

PLANNERS NETWORK

P.O. BOX 4671

BERKELEY

CALIFORNIA 94704

#27 - December 1, 1980

Hello Networkers! This will be the last newsletter before Christmas. We are still looking for a group somewhere who would be willing to take on producing the next few issues. It is mostly an enjoyable task, and, properly organized, shouldn't take much time. Please let us know even if you are mildly interested, although we won't try to dump it onto the first enquirer! In the meantime, the above address is still the newsletter's home.

This issue has some more information about the coming national conference, now to be in the Spring. There is also more discussion about taking on board the Progressive Health Caucus. With contributions almost all in favor, let's go ahead with the merger. It would help the newsletter people if the organizers of the Caucus - and indeed, other small groups who from time to time might join us - could send us an address list triple-typed on labels the size you see on this issue.

Thank you for continuing material both editorial and financial. The latter is moving us towards solvency but we have some way to go, so checks from those who have not given lately, or who have just joined, would really help.

We are still updating the address list and roster, and "retiring" those who haven't communicated for a year and a half. Let us know if there are any mistakes.

You will notice some typographical differences once again. That is because we phototypeset the issue ourselves to save money, using the UC Berkeley computer. Those who worked on the issue were Chip Downs, Daniel Farber, Linda Gardner, Nancy Leigh-Preston, Phil Shapira, Paul Sussman, and David Wilmoth. Those who helped in the production of the last issue, #26, were Priscilla Cobb, Karen De Loach, Hilary Greenberg, Anne Hafrey, Kathy Blaha, Karen White, Mollie Felton, Dan Stroh, Ty Synroski, Pat Coke, Craig Wacker, Andree Tremoulet, Mike Slauney, Nancy Lofaro, Julie Shambaugh, Steve Smotherman, Ed Bergman, Chester Hartman, Maria Stanco and Claudia Kitchen.

NETWORK NEWS

PROGRESS REPORT: NATIONAL CONFERENCE (from Bob Beauregard)

In the last newsletter, there was extensive discussion about the movement to hold a national conference and to use it to form a national organization of progressive planners. At the APA and ACSP meetings in Cincinnati, the debate continued. A general consensus emerged that we had to continue to build upon the momentum generated by the regional network meetings, and that it was time to establish such an organization. Through a series of telephone calls and then meetings in NYC after the Cincinnati conference, the idea of a founding convention was further advanced. Task forces were set up, a steering committee was established, and new dates were tentatively set for the conference.

Using a list of persons actively involved over the last few years in these organizational discussions and another list

generated at Cincinnati, a number of task forces were established. These would increase participation, bring diverse and new ideas into the discussion, and also spread the burden of planning and preparation. To coordinate these, a Steering Committee was formed. (See the list of names below.) This Steering Committee was conceived as an "open" entity which would reach out to involve as many people as possible in setting up the conference. Its major purposes would be to prepare for the conference and to engage in preliminary work on the development of the organization. A coordinator was named, Bob Beauregard. His job is basically to maintain communication among the task forces and serve as a contact person for those who want to help. To set up these task forces, people on the lists were contacted and asked to serve as chairpersons. The task forces and their chairpersons are listed below. Telephone numbers follow their names, and their addresses can be obtained from the newsletter roster.

1. Program Committee chaired by Judith Kossy (202-265-8238, home). Its responsibilities include the format of the conference, the program, procedures, keynote speakers and conference logistics.

2. Projects and Issues chaired by Bill Goldsmith (607-256-2333). This group will consider the various panels and workshops which will be presented at the conference and also identify "fundable" projects in which the organization might engage.

3. Organizational Structure co-chaired by David Wilmoth (415-540-5362, home), Bruce Dale (212-675-3937, home), and Tony Schuman (212-691-9708, home). This task force will develop alternative forms that the organization could take and present them at the conference.

4. Funding chaired by Derek Shearer (213-825-7442). The task for this group is to search out funding for the conference, the organization and projects.

5. Conference Attendance chaired by Charles Hoch (515-294-7716). This group will work on increasing the size and representative character of conference attendance.

6. Student Organizing and Education co-chaired by Andre Tremoulet (919-489-0822, home) and Ed Bergman (919-933-3983). This group will explore the role of students at the conference and in the organization, as well as various issues related to planning education.

7. External Relations chaired by Chester Hartman (919-933-3983). This group's task is to develop relations with other progressive organizations and to invite representatives to the conference.

It was also decided to postpone the conference to late March or April, and to try to hold it at the 4H Center outside Washington, D.C. if at all possible. (At the present moment, arrangements are still not completed.) The postponement provides us with more time to organize the conference and makes it easier to meet the financial obligations of a conference center. There will, however, be a

meeting of the Steering Committee some time around January 9th or 10th in Washington, D.C. for the purpose of finalizing conference plans.

Please plan to attend the conference, and please send us your ideas. Your participation is crucial for the formation of a progressive planning organization which will engage in activities which serve progressive ends and which will meet the needs of its membership. If you wish to help, contact a member of the task force in which you are interested, a member of the Steering Committee, or Bob Beauregard (201-932-4053/201-828-4457).

Steering Committee Membership to date:

- Bob Beauregard, Livingston College, Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, NJ 08903
- Ed Bergman, DCRP, Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- Robb Burlage, Avery 408A, GSAP, Columbia Univ., NYC, NY 10027
- Bruce Dale, 56 W22nd St, NYC, NY 10010
- Bill Goldsmith, DCRP, 106W Sibley, Cornell, Ithaca, NY 14853
- Harvey Goldstein, GSAP, 410 Avery, Columbia Univ., NYC, NY 10027
- Chester Hartman, DCRP, New East 033A, Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- Charles Hoch, Dept. Comm. & Reg. Plng., Iowa State Univ., Ames IA 50010
- Judith Kossy, 1864 Wyoming NW, Washington, DC 20009
- Peter Marcuse, Dept. Urban Plng., Columbia Univ., NYC, NY 10027
- Derek Shearer, 655 Ashland Ave., Santa Monica, CA 90405
- Tony Schuman, 56 W 22nd St, New York, NY 10010
- Andre Tremoulet, 3918 Wynford Dr, Durham, NC 27707
- David Wilmoth, 3091 Wheeler St, Berkeley, CA 94705

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY (from Bob Beauregard)

As of November 21st, 119 people (out of a possible 1,300 networkers) had returned their questionnaires concerning a progressive planners organization and a national conference. The results indicate a very strong interest in forming a national organization, and almost 100 percent indicated that they would definitely or probably join. There was more interest in a "loosely structured" than a "tightly structured" organization, and more than one-half the respondents stated that they would attend the founding conference. All of these results are presented in the box.

In addition to direct responses to the questions, a number of people wrote additional comments and a few even sent page-long letters. Some suggested that certain topics covered (e.g., health planning, land use, transit planning). A number mentioned a desire to include non-networkers in the organization and at the conference. Others commented upon the need to avoid the label of radical in order to maximize participation. People also commented upon the development of projects, the continuation of the newsletter, the need to reach out to other progressive groups, and the feeling that we should act now.

The geographic distribution of responses is also interesting:

1A.	I think it is time for a radical planners organization to evolve out of PN.	103
1B.	I think it would be a mistake to form an organization at this time. No response. (5)	11
2A.	I would definitely join such an organization.	75
2B.	I might join such an organization providing it took a form I think appropriate. No response. (4)	39
3.	I would probably attend the founding conference (assuming suitable time/location).	85
4A.	I tend to favor a loosely structured organization, built largely around task force projects.	79
4B.	I tend to favor a more tightly structured organization of the type proposed by the New York Area Network. Undecided. (7) No response. (11)	21
5.	I would be willing to do some organizing work around the founding conference.	48

California	24
New York	18
Iowa	12
New Jersey	11
North Carolina	8
Massachusetts	6
Washington, DC	5
Michigan	5
Illinois	3
Pennsylvania	3
Maryland	2
Colorado	2
Florida	2
Texas	2
No Address	3
France	1
Canada	1
Eleven states with one each.	

The survey was compiled by Bob Beauregard. If there are any questions, contact him.

REPORT ON CINCINNATI (from Chester Hartman, DCRP, UNC, Chapel Hill 27514)

Network presence and events at the Cincinnati APA conference were a smashing success. Two sessions were organized by Network members on progressive planning roles and political response to spending cutbacks, both of which were very well attended and well received (Pierre Clavel, Judy Kossy, Eve Bach and Nick Carbone were on one panel, Elliot Sclar, Grace Raines, Chester Hartman and Kate Crawford on the other.) Our open Planners Network meeting, at which we showed the slide show on displacement from Cincinnati's Over-the-Rhine area, was attended by about 150 people, with a really good discussion involving neighborhood residents who also came, and Network members. At the various sessions and our literature table we signed up about 75 new members.

The two dozen or so Network members at the conference met twice for working sessions on starting an organization. A tentative working/steering committee is being set up representing all parts of the country, and Bob Beauregard will be working with them to set up the founding conference.

Putting on these events at the semi-annual APA meetings is an excellent outreach and organizing/education technique, and we ought to make sure we repeat it at each APA meeting.

SOUTHWEST REGION NETWORK OF RADICAL PLANNERS (from Joochul Kim, Dept of Planning, College of Architecture, Arizona State Univ., Tempe, Arizona 85281)

I have just come back from the APA conference in Cincinnati. I thought that the three events sponsored by the Network were quite successful. On the issue of a radical planners national organization, I thought that there was no single consensus among the members I attempted to talk to. For my own position, I would rather spend my energy strengthening the Southwestern region at the present time. In fact, I would like to propose to hold a Southwestern regional conference sometime next year in Tempe. If anybody who is interested in the idea of having the conference, particularly in the areas of Southwestern states, could please let me know, I can start implementing the idea.

THE CITY AT SIX NETWORK/FORUM (from Dale/Schuman, 56 W22nd St, NYC, NY 10010)

While last year's Network/Forum focused more generally on the historical development of cities, the present series addresses current issues in New York City. The format of film plus speaker to guide discussion has been maintained, with a shift from classic documentaries to contemporary films, videotapes, and slide presentations. In response to popular request, we are also initiating an informal wine and snack period following the forums each month.

The 1980-1981 City at Six series began Nov. 21 and continues through May 15 on selected Friday evenings. The topics covered are: (Nov 21) Health Care: Public Hospital and Community Struggles; (Dec 19) Transportation: Westway--Bestway or Worstway?; (Jan 23) Cuba Special: Slide Bonanza and Poster Raffle; (Feb 20) Urban Strategies: Politics and Policies; (Mar 20) Urban Neighborhoods: Community Preservation in the Lower East Side and Northside (Brooklyn); (Apr 24) Urban Renewal: Displacement and Gentrification on the West Side; Urban Decay: Quality of Life in the South Bronx.

ARTICLES

A TOUR TO THE USSR

This summer I spent three weeks visiting five large cities in the European part of the USSR. The tour, sponsored by "Promoting Enduring Peace" of Woodmont, Ct., had 45 members of varied ages and interests. Being interested in housing and urban design, I was impressed by the construction going on everywhere. Since 1970 2.2 million apartments have been built each year. Large as that figure is, it is still not enough to provide each family with an apartment of its own. In the USA one tends to forget that during World War II 1,700 Russian towns and 70,000 villages were destroyed and 25 million people rendered homeless. Now only eight out of ten families enjoy a separate apartment but indications are that, barring a major war, the housing shortage should be solved before 1990. (In addition, there is, of

course, a continuing need for industrial, agricultural, and other kinds of construction!)

The vast majority of urban dwellings are built by the government using advanced mass production with assembly methods, and standard plans. Since housing is a fundamental social service and not a commercial venture, rents are low -- about 3% of the principal wage earner's income (utilities are extra). Rents have remained stable since 1928 in spite of increased room sizes, more appointments, and better construction. The rent covers one-third of the construction cost; the government pays the rest.

A growing number of apartment houses (7%) are being undertaken by cooperatives. A group of citizens (often from the same workplace) who have enough money and do not wish to wait for government housing, request the local authorities for land, a loan, plans, etc. The coop members must produce 30 to 40% of the construction costs in order to qualify for a 15-year loan at 1/2% (yes 1/2%) annually. Senior citizens, disabled veterans, and families of dead soldiers obtain the loan free. And when the construction cost is paid up, the residents pay only their utilities. The government fosters the coop construction in the hope of reducing the housing shortage.

There were no single houses being built in the large cities I saw. Some houses built soon after the war are being replaced by apartment blocks. Vacation houses can be constructed by people themselves on countryside land leased from local governments. Loans are available on the same terms as for coops.

Rural housing consists either of single dwellings or two-to-five-story apartment houses located close to the village square and to administrative, cultural, and other communal facilities. Apartment houses may also be spotted among older houses in villages which are being enlarged. The single houses I visited had comfortably-sized rooms, electricity, gas, and central heating, as well as a two-acre plot for growing vegetables and grain for private use or for sale in the Farmers' Markets in nearby cities. However, here, as elsewhere, there is a tendency for young people to move to cities, especially the new cities.

The urban population is now 63% and this percentage has been increasing steadily. Since 1930, 1,142 new towns have been built, many of them in Siberia and the Soviet Far East. These "Pioneer towns" were built from scratch, and under harsh climatic and geological conditions. Their major purpose was the development of natural resources, including sources of energy, and of scientific and educational facilities.

In the five "old" cities I visited, I was impressed by the public parks, green belts, and the clean air (especially in Moscow); tree-lined avenues, underpasses for pedestrians and, at major crossings, for wheeled traffic; efficient mass transit (buses, trolleys, streetcars, subways); and, the nine and 16-story housing complexes based on superblock concepts. A Soviet architect told me that planning professionals are expected to make their cities (1) convenient for living and working, (2) esthetically pleasing, (3) economically expedient, and (4) ecologically sound.

Now that I have had a chance to reflect on the tour, review my color slides, and read the literature I brought home, I think I understand better the differences between capitalism and socialism (at least so far as architecture and urbanism are concerned). I should like to suggest that Network People consider a 2-3 week study tour of the USSR. Anybody interested for next summer?

THE PLACE OF PROGRESSIVE IDEALS IN EVERYDAY PRACTICE (by Warren S. Feld, The Villages F-18, Carrboro, NC 27510)

I would like to pose two interrelated questions for those in the Planners Network. Who is the progressive planner? What should s/he expect out of planning practice? On the one hand, when I find myself with other people who call themselves "progressive planners", the answers seem obvious, or at least I assume that they are so. On the other hand, when I find myself attempting to fit progressive ideas into the everyday practice of health planning, the answers seem less obvious and somewhat contradictory.

Frequently, when I mention to someone in the local health planning establishment that I am a member of the Caucus for progressive Health Planning or of the Planners Network, these people immediately ask in a hushed voice: Is that a communist group? I am always at a loss at how to answer that question. I want to debunk their myths about Marxism and communism, but I want to also justify my beliefs about working within and through the system to bring about certain fundamental changes. I don't have nowhere to turn to in order to justify my beliefs.

So I rely on my personal experiences to answer this or other similar kinds of questions which challenge the applicability of my progressive knowledge, my progressive values, and my progressive beliefs to social change. But many of my personal experiences have not been particularly progressive, and many which I at first labeled progressive, have proven to be less so. My sense of the 'good' has frequently been compromised in order to get others to agree on some working consensus so that we could get the job done. I have found myself complying with federal and state regulations, convincing others of the need to incorporate these into the plan or into the process, all the while firmly believing that these regulations would ultimately serve to hurt people, diminish the viability of places, and shore up an already inequitable organization of health services.

What are the progressive alternatives for the planner working within the system to bring about needed changes? Reiterating statements in ordinary language which denounces political/economic oppression, racism, sexism, often fall on deaf ears or scare people when they are forced to think about the necessary changes. Establishing the feasibility of progressive ideas is problematic because of the politically-charged symbols associated with our ideas.

But even when we as planners can get others to recognize the legitimacy of a particular community need, that is still not enough. The community people I work with admit that they, would be willing to make the necessary tradeoffs which could result in some redistribution of resources to those in need. However, they first want to be convinced that the planned solution will not place an unfair burden on any one group in the community and that the planned solution will be implementable. This requires negotiating the feasibility of progressive ideas. This forces the planner to walk a thin line between technical objectivity (credibility) and political action (relevance).

There is one more problem that clouds an ability to set a personal agenda for defining progressive planning. The problem has to do with value themes. These explain how and why someone has a particular preference for what should occur in plan development. These themes are not always fairly represented in deliberations over public issues. They do not sort themselves out into nice categories like "provider" and "consumer", "black" and "white", or "male"

and "female". The decisions reached, even those which may result in fundamental changes in the community, do not always result in things which are progressive. Actual decisions are very sensitive to who attends meetings and to who speaks out at them.

Who is the progressive planner? What kinds of flexibility does s/he have in pursuing progressive ideals and in taking on a progressive planning role? How does s/he fit these ideals into the constraints and limitations of everyday practice? How does s/he convince others that their progressive decisions will have the desired impact, will be fully implementable, and will represent something that may be called the public's interest?

Progressive planning, at the least, means having to deal with persistent, gnawing questions about right and wrong, good and bad, the acceptable and the achievable. Too often we resort to an ideological justification of our beliefs, rather than confront the day-to-day issues of their operationalization. I have no difficulty in buying into the ideology. The difficulty comes in making the transition to the everyday practice of questioning, shaping attention, building convincing arguments, and, simply, of creating an environment conducive for progressive deliberations over public issues.

NETWORKING

JOB LEADS FOR COMMUNITY DESIGNER: (from Jesse Schwartz, PO Box 797, Bolinas, CA 94924) "I'm interested in the design of small communities who reflect, to some degree, inner harmony. Have had considerable experience with intensive horticulture and see this as one step towards self-sufficiency. I'm seeking a position, either as a private consultant or to work with enlightened people on designing spaces worthy of their inhabitants. Am in San Francisco frequently and would be pleased if perhaps there is some member of the Network with whom I could discuss employment prospects in the Bay Area. (In addition to horticulture, am into economic analysis and transport planning.)"

PLANNING IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES: (from Doyle Niemann, 1704 R St NW Washington DC 20009); "One of the areas I would like to explore in the coming year is the role of planning in community activities. Obviously, all community activity involves planning of one kind or another, but I'm interested in examining situations where this is a more conscious and deliberate process and where actual planning structures have been established. I'm interested in finding people who can write about innovative planning experiments at the community level and who might be interested in furthering planning in their community. Any suggestions networkers might have would be appreciated."

MIXED-INCOME HOUSING COOPERATIVES: (from Anne Wheelock, 114 Dartmouth St, Boston MA 02116); "I am on the board of a new and struggling community housing development corporation, the Tent City Corporation. We are currently attempting to be designated developer of a 3.3 acre parcel in Boston's South End, a neighborhood that has been much gentrified through urban renewal. Our goal is to develop 270 units of mixed-income housing through a leased co-operative plan whereby we would have the benefits of syndication proceeds while residents have the ownership benefits of a cooperative.

The land is adjacent to land which is to be developed by Urban Investment Development Corporation, a subsidy of Aetna, and which has received an \$18.5 million UDAG for

its hotel-department store-convention center complex. A competing proposal has been submitted by a principal landowner who operates a parking lot on 54% of the land. Assuming that we surmount all these difficulties we would be interested in hearing of any experiences with mixed-income housing cooperatives (their development and management) in other areas of the country."

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH NEWS is a monthly clipping service covering major papers and major events in occupational and environmental health and labor developments. Papers covered include *San Francisco Chronicle*, *LA Times*, *NY Times*, *Wall St Journal*, *Chicago Sun Times*, *Washington Post*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Guardian*, *In These Times*, *The Nation's Health*, etc. Subscription is \$15 (\$9 for people who clip) for 6 months. Send checks to OHN, c/o Vivian Lin, 3091 Wheeler St, Berkeley CA 94705, or call (415) 540-5362 for information.

COMMUNITY INFORMATION SYSTEM: (from David Bartelt, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122); "I am working on a Community Information System, compiling data that could be of use to community groups in developing or responding to policy issues. If you have been similarly involved and could share insights, problems etc, please contact me.

PLANNING IN MOZAMBIQUE: (from Barry Pinsky, 472 Brunswick Ave, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5R 2Z5); "I have recently returned from a two month visit to Mozambique, Africa, during which I was following up work that I had done there in 1977-79 on the country's first pilot project in shanty-town upgrading. (Mozambique gained its independence in 1975.) I was immensely pleased and excited to find that not only were the various infrastructure works being completed, but also that the neighborhood organizations and block committees were able to expand their activities beyond the upgrading work. Unfortunately due to a very severe shortage of technical help, it has been difficult to transfer the work to the newly reconstituted city councils.

It would be very useful to me and also to Mozambique, if we could begin to contact people/ information relating to urban planning/ housing/ local government policies and programs in countries attempting to develop along socialist lines, eg China, Cuba, Viet Nam, and even Eastern Europe about which there seems to be relatively little English language documentation. In exchange, I do have some articles written and others in preparation about Mozambique attempts."

SMALL SCALE COMMUNITY PLANNING: (from Joochul Kim, Department of Planning, College of Architecture, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281); "I am trying to work with Indians in the State of Arizona concerning small-scale community economic development planning. If any network member has useful information dealing with this specific issue, please let me know. Thank you."

COMMUNITY JOBS: (from Doyle Niemann, 1704 R St, NW, Washington, DC 200909); "At present, I am directing and editing *Community Jobs*, which we like to think of as a "trade journal" for everyone involved in community-oriented work. We list job openings and provide a range of useful and, we hope, interesting information on a wide range of progressive community-oriented activity" (ed: we presume copies are available at the above address).

CALL FOR PAPERS, URBAN POLITICAL ECONOMY:

(from Larry Sawers, Dept. of Economics, the American University, Washington DC 20016 and William Tabb, Department of Economics, Queens College, CUNY, Flushing NY 11367); Papers are being sought for a conference on "New Perspectives on the Urban Political Economy" scheduled for May 22, 23 and 24 in Washington DC. Topics include: conceptualizing urban growth and form, restructuring work and the spatial division of labor, alternative neighborhood rebuilding strategies, gentrification, nineteenth century urbanization, plant closings, race relations, municipal governance, housing strategies, services and municipal unions, Marxism transit and racism, cross-national urban form, left municipal governments, gender and urban form, Marx's theory of rent, race and metropolitan spatial form, Marxian crisis theory and the urban crisis. For more information, write to Larry Sawers or William Tabb at the above addresses.

PROGRESSIVE PLANNING SUMMER PROGRAM. Cornell's DCRP is again putting on its Progressive Planning Summer Program. The 1981 schedule extends from June until August, and include a variety of one week, three week and six week courses on community development, political economy, women and planning, international planning, environmental and health planning, quantitative techniques, and communications. The faculty includes David Barkin, Richard Booth, Ira Brous, Sarah Elbert, John Forester, Gary Freeman, Chester Hartman, Sander Kelman, Tim Kennedy, Linda Lacey, Jacqueline Leavitt, Manning Marable, Chris Meek, Yvonne Scruggs Perry, James Petras, David Shearer, William Tabb, Alfred Watkins and William W Whyte. Tuition is charged. For more information, write or call Professor Sander Kelman, Department of City and Regional Planning, 106A West Sibley Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853. tel (607) 256 6212.

UNC PUBLICATIONS: For a list of Occasional Papers put out by the University of North Carolina's Department of City and Regional Planning, write to them at East Building 033-A, UNC at Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

WASTES AND TOXINS: The Environmental Action Foundation has established a Waste and Toxic Substances project that is co-sponsoring conferences around the country on hazardous wastes. It publishes a free newsletter on toxics called *EXPOSURE*. For more information, contact Environmental Action Foundation, 724 Dupont Circle Building, Washington DC 20036.

FORMING A UNION OF PROGRESSIVE PLANNERS: (from Susie Erenrich, 449 S. Meridian St., Ravenna, Ohio 44266); "Let's unite and develop a radical planners organization. I'm not recommending genocide to the working network. I'm suggesting an extension to the network, so that we can precipitate change by implementing our ideas and putting them into action. To be organized is to be successful. It creates the forces needed for progression."

WORKING PAPERS: (from Peter Marcuse, Columbia University, NY, NY 10027); The division of Urban Planning at Columbia has put out several interesting working papers written by Network members. For more information or a list of titles write to Peter Marcuse at the above address.

ON INCLUDING THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS FOR HEALTH PLANNING: (from Peter Marcuse, Columbia University, New York 10027); "I see nothing to be lost and everything to be gained by our sharing space with the Pro-

gressive Caucus for Health Planning. In fact, there are indications that other groups may wish to do the same thing, i.e., the group on Political Economy and Land Use. If indeed we can facilitate communication within groups for whom it is difficult to do so on their own, we are doing them a real service; if we can let others with lesser interest also know what these groups are doing; if we can increase the knowledge of what the Network itself is doing among members of these groups; everyone will have gained. I am not even sure that it represents a change in policy; it is simply a more systematic way of grouping communications is it not?... The wider the communications network, the better."

(from Hope Melton, 18 Pelham Street, Princeton, NJ 08540); "I think that news from the PCHP should be included on a regular basis in the newsletter. Surely the segmentation of that sector from other urban issues is an attempt to discourage planning participation by those opposing the established system, to convince us that only "experts" or "specialists in the field are competent to make policy decisions. We, of all groups, shouldn't fall into that trap."

PROTECTION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS: (from Gary Pivo, Program Analyst, Natural Resources and Environment, Office of the Secretary, Dept. of Agriculture, Washington DC 20250); I am currently looking into less-than-fee simple acquisition methods for the US Government to protect wild and scenic rivers. Local responsibility and autonomy are important criteria. Please contact me with your ideas.

SAN DIEGO REPRESENTATIVE PROPOSAL: (from Philip M Connor, Atty, 1520 State St, Suite 210, San Diego, CA 92101.); In San Diego we are giving serious consideration to a proposal to elect by precinct a neighborhood representative to serve both in a planning function and as a facilitator for the now flourishing "crime watch". Neighborhood representative would be a means for new people to enter into the political arena and give those who wish an opportunity to develop leadership skills at a very grass roots level. We have completed the first stage of the written proposal.

The matter is now being considered by the Community Planners Committee, which is made up of the chairpersons

of all the planning groups in San Diego. The greatest complaint at the present time is that it will not receive popular support. In any event many people are committed to some type of neighborhood representative system, any information you have or can share with us will be greatly appreciated.

JOBS.

Commercial housing development specialist: (from Andrew Shapiro, West Bank Community Development Corporation, 2000 S. 5th St., Minneapolis, MN 55454, (612) 376 1092); "please call or write for complete job description to the above address. West Bank CDC encourages minorities and women to apply."

Project Coordinator, Seattle Displacement Project (contact Chuck Weinstock, Fremont Public Association, Housing Department at 619 N 35th St., Seattle, WA 98103 (206) 634-2222. Resumes must be received by Dec.15,1980.

Director of Research and Director of Organizing: (For more information, contact Miles Rapoport, Director, Connecticut Citizen Action Group, Box G, Hartford, CT 06106 (203) 527-7191.

Project Manager and Information Activist: for program to support neighborhood self-help organizations. (For more information, contact Dr Miles Martin, Neighborhood Information Sharing Exchange, 1725 "K" St, NW, suite 1212, Washington DC 20006.)

CORRECTION.

A layout mistake in #26 on pp 6-7 caused some confusing items. Michael Smith's item on Workplace Democratization at the bottom of the left column of p.6 really should pick up at the 6th line of the left column of p.7 - the book *The City and Social Theory* is his. Nathan Weber's item on Neighborhood Revitalization and Displacement got hopelessly garbled, and since we threw away original copy, we invite him to resubmit it.

FIRST CLASS

P.O. Box 4671
Berkeley, Ca 94704



Pierre Clavel
Dept of Urban Planning
Cornell Univ.
Ithaca NY 14850

STOP PRESS!

(ed: This was received too late for the first printer but seemed important enough to insert separately.)

Committee on Projects and Issues

(from William Goldsmith)

The national conference steering committee in November nominated Robb Burlage, Peter Marcuse and me to form a temporary Committee on Projects and Issues. After considerable discussion we have tried, as outlined below, to arrange a system of working groups to encourage widespread participation from current Network members, to encourage others to join, and to promote unity and clarity in our goals and objectives. We propose these working groups and a pattern of organization in the hope that our collective commitment can be used to unify activists, organizers and planners not only to resist austerity proposals and cutbacks, but to formulate alternative programs, to join forces with other progressive groups, to publicize successful projects and other experiences, and to reinforce the many supportive functions of the Network.

We propose working groups in seven areas, and for each we list persons who will serve as convenors and others who will draft position papers for the conference next Spring. We expect others to perform other activities related to each working group area. We mean this list *not* to be exclusive; instead, we urge others to nominate themselves for partici-

pation in the conference sessions, to write drafts, and to help coordinate and edit the writing of positions that will ultimately be submitted to the Network/Conference for adoption. Our initial lists are of course made up of a limited number of people (whose work) we know, and we should be most disappointed if others did not join. PLEASE think carefully about ways you might contribute (see Rob Burlage's accompanying note) and then call a convenor.

The work process we envisage is as follows:

1. Various persons will agree with the convenor to draft position papers; names, topics, and brief summaries should be available for the January 10 meeting, where some coordination will be attempted; final drafts must be distributed to working group members five weeks prior to the spring conference;
2. Working groups will meet or communicate prior to the spring conference, having read competing and complementary drafts; they will draft one or more position papers to be submitted for discussion and adoption at the conference;
3. Working groups will also formulate various national projects for adoption;
4. Working groups will propose modes of cooperation with other groups and forms of publicity to connect us with other progressive groups. These ideas are elaborated in Burlage's note. Our list of Working Group convenors, which can of course be modified, follows:

Working Group	Convenor	Members (partial list)
Housing and Neighborhoods	Judith Kossy 202 755-5324	Emily Achtenburg Peter Marcuse
Health and Human Services	Steve Meister 413 781-2845	Robb Burlage John Forester
Community Economic Development	Robert Mier 313 935-1928	Ed Bergman Patricia Salinas
Affirmative Action: Minorities, Women and Labor	Manning Marabel 607 256-4625	Jackie Leavitt
Reindustrialization and Urban Policy	Derek Shearer 213 399-5924	Emil Melizia
Urban Fiscal Crisis	Norman Krumholz 216 687-2166	Eve Bach Nick Carbone
Community-Labor Coalitions and Local Planning	Pierre Clavel 607 256-6212	Denise Young Roger Lesser

Developing Project Proposals by Position Papers.

(from Robb Burlage, Columbia Graduate School of Architecture and Planning)

The Projects and Issues (Position Papers) Committee, coordinated by Bill Goldsmith, is asking all "Position Paper Task Forces" to generate appropriate national issue, sectoral and local project proposals by the Saturday, January 10 planning meeting for the national organizing conference in Washington DC. These proposals then could be considered for organizational support. *Please give your ideas to Task Force convenors or to the Committee.* The following are some possible levels of project consideration.

1. Some projects might be considered by all task forces for their respective areas:

- Immediate publicity to and publication of position papers;
- Ongoing (joint interorganizational?) representation and support of these positions with such vehicles as a "policies monitoring project" (centered in Washington or some committed locality) and a "speakers bureau" by key issue areas;
- An ongoing "progressive planning papers" publications series, aimed at front-line practitioners and organizers (Pierre Clavel of Ithaca is putting forward this project idea, possibly to be co-sponsored with other organizations, based partly on experiences with upstate New York planners' and organizers' expressed interest);
- An expanded Planners Network Newsletter section, perhaps a "magazine" at the front of the Newsletter to report on policies, positions and actions for (and by) organization members and subscribers;
- A national job clearinghouse/ hot-line service for progressive planners and organizers. Washington area Networkers have suggested a local "Network/Union" ("N/U"?) "welcome wagon" for arrivals in new areas.

2. Specific national issue/ topic area projects and services (or inter-area? joint interorganizational?), including publicity, communications, policy analysis and monitoring, organizing, technical assistance and action, to be (co-?) sponsored by the "Network/Union" should also be considered. For example, a Housing Action Support Center, including Public Housing, Rent Control, and Anti-Displacement/ Abandonment Project? A "Reagan Reindustrialization" Analysis Project, an Urban Policy Monitoring Project, and an Alternative National, Regional, and Urban Economic Planning Project? A joint Environmental Protection and Community Services Cutbacks Resistance Project, proposing an Alternative Inter-governmental Fiscal Policy?

3. Exemplary locally-based projects might be nationally sponsored and assisted. For example, activists around the New York Network/ Forum are discussing a possible united alternative plan assistance project in some target area, perhaps in the South Bronx, by summer 1981, as local action relating to critical positions regarding National Urban Policy, Housing and Neighborhoods, Urban and Regional Economic Policy, Community Economic Development, Health and Human Services, etc.

4. Those interested in planning education and professional planning organizations, including also the Student Organizing and Education Committee, might consider proposing a "N/U" sponsorship and support of the Progressive Planning Summer School and Planning Issues/Action Forum at Cornell, beginning even by Summer 1981, might be pur-

sued. "Affirmative Action"-oriented Task Forces might target on current American Planning Association women's issues and minority organization activities, perhaps emphasizing more political-economic and public sector commitment criteria and perhaps even adding labor issues as an area of affirmative action planning concern?