities and other institutions might have the library order copies, as a way of getting these materials into wider circulation and supporting them financially.)

Richard Glance wants to bring to everyone's attention a valuable organizational tool he used while working at the Architect's Workshop in Pittsburgh. It's the Source Catalogue #2, Housing, put out by Swallow Press in Chicago (\$2.95, or order directly from the Source Working Collective, PO Box 21066, Wash. 20009.) It contains good information about tenants rights organizing, public housing, open housing, third world, and changing national urban housing policy. Their catalogue #3, Design, also has just come out.

Ellen Lurie of the Community Service Society (105 E. 22 St. NYC 10010) has sent in their "Citizen's Guide to Charter Reform", "The Politics of Budget Decisions", and "Summary of Activities of Technical Assistance Unit". I imagine copies can be requested through Ellen.

Housing and People is a (bilingual) quarterly published by the housing program of the Canadian Council on Social Development. The Spring, 1975 issue includes an article on neglect of the socio-cultural aspects of housing and an article on women's time allocation and the home environment, as well as some good book reviews. Subscriptions are \$6/year; write Jan McClain, Mg. Ed., at the Council, Box 3505, Station C, Ottawa, K1Y 4G1.

Jerry Selig of the Inst. on Pluralism and Group Identity has available a catalogue of the Institute's publications. He's reachable at 105 W. Adams St., Chicago 60603.

Joseph Baker, new director of Laval Univ's. School of Architecture (Quebec), has sent in a good description of his previous work at the Community Design Workshop at McGill, which provided architectural services to community groups and training in alternative professional roles for architecture students. The article appeared in the October, 1973 Canadian Architect, and if you're interested in having a copy, write him directly (Cité Universitaire, Quebec G1K 7P4) or let me know and I'll make a copy for you.

Tom Angotti has sent from Rome a short (6-page) paper entitled "Libya's Social In-

frastructure: Major Advances and Problems". I can make copies for anyone interested in seeing it. Tom is also preparing something for the network on Bologna's interesting urban renewal program.

The People's Guide to Urban Renewal and Community Development Programs: A Community Defense Manual (by Les Shipnuck and Dennis Keating, with Mary Morgan) is available for \$3 from the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Comm., 2022 Blake St., Berkeley Cal. 94704. It's a first-rate how-to-do-it resource book on federal programs, discussing strategies and tactics as well, written in a down-to-earth style.

Another recent Keating-Shipnuck opus (along with John Denton and Joel Rubenzahl) is "The Politics of Local Citizens Participation in Community Development Revenue Sharing: A First Impression -- Berkeley, Cal." If you'd like a copy, write Dennis at 432 Hudson St., Oakland 94618. They are particularly interested in making contact with others in the network similarly involved with local revenue sharing politics who might want to write up other local case studies.

The prolific Keating, an attorney and planner who's been heavily involved in the Berkeley rent control battles, also has in draft form a short article discussing whether it makes sense for tenant groups to organize for rent control, whether it's a radical reform or a dead end. It's scheduled for eventual publication in Shelterforce, but if any of you would like advance copies, write Dennis.

We've received a communication from Astrid Merget, co-director of the new Government Services Equalization Center (announcement enclosed). She writes: "We could benefit from the identification of a network of public-interest planners who would donate their services either on a pro bono basis or reduced fee basis on the particular legal cases and policy/research projects we undertake." Yale Rabin has already been heavily involved in this kind of work, and Peter Marcuse, a member of the Center's Advisory Council, is helping to shape the broad strategies of the project and is also developing a spin-off venture in the NYC region. Any of you interested in providing assistance to this really useful project should contact Astrid Merget directly, possibly in terms of initiating other regional/metropolitan spin-off operations (Peter Marcuse is at the Div. of Urban Planning, Columbia Univ., NYC 10027. Yale Rabin at 8238 Williams Ave., Philadelphia 19150, in case you want to contact them directly.) I'm also asking Merget to funnel specific requests through us for the future.

Cushing Dolbear has sent in the text of her Sept. 25, 1975 testimony before the Senate Housing Comm., and with her usual clarity and forthrightness lays out the magnitude of the current housing problem and the kinds of solutions needed. I think it's something we should all read and have reproduced it for circulation to the entire network. She also brings to our attention Rep. Parren Mitchell's speech introducing the Emergency Low Income Housing Act of 1975, drafted by and available from the Ad Hoc Low Income Housing Coalition, 1346 Conn. Ave. NW, Washington 20036.

In the first mailing I made reference to a West Coast regional "Radicals in the Technology" proposal. I'm enclosing a more detailed description of their idea, including a list of contacts.

Derek Shearer is among the organizers of the California Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policy, to be held at the Sacramento Convention Center Jan. 9-11. The conference will bring together activists involved in state and local government, particularly elected and appointed officials, who feel the need to share ideas and experience on innovative approaches to public policy. It is an outgrowth of the national conference on this subject held last summer in Madison. It looks like a good working conference, with workshops on taxes, economic development, food,

health and public employees. For further information about the conference (and copies of the proceedings of the Madison conference @ \$2.25) contact Derek at the Calif. Public Policy Center, 1434 Westwood Blvd., LA 90024.

Pat Morrissy of Shelterforce would like to encourage someone in the network to do an article on the Real Estate Research Corp. and its role as HUD's chief advisor and particularly the conferences they've been giving for local redevelopment officials. It's a good idea -- any takers? (At a minimum, maybe any of you who have attended the local HUD-FERC road shows might write up a short account of what went on.)

Several people asked about the Marx and the Megalopolis conference I referred to in my Aug. 4 letter. John Mollenkopf, who attended, has provided the following description: On Feb. 15-16, 1975, the New School for Social Research hosted a conference entitled "Marx and the Megalopolis", which attracted several hundred people. Though mainly NY area planners and urbanists, the conference also drew academics from places like Montreal and S.F. Organized by Bill Tabb (Queens College Economics Dept.) and David Gordon (New School Economics Dept.), the conference presented a dozen mostly economic analyses of urban development, suburbanization, socialist cities, and the developing urban crisis. Tabb and Larry Sawers of American Univ. are presently negotiating to publish an edited collection of these papers and several others (the tentative title is New Perspectives on the Urban Political Economy.) While many of the papers present fairly abstract analyses of the relationship of urban form to capitalist development, a great many also present detailed empirical analyses. Overall, they represent the best of an exciting and rapidly growing radical literature on urban problems. I imagine Tabb would be willing to supply anyone interested with a copy of the book's tentative table of contents and any of the papers you wanted to see in advance.

Bob Goodman suggested that someone ought to write up the Coop City debacle and what its implications are for housing policy. Any of the New Yorkers up for it?

And on the subject of that great and beleaguered city, do any of you out there want to take a stab at some trenchant radical observations and analyses about what's going on in the Big Apple and what it means for all the smaller apples around the country?

Al Wroblewski, an old PEO-er, had urged establishing this kind of network as far back at the 1970 PEO conference, at the time he was involved in advocacy planning for a blue-collar neighborhood in St. Paul. Finding no takers, he subsequently began his own tri-weekly newspaper, the Minnesota Leader, a very lively one-man operation. Subs are \$6 a year, and he might be willing to send out a sample copy to anyone interested (2314 Elliot Ave. So., Minneapolis 55404). The idea of one-person newsletters, of the IF Stone type, done locally is one that has always intrigued me; they have a character and freedom that are quite unique. Those I have seen cover lots of planning-related local issues in a far more critical way than does the daily press. One that has especially impressed me in the past is Point of View, bi-weekly put out by Roldo Bartimole (2150 Rexwood, Cleveland), for the benefit of network members in the Cleveland area, as well as people interested in the possibility of starting such an endeavor in their locality.

Matt Edel, who teaches in the Urban Studies program at Queens College, CUNY, is interested in lining up chances for his students to do interesting internships. If any of you have suggestions or requests for student help, call him at 520-7150, 7350.

Bill Siembieda would like to see us do an analysis of where Title 8 residents are located and why; in what way does legislation promote active freedom of choice and in what ways does it constrain it? He's also interested in having us do studies of the social impact of environmental legislation. Anyone interested is exploring this

further should contact Bill at the Urban & Rural Studies Program, U.C. San Diego.

A good, radical 70-page study by Ken Kilimnik entitled Redevelopment In Philadelphia-- Who Pays? Who Benefits? (June, 1975) is available (for \$1) from the Phila. Tenants Information Service, 5622 Germantown Ave., Rm. 204, Philadelphia 19144. They have also produced a shorter report, Is North Philly Being recycled into Another Society Hill? (June, 1974), also available for a buck. And they publish a bi-monthly newsletter, Tenants' Advocate.

Andy Melamed (the very first city planner I ever met in my life and the friend I consulted when I was thinking of going to planning school) has, I'm happy to say, taken up the city report idea, with his enclosed "Letter from Montreal". I hope it will be the first in a long series from many of you.

Ruth Friedlander has asked to have the enclosed "Criteria for a Feminist Design Award" circulated to the network. Any comments should be sent to her (and to me, if there are issues and reactions you want circulated to the network as a whole); and any Bay Area women interested in linking up with her group should contact Ruth directly.

As guidelines for the future regarding various publications you think network members might be interested in: I think the best thing to do would be to send me titles (with a short description, if possible), and I'll list these each mailing, together with information on availability. (If possible, send me copies of the reports, articles, etc. as well.) Looking to the future, I can foresee possible problems arising with regard to materials submitted for distribution. One problem will be whether to exert any editorial control, and if so, how and according to what criteria. Circulating everything and anything members submit is one possibility, but there are problems of cost (reproduction and postage) as well as reader overload. I'm not sure how this all should be handled and when it will come up, but I'd like your thoughts on what general principles to apply and what procedures to use. Part of the answer of course will be discretion on the part of network-ers -- submitting material in as brief a form as possible, with some self-screening as to what ought to go in a packet distributed to everyone. These (perhaps premature) cautionary notes hopefully will not discourage people from starting to submit materials; right now, the problem is lots of promises but little actual material. For those of you with access to reproduction machines (or budgets), it would be best to send me enough copies of whatever you submit so that all costs do not fall on the network; at the moment the size of our mailing list is about 500; I'll keep reporting a running total periodically, to guide those of you at offices and universities who can make copies yourselves.

ME

A couple of people in writing back, have asked what ever became of my appeal to Harvard regarding their failure to reappoint me in 1970. (For those unfamiliar with that history, in late 1969 I was informed by the Harvard City Planning Dept. that my teaching contract would not be renewed. That decision appear^{ed} to me and many others as highly political, rather than based on academic grounds, and as a result of extensive protest within the Harvard community and by planners in other parts of the country the university took the unprecedented step of establishing a 5-person investigating and review committee, consisting of Harvard faculty outside the Graduate School of Design.)

In brief, what has happened is the following: It took two years to establish the review committee, because of procedural difficulties within the university. It then

took the committee over three years to produce a 300-page report, which was transmitted to the GSD faculty in mid-September. The faculty now is reviewing the document and will eventually act on it. The report, long and confusingly written, contains no recommendations (the committee felt this was beyond its mandate), some curious and conflicting conclusions, and a whole lot of factual material supportive of my claims that my academic freedom and due process standards had been violated. For example, the GSD's reappointment procedures were found to be "shockingly lax" and "execrable"; Harvard president Pusey's role in the whole affair was found to be "troublesome". One critical problem for the committee was that, although the GSD had mandated the investigation, virtually all of the key actors on the university's side -- the three tenured members of my former department (Reginald Isaacs, Frank Vigier and Bill Nash), former dean Jose Sert, and others -- either refused to cooperate at all with the committee's investigation or did so incompletely. Sert's successor, Maurice Kilbridge, GSD dean during the whole 1969-70 controversy, was criticized by the committee for his "defensive posture throughout," which was "hardly conducive to a full and fair airing of the situation", and the committee found some of his claims "hard to believe". The Crimson is reporting and pursuing the story really well and aggressively, something that was very important in forcing the university to set up the review body in 1970 and will be an important factor in not allowing the whole thing to be pushed under the rug at this point. It makes me all the more convinced how important news media are as an antidote to institutional behavior.

The matter now is in the lap of the GSD faculty, which must decide how to handle the committee's findings and what action, if any, it wants to take against former and current colleagues who did not cooperate with the investigation. Everyone there would, of course, like the matter to just go away. And at times I feel pretty much that way myself. Pursuing the appeal took several hundred hours of my time over the past five years in preparing and responding to documents. Because the case does have important implications for academic freedom and because of the widespread support and interest I received when it was "hot", I felt I ought to stay with it, even though that whole world seems light years away from where I now am. I doubt whether the GSD will act to support my claims, and I probably will continue to press the appeal at the university level, the AAUP and possibly through the courts. I imagine the whole thing will continue to grind on slowly, and I'll keep you periodically informed of any major happenings. If any of you want more detailed information, let me know, and I can send you copies of documents and newsstories that go into the matter more comprehensively.

While I'm on the subject of me, I'd like to describe a little about what I'm now doing, in part as a way of encouraging others in the network to get a bit autobiographical and to circulate thoughts and information about our political-professional-personal lives. (If for no other reason, it's an efficient way for poor letter-writers like myself to communicate regularly with friends.)

For the past year or so I've been experimenting with trying to have a "non-institutionalized" life. I left the Housing Law Project at UC Berkeley in mid-1974, right after completing my book Yerba Buena: Land Grab and Community Resistance in San Francisco. I wanted to see what kind of work life I could put together, without a full-time and long-term job commitment and without a university or other institution to "define" me, to myself and others. ("What do you do?" "I'm at UC.") To date, the results have been pretty satisfactory. Financially, things have been made easy by the fact that I was eligible for unemployment benefits -- \$90 a week (tax free) for 65 weeks. My life- and consumption-style are such that the sum is almost enough to carry me through, supplemented by occasional consulting and some savings. I've regarded it as a low-level Guggenheim, giving me the freedom to work on what I please without worrying about money. I'm just starting my last 13 weeks (interim consulting gigs have the effect only of suspending payments -- one is

still entitled to the full 65 weeks, no matter how long a period the payments are spread over), and so sometime early next year I'll have to reassess the monetary basis of my existence. The occasional consulting opportunities have by and large been interesting and useful; they also can pay awfully well, and if it were possible to count on six weeks or so of that kind of consulting each year that would be an alternative way of providing a financial base from which to operate freely over the other 46 weeks.

The major consulting I did this year was with the Stanford Research Inst., which had an evaluation contract with the Hawaii Housing Authority to assess their various public housing management experiments being carried out with HUD HMIP (Housing Management Improvement Program) funds. It was interesting and enjoyable, particularly looking at their experiments with tenant self-management and management of a big high-rise project by a private realty firm. Some of the interest and enjoyment came from seeing how such experiments are mis-managed and mis-conceived, how a bureaucracy like the Hawaii Housing Authority deals with innovation, and how a big r&d outfit like SRI operates. Another consulting job has been carrying out a user needs survey for the architect hired by a neighborhood housing development corporation (the Yerba Buena tenants group who brought the relocation suit against the S.F. Redevelopment Agency and got the right to develop 400 low-rent units, subsidized by an increase in the city's hotel tax, as partial settlement of their suit.) We developed some interesting techniques, using slide shows to small groups of the elderly to elicit their design preferences. And I'm just about to begin a consulting project with the state's Dept. of Housing & Comm. Dev. to design a reporting/evaluation system by which the state can monitor and oversee the relocation activities of local renewal agencies.

Perhaps the largest chunk of my time over the past year has been spent working on a local newspaper, Common Sense, and on the organization of which it is a part, the S.F. Socialist Coalition. The paper is an attempt to reach a mass, primarily working-class audience, rather than the left. It focusses primarily on local news, although there are national and international stories as well. It's really one of the better left papers around, in terms of writing style, appearance, absence of sectarianism and rhetoric (I'll be glad to send copies to anyone who's interested), and I've spent a good deal of time, not only writing for it (on everything from community gardens, property tax reform and neighborhood health center politics to the usual housing, redevelopment and neighborhood preservation struggles), but as a member of the overall editorial collective, trying to guide its growth and raise money for it. The Socialist Coalition is in the process of merging into a larger Bay Area socialist organization, with a strong emphasis on community and workplace organizing. Presenting radical ideas and reports on urban problems to a mass audience in a newspaper format is something I find very challenging, and I find myself increasingly drawn to working within the framework of an explicitly socialist organization and perspective. (If any of you in the Bay Area are interested in learning more about or working with the organization or paper, let me know.)

I've also been trying to spend a lot of time providing assistance to community groups (of the kind we used to provide with Urban Planning Aid in Boston, but on an individual rather than organized basis -- there is as yet no advocacy planning group like UPA in the Bay Area.) One recent project that's been taking up a lot of time has been trying to get a relocation ordinance passed that would require private developers to provide the persons they displace with comparable replacement housing as a precondition for receiving a demolition permit (for buildings with three or more units.) It's a pretty advanced concept: I don't know of any other city (except NYC, as an adjunct of rent control) that interferes with a property owner's absolute right to kick people out and tear down the building. The ordinance is backed by a wide coalition of community groups and came out of a well publicized

struggle around proposed demolition of the International Hotel, downtown adjacent to Chinatown, and home for 100 elderly Chinese and Filipino men. It's involved a lot of legislative drafting (and compromising), a good deal of lobbying, and community organizing. We have a favorable committee report, and at least five yes votes (out of 11 Supervisors), with 1-2 others likely. Since our outgoing mayor, Joe Alioto, probably would veto the bill and we probably don't have eight votes for an override, we'll probably hold off sending it before the full Board until early January, when the new mayor takes office (the likely winner of our Dec. 11 run-off is State Senator George Moscone, a supporter of the ordinance.) If and when it passes, I'll report more on it, as it's a good model for other cities to follow, both as a substantive protection to people being displaced by private owners and as an important victory in the property rights vs. housing rights battle.

Another local effort has involved trying to stop the big downtown Yerba Buena Center renewal project and initiate a neighborhood-based replanning process for this 87-acre tract. The multi-pronged effort has involved lawsuits that have effectively halted progress on the convention center, sports arena and other public facilities (because of a Redevelopment Agency financing plan that we allege is unconstitutional, as it tries to avoid bringing a general obligation bond issue to the voters by falsely labeling the bonds "lease revenue bonds", even though the city is committed to an open-ended obligation to repay these bonds whether project revenues are sufficient or not) and creation of a Citizens Comm. on YBC that last week held a press conference to kick off a replanning process via neighborhood organizations. There is considerable likelihood that the project will be completely revised, particularly if Moscone is elected, as he has publicly endorsed the work of CCYBC. I'm also serving on the board of Oakland Community Housing, Inc., a local housing development corporation that is building 300 units of low-rent replacement housing with city tax increment funds from the downtown City Center renewal project, to replace units torn down for that project. OCH was formed by an East Bay senior citizens group, Oakland Citizens Comm. on Urban Renewal, and the Black Panther Party, and won the right to develop this housing by threatening a relocation/replacement housing lawsuit of the kind that stopped Yerba Buena Center across the Bay for four years. The group is moving along rapidly; we've selected architects and sites and hope to begin construction by the middle of next year.

Finally, I'm still trying to do some more academic writing -- partly because I enjoy it, partly because of a feeling that the more conventional respectability one can build up, in terms of the usual criteria for that commodity, the more effective one can be in working for radical change. Without an institutional identification, credentials of some kind may become more important, to gain access to information, forums, etc. (The absence of institutional letterhead, e.g., has on occasions been a drawback in trying to obtain information and interviews; other things I find I miss are free xeroxing, postage, long-distance calls and office supplies.) I completed a textbook (Housing and Social Policy) for Prentice-Hall, and have several articles in the works or recently published (an ideal housing allowance proposal, in the Spring 1975 Working Papers for a New Society; a write-up of our user needs study and the slide-show technique, for an upcoming issue of Design & Environment; and a piece of survey research, on attitudes toward and knowledge of urban renewal, carried out with two S.F. State Univ. faculty members.)

That's it on me. I really do hope others will follow suit and set down some "my life and times" notes; they can be shorter or longer, more discursive and analytical -- whatever feels right.

CONCLUDING MISCELLANY

In the next mailing, I do intend (barring any overwhelming opposition) to circulate a list of network members, with addresses and some description of your work and interests. I'd appreciate it if those of you who have not already sent me such a description would do so soon. The list will be that much more useful to everyone if it has some substance, rather than just being names and addresses. David Hulchanski has suggested that I draw up and circulate a questionnaire, as the best way to get this information from all of you, and in a roughly comparable form. I'd like to try getting it without that formal device, in whatever form you want to give it, as I find questionnaires somewhat alienating, and maybe out of keeping with the somewhat looser tone I'd like the network to have. If that doesn't work out, we may have to resort to a questionnaire -- be forewarned.

I'd like to repeat the items from the first mailing which called for response, in the hope that more of you will pass on some thoughts on these subjects:

* How much beyond the US and Canada should we go?

* How home/heterogeneous should be attempt to be, politically and professionally?

* A name for the network

* Thoughts about the future: formal organization, journal, etc.

With regard to further outreach, I'd like your suggestions as to how we can try to make the network known more widely, so that everyone who ought to be in it at least hears about it. In addition to notices in Working Papers and Social Policy, one will appear in Design & Environment. Are there any other publications you can suggest for placement of a notice? People teaching at various planning schools should think about ways to make known the existence of the network. One possibility is to post a notice or the first mailing; or just send in the names of any colleagues and students you think would be interested. Other ideas on how to (selectively) publicize ourselves?

One other function for the network, which I'd like to add to those outlined in my Aug. 4 letter, is reports on conferences we've been to. Perhaps some of you who attended the AIP conference in San Antonio would jot down your impressions. I'll be at what looks to be an interesting Public Land Ownership Conference Nov. 13-15 at York Univ. in Toronto and will include a report on that in our next mailing. It's a good way to exchange information, contacts and observations about what's going on at meetings of related professional and political groups. As Lew Lubka points out, we should do more than ex post facto reports; we should publicize potentially interesting gatherings in advance, so people can attend. (Anyone interested in the York Univ. conference, by the way, should contact Prof. Neal Roberts, 416-667-3981 -- you'll have to phone because of the mail strike.)

Those of you whose names I got after mailing out the introductory letter are receiving a copy of that letter in this mailing. Those who requested the Habers' paper will find it enclosed; it's a slightly shortened version, which I learned had been published in Priscilla Long's collection The New Left (Beacon); I still have a few extra copies for anyone who wants it, or you can find it in the Long book.

Pat Morrissy, in his response to the Aug. 4 mailing, writes that the network "should be open to those who contribute -- either money, time or materials." My feeling is that contribution/participation should be mandatory for continued membership in the network. Once we get a filing system set up here, I plan to keep records of communications and other expressions of interest and activity on the part of people in the network. My thought is that if a substantial period (say, 4 or 6 months) goes by without any input I will notify people that they will be dropped from the mailing list unless they manifest some active interest in the network. I think this is a

fair and effective way to ensure everyone relates to others in the network in an active-contributing rather than passive-receiving way. We would constantly be dropping people who are not really interested. For myself, I have little interest in coordinating a large mailing list, lots of interest in helping to catalyze and energize a group of activists, no matter how small or large. I'd appreciate comments on this proposal.

*

Finally, I'd like to get your reactions (on a continuing basis) to the content, form, etc. of these mailings. Are they too long? Overorganized, underorganized? Could the material be presented in a better fashion (somehow a 21-page letter seems awkward -- I was shocked at how long it turned out to be). In order to evolve a format and style that best meets our needs, we're going to have to exchange some thoughts and criticisms. On my part, I hope to be able to get out the third mailing more promptly than this one; now that the various start-up tasks (putting together the basic mailing list, printing labels, etc.) are done, perhaps it will be easier to organize things.

Cheers,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris".

LETTER FROM MONTREAL

Montreal, a year away from Summer of '76, is bubbling with preparations for the Olympics, but is in a planners' limbo. Cranes are hovering above dozens of rectangular skeletons, new hotels and apartments, new office and commercial complexes, celebrating a developers' field-day, while many landmarks and older residential areas disappear. This massive demolition has generated progressively more popular opposition which culminated last November in a surprisingly strong showing of a broad coalition of conservationists, radicals and "Independents!" This same scenario, in varying forms, has already occurred in Toronto and Vancouver, where former opponents to expressway and renewal projects have actually taken control of city council.

This prospect of actually taking political power as the culmination of urban guerrilla activities has induced a number of planners and architects to take strong stands in opposition to the excesses of the autocratic and megalomaniac administration of Mayor Drapeau. Thus professionals have been instrumental in the formation of new conservation-oriented citizen groups like "Green Spaces" and "Save Montreal", have been vocal in their criticism of the East-West Expressway (built), the use of the lone public golf course for the Olympic Village (built), and the demolition of housing in low-rent areas to make way for public projects (continuing). The important fact is that these losing battles (with some minor victories, of course) were sufficient to politicize not just the professionals, but also the electorate.

In the 1974 municipal elections, a new party was formed in each of the major language communities (one party, but two different names) which elected a third of the city councillors, and reduced Drapeau's majority from 93% (!) in 1970 to 55%. That a virtual unknown, a former priest and avowed separatist, could rally nearly half the votes after only two months of campaigning was rated as a minor miracle by the press. Moreover, the possibilities of extending political power from the city level to the provincial and federal levels has been indicated by recent elections in Ontario where the N.D.P. (Social democratic) became the official opposition in a campaign which stressed housing and environmental issues.

An unusually high proportion of local planners and architects were active in Montreal's election campaign, and as a result are regarded with increasing suspicion by the city administration. However, the increasingly outspoken attitude of the professionals is explained in part by the Mayor's decision to hire a French architect as the master-builder for the Olympic facilities. Thus far, he has exceeded every cost estimate by a factor of at least five (the Munich Games cost four times the original estimate: \$720 millions instead of \$180 millions). Montreal is up to \$650 millions from \$315 millions, and there is a year to go.

There is a distinct political advantage in the fact that the local planners and architects share no responsibility for the up-coming financial fiasco, since the Mayor systematically rejected all of the recommendations of his staff. The main thrust of these recommendations was to orient the Olympics to the needs of the citizens, utilizing all of the existing facilities to the maximum (e.g. 5,000 beds in the various dormitories at four universities.) Instead, the stadium will be made available to the professional football and baseball teams (present cost for this monster white elephant is \$380 millions and it isn't near completion), and the apartments in the Olympic Village are over \$70,000 each.

Just how long this united front of professionals can be maintained is a matter for speculation. The Toronto experience indicates that the split will be along "establishment" lines. There the younger planners and architects gave strong support to the new populist administration of Mayor Crombie which pledged controls on new development, re-orientation of city priorities towards co-operatives and rehabilitation of housing, and creation of a major park-cultural centre^{on} the formerly industrialized lake-front. The new planning director, Michael Dennis, was the co-author of a report on housing which the CMHC (our FHA) felt was too hot to handle, although it had commissioned the study. Dennis and Susan Fish published it on their own, Housing: programs in search of a policy. Although there have been other controversial reports leaked into publication, rarely are the authors rewarded with such an important position. This is just one indication of the possible political spin-offs from gaining power at City Hall.

Experiences in housing and community development in Montreal have had only modest success so far, but have gotten pretty good press. The most advanced project involves the rehabilitation of 96 apartments scattered throughout a working-class neighborhood. The tenants have formed themselves into a co-op and are negotiating with CMHC to write-down the mortgage (100% at 7-7/8% interest for 20 years) from \$1,000,000 to just under half that figure which would permit the rents to remain unchanged. Loge-Peuple, the community-based group which carried out the project, survived harassment by the R.C.M.P. (they dont ride horses or wear Nelson Eddy uniforms in the city) who seized its records. The pretext was investigation of fraud, because the final cost of the work was double the original estimate. However, the suspected motive was reprisal for the political activities which the group generated to promote interest in the project.

The current scene is fairly bleak, despite the trappings of growth and prosperity. The vacancy rate is around one percent, rents are skyrocketing, mortgage interest is at 12%, unemployment is at 8% and rising despite the extension of the Metro to four times its present length, the construction of a huge sewage-treatment plant, the creation of a new express rail link to the jet-port 30 miles away, the building of a Federal office complex over-shadowing Chinatown, and other such projects designed to make work. All the economists expect a downturn in private investment.

The labor scene has been marked by strikes in the public service, police and firemen, hospital workers, public transit, postal workers. The political scene has been rocked by pay-off scandals, links with the underworld, language rights controversy, and increasingly militant native-rights groups protesting the huge James Bay hydro-electric project.

Nevertheless, there is enormous vitality in the arts. Workers co-ops have been formed to take over defunct U.S. companies which abandoned industries in Quebec. A new morality standard is being set by the reform parties at provincial and local levels. Montreal is still an exciting ~~(if expensive)~~ city to live in. The mood is restive but hopeful.

Andy Melamed
September, 1975

P.S. It would be great if Hans Blumenfeld would write more about the Toronto scene.

LETTER FROM MONTREAL

Montreal, a year away from Summer of '76, is bubbling with preparations for the Olympics, but is in a planners' limbo. Cranes are hovering above dozens of rectangular skeletons, new hotels and apartments, new office and commercial complexes, celebrating a developers' field-day, while many landmarks and older residential areas disappear. This massive demolition has generated progressively more popular opposition which culminated last November in a surprisingly strong showing of a broad coalition of conservationists, radicals and "Independents". This same scenario, in varying forms, has already occurred in Toronto and Vancouver, where former opponents to expressway and renewal projects have actually taken control of city council.

This prospect of actually taking political power as the culmination of urban guerrilla activities has induced a number of planners and architects to take strong stands in opposition to the excesses of the autocratic and megalomaniac administration of Mayor Drapeau. Thus professionals have been instrumental in the formation of new conservation-oriented citizen groups like "Green Spaces" and "Save Montreal", have been vocal in their criticism of the East-West Expressway (built), the use of the lone public golf course for the Olympic Village (built), and the demolition of housing in low-rent areas to make way for public projects (continuing). The important fact is that these losing battles (with some minor victories, of course) were sufficient to politicize not just the professionals, but also the electorate.

In the 1974 municipal elections, a new party was formed in each of the major language communities (one party, but two different names) which elected a third of the city councillors, and reduced Drapeau's majority from 93% (!) in 1970 to 55%. That a virtual unknown, a former priest and avowed separatist, could rally nearly half the votes after only two months of campaigning was rated as a minor miracle by the press. Moreover, the possibilities of extending political power from the city level to the provincial and federal levels has been indicated by recent elections in Ontario where the N.D.P. (Social democratic) became the official opposition in a campaign which stressed housing and environmental issues.

An unusually high proportion of local planners and architects were active in Montreal's election campaign, and as a result are regarded with increasing suspicion by the city administration. However, the increasingly outspoken attitude of the professionals is explained in part by the Mayor's decision to hire a French architect as the master-builder for the Olympic facilities. Thus far, he has exceeded every cost estimate by a factor of at least five (the Munich Games cost four times the original estimate: \$720 millions instead of \$180 millions). Montreal is up to \$650 millions from \$315 millions, and there is a year to go.

There is a distinct political advantage in the fact that the local planners and architects share no responsibility for the up-coming financial fiasco, since the Mayor systematically rejected all of the recommendations of his staff. The main thrust of these recommendations was to orient the Olympics to the needs of the citizens, utilizing all of the existing facilities to the maximum (e.g. 5,000 beds in the various dormitories at four universities.) Instead, the stadium will be made available to the professional football and baseball teams (present cost for this monster white elephant is \$380 millions and it isn't near completion), and the apartments in the Olympic Village are over \$70,000 each.

Just how long this united front of professionals can be maintained is a matter for speculation. The Toronto experience indicates that the split will be along "establishment" lines. There the younger planners and architects gave strong support to the new populist administration of Mayor Crombie which pledged controls on new development, re-orientation of city priorities towards co-operatives and rehabilitation of housing, and creation of a major park-cultural centre^{on} the formerly industrialized lake-front. The new planning director, Michael Dennis, was the co-author of a report on housing which the CMHC (our FHA) felt was too hot to handle, although it had commissioned the study. Dennis and Susan Fish published it on their own, Housing: programs in search of a policy. Although there have been other controversial reports leaked into publication, rarely are the authors rewarded with such an important position. This is just one indication of the possible political spin-offs from gaining power at City Hall.

Experiences in housing and community development in Montreal have had only modest success so far, but have gotten pretty good press. The most advanced project involves the rehabilitation of 96 apartments scattered throughout a working-class neighborhood. The tenants have formed themselves into a co-op and are negotiating with CMHC to write-down the mortgage (100% at 7-7/8% interest for 20 years) from \$1,000,000 to just under half that figure which would permit the rents to remain unchanged. Loge-Peuple, the community-based group which carried out the project, survived harassment by the R.C.M.P. (they don't ride horses or wear Nelson Eddy uniforms in the city) who seized its records. The pretext was investigation of fraud, because the final cost of the work was double the original estimate. However, the suspected motive was reprisal for the political activities which the group generated to promote interest in the project.

The current scene is fairly bleak, despite the trappings of growth and prosperity. The vacancy rate is around one percent, rents are skyrocketing, mortgage interest is at 12%, unemployment is at 8% and rising despite the extension of the Metro to four times its present length, the construction of a huge sewage-treatment plant, the creation of a new express rail link to the jet-port 30 miles away, the building of a Federal office complex over-shadowing Chinatown, and other such projects designed to make work. All the economists expect a downturn in private investment.

The labor scene has been marked by strikes in the public service, police and firemen, hospital workers, public transit, postal workers. The political scene has been rocked by pay-off scandals, links with the underworld, language rights controversy, and increasingly militant native-rights groups protesting the huge James Bay hydro-electric project.

Nevertheless, there is enormous vitality in the arts. Workers co-ops have been formed to take over defunct U.S. companies which abandoned industries in Quebec. A new morality standard is being set by the reform parties at provincial and local levels. Montreal is still an exciting ~~(if xxxxxxxxxx)~~ city to live in. The mood is restive but hopeful.

Andy Melamed
September, 1975

P.S. It would be great if Hans Blumenfeld would write more about the Toronto scene.