

INTRODUCTION

This paper is about what I have observed and experienced while working with what came to be Roxbury Tenants of Harvard Association. The main theme is the power relationships between the tenants group and Harvard as both have negotiated to get what they consider necessary. This is not an example of two organizations working together to produce a mutually beneficial result; Harvard and the tenants are antagonists. This does not preclude, of course, a mutually beneficial result. A second theme, closely linked to what power it has, is the growth of the community.

~~This~~ The first part of the paper traces the history of the tenants' association, and the second part discusses some of the issues at greater length.

Some of the questions I have tried to discuss are:

1. What is a University's responsibility to the community?
 2. What rights do individuals and communities have regarding
-

their living quarters?

3. How does a community differ from a group of people living next to each other?
4. What power should remain in the hands of communities?
5. How can a community best get its interest served?
6. What type of health facilities should be available to the public?
7. What function do specialized hospitals serve and what special rights do they have to infringe on communities?

Part I

Chapter I BEGINNING TO PROTEST

On April 9th, 1969, a group of students led by SDS took over an administration building in Harvard Yard. Their main demand was that ROTC be banned from campus. Their second demand concerned Harvard-owned housing below Mission Hill where three Harvard-teaching hospitals planned to consolidate. There was vacant land two blocks away but instead they decided to build one block away. This would mean the destruction of 182 housing units. SDS demanded that Harvard build on the vacant land and not destroy the neighborhood.

At this point Nathan Pusey insisted "There are no plans to tear down any apartments on University Road nor are any homes being torn down to make way for Harvard Medical School expansion."

On May 6, 1969, the Harvard Corporation, Harvard's ruling body, announced that Harvard would build 1100 units of low and middle income housing on the vacant land- called the Convent Site.

*parking lot
-behind mass
mental*

The strikers did not believe Pusey, and were not impressed with the promise of new housing. They wanted the old housing to stay. This was housing in the area between Mass. Mental Health Center and Peter Bent Brigham Hospital., including South Francis Street, Fenwood Road, St. Albans Road. About twenty students spent two nights canvassing the neighborhood. The reaction was generally favorable, so a few students (which dwindled to two, Douglas Levinson and myself) ~~went~~^{went} down to talk to some of the interested people, and together we held meetings to discuss the issue and see whether people wanted to fight eviction. Many did.

Partly as a means of getting more people involved the tenants decided to circulate a petition, demanding that Harvard repair and renovate the existing housing, that it not destroy homes to build the new hospital, and that it reveal all its plans for the area. During this period a group of tenants demonstrated and the Affiliated Hospital Center on Huntington Avenue. Their press release stated in part, "We will fight to save our community. We think it is criminal to destroy 180 living units when alternate sites are available... By building on the former site of the Convent of the Good Shepherd, Harvard could build its hospital without wrecking our homes." In the first week of August, 50 tenants presented the petition, which now 175 signatures on it, to Dean Ebert,. He glanced at the petition, laid it aside, and no more was heard about it. Instead he invited the tenants to chose representatives to join his Committee on Community Relations. The implication was that they would be members of the full committee, but they found they were members of a Subcommittee for Housing and Relocation.

Chapter II

The Fein Committee

Getting the tenants of a committee was a way of sidetracking them, of making them of giving the impression that progress was being made when actually they were just talking without power while the real decisions were being made elsewhere. This was evident at the July 16th meeting of the full committee when the chairmen said that he had no authority to discuss whether the site of the Hospital should be changed, although this was the key issue at the time.

At the meeting of the subcommittee the tenants soon learned the art of committee meetings. They came in with an agenda, they made sure that all five came (this gave them a majority, since the five Harvard delegates were seldom all there) and they learned to express themselves. This process was aided by John Sharratt, an architect who became consultant to the tenants.

There were four main topics discussed by the subcommittee:

(1) relocation benefits, (2) guidelines to define the

relationship between Harvard and the tenants, (3) and the selection of the developer. The first was a clarification of how much money a family would get for moving expenses when it was either forced to move or chose to move. The second topic started out as an attempt by the tenants to get more apartments rented and ended up as a policy to rent first to families. This was passed on by the full committee. A recommendation to let two tenants approve or disapprove of prospective tenants was not voted on by the full committee because they had a long discussion of what was meant by "responsible tenant". Their they implied that the tenants were bigoted, although they found out that one of the tenants who would review applications was black. The guidelines gave the tenants equal control with Harvard over planning and management of the new housing. The guidelines also were passed and sent to the full committee.

The fourth topic considered by the Subcommittee on Housing

and Relocation was the developer for the new housing. In late September, Edward Gruson, President Pusey's special assistant for community affairs, appeared before the subcommittee and revealed that Harvard, contrary to the revised guidelines, had started negotiating with a developer. This was contrary to the accepted guidelines passed by the subcommittee, which stipulated that the tenants would have equal say in all decisions, including selection of the developer. Dr. Rashi Fein, Chairman of the Committee on Community Relations, was also present. He mentioned a November 2nd deadline for applying for federal funds for the new housing. Apparently the government had in early September given Harvard a two month deadline. The tenants became aware of how little Harvard cared about their participation when they realized that the subcommittee had not been told of the deadline and had, in fact, learned of it only by accident. The lack of time meant that the tenants were pressured to accept Harvard's developer, Rose Associates of New York. They insisted on interviewing him, however, and found out that he was not interested in giving tenants decision-making power and was definitely

not interested in building a tenants' cooperative. Mr. Rose was rejected by the tenants and did not become the developer.

While the tenants were meeting in the subcommittee they were also studying 236 housing with the help of John Sharratt. (Section 236 of the Federal Housing Act is the section which provides Funds for subsidization of the interest on the mortgage for low and moderate income housing.) On October 9th Dean Ebert of the Medical School and Mr. Gruson signed an agreement which said that it stipulated that Harvard would not file form 2013 with the government for the new housing unless the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard approved of all the details. Form 2013 is a form requesting funding which includes the final requests for all details of the new housing, including the architect, the developer, and the building design. Most people who saw this agreement said that it would probably stand up in court and it would at least hold up the new housing for several months. Thus the tenants gained a veto power over the new housing, and they hoped that their guidelines would be approved so that they

could have some positive power.

Harvard had repeatedly promised that when they tore down houses they would replace them with "comparable homes at comparable rents".

The tenants were surprised, therefore, to find that rents in 236 housing, which was the only low and moderate income housing available, were 30%-70% higher than the rents the tenants were now paying.

The 236 rents ranged from 118\$ for an efficiency to \$177 for a four bedroom apartment. ⁽³⁾ Since the average rent in the area for a five room house was \$100, these were certainly not comparable rents.

There is a way, however, for a limited dividend corporation sell tax benefits from the depreciation of the building by selling shares of the building. The benefits from selling these tax shelters would reach 1 million dollars for the buildings on the Convent site.

This money could then be used to lower the rent for about eight years.

Since 236 rents increase only slightly, inflated hearings would make *(this does not seem to be true now)*

up the difference at the end of that time. Harvard, however, planned

to use that money for further investment. The problem of rents

became a central issue. The tenants feel that since their rents

will be paying off the mortgage and thus paying for the construction.

they should get the tax benefits. Harvard, however, feels that it should get back its investment in the land - the Convent site cost Harvard 1.1 million dollars - and that it should get the land back in 50 years if it wants if for further expansion. This, and who should control the building, are the central issues now.

When we started organizing in the spring of 1969, the goal was to force Harvard to build its hospital in the Convent Site. When, however, Dean Ebert asked the tenants to join this committee in talk about new housing, the tenants were interested enough in to join in order to work with Harvard to develop new housing. They said that they should have faith in Harvard and that they should trust Harvard. After working with Harvard for four months, however, their views were very indifferent. They postponed the subcommittee meetings until the guidelines had been passed on by ~~the full committee meetings until the guidelines had been passed~~ ~~on~~ by the full committee and until their consultant was paid as Dr. Fein has promised orally. But at the same meeting of the full committee which was going to review the guidelines, Dr. Fein read

a letter from the dean saying that in effect that the Fein Committee has outlived its usefulness and was now disbanded. When the committee which was supposed to sidetrack the issue looked as though it was going to pass something with power, it was set aside. The tenants, however, were still interested in new housing and were trying to find the person in power to talk to, since that person clearly was not represented by the Fein Committee.

Chapter III

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

In Cambridge, meanwhile, some students were still interested in the tenants. They formed the Harvard-Radcliffe Tenant Support Union and got over 1,000 signatures on a petition supporting the tenants' demands. The students at the Medical School, however, were much more active. Some of them spent a considerable amount of time talking to faculty members, workers, and other students. In the Spring, 2/3 of the first year class had signed a petition asking the Fein Committee to consider the question of the site of the Affiliated Hospital. This petition, of course, was unsuccessful.

In December, 1969 and January 1970 the medical students with

the tenants, were instrumental in persuading the Dean of the Medical School to go on a tour of the neighborhood to see the maintenance problems for himself.

In January, 1970, the medical students found out that the Affiliated Hospital officials were having a luncheon for the press. Not wanting to miss out on any news, several students showed up, along with Mrs. Theresa Parks and John Sharratt from the tenants' association. Stanton Deland, Jr. who is head of the Affiliated Hospitals Complex said that the students could come in if they waited to speak until the newsmen had asked their questions. The students did wait, and their politeness and lack of rhetoric was very different from the style of SDS members and, in this case at least, more productive.

Chapter IV

UPGRADING THE NEIGHBORHOOD

The most publicized activity of the medical students was their part in Dean Ebert's tour of the neighborhood. When Harvard bought the houses in the area (through Hunneman and Company) it allowed the property to deteriorate. This might have been done to dis-

courage people from living there, or it might have been through laziness, since the houses were scheduled for demolition anyway. Whatever the reason, the houses were in need of repair. To compound the problem, the man in charge of maintaining the houses for Hunneman was often drunk and usually inefficient. Also, Harvard was not renting apartments. In one apartment 15 Kempton Street- the boiler broke and rather than put in a new boiler, Hunneman (acting on orders from Harvard) boarded up the building. Hunneman could not tear it down, as it had other houses in the neighborhood, because it was attached to two other houses. One of these eventually became empty and the other was left with one tenant. This tenant was pressured to move, but she was not offered another apartment in the neighborhood of the same size and price, so she is still there and the buildings have not been torn down. *that building is now full* She was, however, left without head for three months last fall. At 52 Francis Street there was a leak. The water dripped onto an electric wire and started a fire. Fortunately, no one was hurt. As a third example, one woman

on Kempton Street complained about a loose board in her back porch. As a result her porch and eight others were torn down.

The tenants drew up a list of demands and, to publicize them, asked the Dean of the Medical School to tour the neighborhood. 130 Medical personnel joined in this request. The tenants were not sure that the Dean had power to help them, and that, therefore, he was the one to ask, but they agreed and went along with the medical students. Their demands were as follows:

1. "Because the present rental agent (Hunneman) has failed

1. maintain our homes properly and has not rented vacant
~~apartments~~
apartments, the....
~~_____~~
~~_____~~

The first demand was a result of the bad maintenance and refusal to rent apartments and was later dropped when the tenants were told by people in other communities that tenant management was not really desirable because the managers tenants would not have enough money to satisfy the rest of the tenants and everything that went wrong would be blamed on the tenants' association. What really was needed was tenant control over management, with the right to fire and hire. *resignation* *Beginning of Community Development Corporation (CDC) problems.*

At first the Dean said he could not make the tour, and sent his assistant, Steven Miller. Later, however, he changed his mind, and a second tour was arranged for January. The first stop on the tour (both were attended by about 100 people , including tenants, medical students and faculty, and press) was the closed rental office, which did not even have a sign on it saying that it was a rental office. Furthermore the rental agent had no regular hours. Then the Dean saw the houses with the porches torn off, and inspected houses where repairs, such as fixing leaks, were

necessary. Finally he met with representatives of the tenants to discuss the demands. The houses that he saw were fixed, and the rental office was spruced up and became a full time business, with orders to rent all available apartments. Also, the houses in areas 1 and 2 were inspected and brought up to code. Almost every house, for example, got more electrical outlets. Porches also were fixed. Area 1 is the block across from the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital and Area 2 is the block across from Mass. Mental Health Center. The rest of the housing is in Area 3.

The other demands, however, such as replacement of the porches payments to John Sharratt, rent rollback and rental of several houses on Kempton Street were not met. Because of the bad condition of the apartments on Kempton Street, they were still not rented. (And still are not. Hunneman will consider renovating them in the Spring.) Because the dean's initial reaction was not considered acceptable to the tenants, about 43 25 medical students and faculty staged a mill-in in Dean Ebert's office in early January. This was the last main activity by the medical students school up to now. The activist

class went into the hospitals, and the succeeding classes were less radical and less well organized.

Chapter V

CHANGES IN THE AFFILIATED HOSPITAL COMPLEX (AHC)

About the same time as the tenants were negotiating to improve their conditions in the neighborhood, they were given more time to stay there. Consequently, it became more important that the rental and maintenance conditions be acceptable. Because of financial problems (cuts in government grants and reduced figts) and according to the AHC - because of the tenant ^{opposition} ~~opposition~~, the AHC was forced to cut the size of the hospital. (5) and postpone the date of building. Fighting within the hospitals among the hospitals meant that the three hospitals no longer planned to be under the same roof. Now four separate buildings were planned - one for each hospital and one for their combined facilities. The dates of eviction were changed from Jan. 1971 to April 1973 for area one, stayed the same - 1974 - for area two, and from varying dates to 1975 at the earliest to for area three with a two year notice promised.

The first time that the AHC changed its plans, it was decided to build the whole new building on the Peter Bent Brigham parking lot, with ambulatory facilities across the street if money became available. The latest change, according to a speech by Edward Gruson at the City Council hearing of October 7, 1970, is that the Peter Bent Brigham will be built on the what is now the Peter Bent Brigham parking lot., the other two hospitals will be built across the street in area one. This must mean that if they are ambulatory facilities they will be built in area 2, which the Mass. Mental Health Center wants; or in area three, which Harvard has agreed not to tear down without the tenants' permission.

Chapter VI

NEGOTIATIONS WITH HARVARD

The agreement not to tear down area three without the tenants' permission was one of several worked out within negotiations with Mr. Gruson, Mr. Mahoney, Harvard's packager (a packager is an expert in the details about getting housing funded and built) and Albert Nickerson, a member of the Harvard Corporation. The tenants finally decided that the Harvard Corporation had the final decision-

making power and therefore sought to negotiate directly with a member of the seven man corporation. While waiting from January 1 to March 1970, to meet with a member of the Corporation, the tenants held small meetings ~~concerning the~~ to find out whether 236 housing was acceptable and, with John Sharratt, prepared an 86 page development proposal.

In small meetings held to discuss the 236 housing the tenants unanimously said that they could not afford 236 rents, and they therefore found Harvard's planned housing unacceptable unless some way was found to decrease the rents. Under the October 9th agreement signed by three officers of the tenants' association, Dean Ebert, and Edward Gruson, the tenants had the power to veto the new housing. There is, of course, the chance that the document would not hold up in court, and the tenants did not want to obstruct new housing.

At a community meeting on February 22, John Sharratt presented a development proposal to the tenants.⁽⁶⁾ The proposal broke the planning down into three stages. In stage I the buildings should be

maintained properly with tenant management if desirable. At the ~~time~~ time Harvard was planning to lease the Convent Site to a developer for \$1 a year. The report requested that Harvard instead lease it to the tenants at the same price. The report also asked Harvard to build a parking garage on part of the ten acres of the Convent Site. Stage II would start when the parking garage *freed* the Convent site (now used for parking) for building. Harvard planned to build 400 units of housing on the Convent Site. The report proposed that 200 of these be family sized apartments, with tenants having equal say in choosing the developer, using the tax-shelters to bring down the rents until then so that the rents were comparable to present rents. Meanwhile the Affiliated Hospital Complex would begin construction on the Peter Bent Brigham side of Francis Street. In Stage III, tenants would move into the new housing, once it had been approved by the Tenants' association. When the tenants were relocated, Harvard would start building in areas 1 and 2.

Finally, the report suggested that the overall environment be considered, with the suggestion of an overpass over Huntington Avenue at Brigham Circle, a new school, and health facilities. The tenants voted on the Development Proposal, and approved it.

The Development Proposal was present to Harvard before the first meeting with Albert Nickerson in March, Mr. Nickerson tried to confuse the issue by saying that Dean Ebert might need area three and therefore could not promise that it would only be torn down at the tenants with the tenants' approval. (If this issue seems confused, it is; there was and is, constant confusion and ambiguities and even contradicitons among the statements of Harvard officials). He also said that the Medical School "needed" a return on its investment and would therefore need the tax money from tax-shelters, so that they could not be used to lower the rents. The tenants said that (represented at the negotiations by Robert Parks, the president of the Tenants' Association, and John Sharratt and later by their attorney, Sumner Chertok.) still believed that

Nickerson, as a member of the Corporation, had more power than Dean Ebert.

In May the two sides met again, and this time there was some agreement. Harvard agreed no houses would in area three would be torn down without tenant approval. Harvard and the tenants also agreed that the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard would be co-developer of 200 low rise family dwelling and 200 high rise apartments on the Convent Site. The other co-developer would be chosen by the tenants with Harvard having veto power. Harvard also said it would bridge the gap between the present rents and the rents in the new housing. It only promised this, however for tenants in areas one and two who forced to move. The tenants insisted, and have continued to insist without success, that residents of area three who wanted to move into the new housing should also have their rents bridged.

Besides its negotiations with Harvard, the tenants also were negotiating trying to find a developer who would accept community control. Rose Associates were rejected because of this issue. Then

Then the tenants started talking to Mr. Churchill of Phipps and Company from New York. These negotiations broke down, however, when the tenants found out that Phipps was holding secret meetings with Harvard. Now they are negotiating with a firm called Midcities,

which wants the tenants to approve a rough and undetailed plan for the housing, since changes made later could be expensive. The tenants are willing to approve of the plan early, but they want to make sure that the room sizes, the design, and the location of the housing etc. are acceptable. For example, most of the families in this area spend a lot of time in their kitchens, so it would be important to have a large kitchen and a smaller dining room or living room. The tenants drew up a list of things they want to approve, in the hopes that Midcities would no longer be afraid that the tenants would want to change something at the last minute or be unreasonable in some other way.

In negotiations with Harvard, the main differences stem from the rent issue. In the first place, Harvard only wants to bridge rents for people who live in areas one and two while the tenants want

bridging for also anyone in area three who wants to move.

Also, Harvard wants rent bridged only for those families who are living in the area on January 20, 1970 and the tenants want the cutoff date to be the start of construction. In the second place, Harvard want the 1 million dollars available from the tax shelters to compensate for the 1 million it spent in buying the Convent Site. Furthermore, it wants the land back in 50 years. The tenants feel that Harvard should not get both a return on its investment and the land back, especially because they will be paying for the project with their rents. Thus, as things stand now, it is not clear whether the tenants and Harvard will come to a mutually acceptable settlement.

Chapter VII

CITY COUNCIL HEARING

On October 6, the City Council held a hearing to investigate Harvard's plans for the area and to evaluate what the Mayor's office had done. About 200 people showed up, but there was

none from the Mayor's office. Officials from Harvard did come, however, and were subjected to a grilling, especially from Louis Day Hicks and Thomas Atkins. A representative from the tenants union also spoke. State Representative Carey gave a long, rambling speech underlining the fact that the tenants are getting no help from their state legislators. Unfortunately the tenants counted on someone in Mission Hill to run off a flyer about the meeting to distribute in the area. He never did it, and the tenants learned that they have to rely on themselves. The City Council meeting had little effect (if any) on the outcome of the housing question, but it did give some publicity.

Chapter VIII

MEDICAL CARE

The tenants have focused on the issue of old and new housing, rather than on the issue on whether the AHC should be built. Many of them have said, however, that they are already surrounded by hospitals and do not see the need for a new one. The tenants association has taken no stand on the issue, except to deny Harvard's

accusations that the tenants association's position is that there is no objection to the hospital, as long as any tenants residents who are evicted are offered comparable housing in the same neighborhood.

Many of the medical students and faculty who support the tenants, however, think that the affiliated AHC is not going to be the kind of hospital which most needs to be built, and that it is bad even for a research hospital. The three teaching hospitals which are going to make up the AHC are highly specialized institutions, emphasizing research and deemphasizing "uninteresting" ambulatory care. This is shown by the fact that when the AHC had to cut its size because of lack of funds, it cut back in-patient beds by only 15% and ambulatory reduced ambulatory capacity by 46%.⁽⁷⁾

The quality of community health care provided by these hospitals is reflected by the fact that "the infant mortality rate in Roxbury is 2-3 times as great as the rest of the metropolitan area."⁽⁸⁾

One way in which Harvard claims to be aiding the community is through the Harvard Health Plan. There are a few objections, however. First, to go to a doctor a resident has to go all the way to Kenmore Square. *There now is a minibus from Brigham O* Second, unless a tenant is paid by his job, or is on welfare the health plan is too expensive for most families. Third, although it is impossible to prove cooperation, most of the non-Harvard observers of the plan say that the community members of the board are not strong. *Bob Parker is on it now* In order for Harvard to get federal money for the health plan, it is necessary to have community participation.

There is a controversy about whether the Harvard Health plan is good, but there are few who deny that Harvard hospitals are interested in specialized research rather than in treating ordinary patients or preventive medicine. The focus is on interesting research and in attracting prominent researchers, academicians, and administrators. (9) The dialysis unit (used for treatment of kidney disorders) at Peter Bent Brigham exemplifies

this policy. "This unit is often not filled to capacity in spite of a nation-wide shortage of dialysis facilities....In addition, the hospital turns off all dialysis machines at 11:00 P.M. for night. The director claims that the hospital could not attract an 'intellectual' resident staff if it required physicians to attend the dialysis procedures at night".⁽¹⁰⁾ The medical students who ~~work~~ have rotations at these hospital find it common for the patients to be given tests for treatments which are not necessary for their recovery but which are usefull for research.

Dr. Francis Moore, chief of surgery at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital answered criticism that the Harvard teaching hospitals do not serve the community by saying that the hospitals serve four communities:

1. Patients in the neighborhood of the hospitals.
2. Patients from the local, national, and international communities who can benefit from the specialization.
3. Medical students, interns and residents.
4. Future generations.

Dr. Moore is right in one sense: there is a need for research hospitals. The question, however, is how limited funds for

for medicine can best be used. For many of us, the answer lies in preventive medicine and in general helping the greatest number of people benefit from what is now known about treatment.

Chapter IX

MEDIA

There are two aspects to the tenant's use of the media: their own newspapers, and the local press. The tenants' association puts out a newspaper which helped to inform the residents about what is going on. One problem with the paper is that since it says it is published by the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard, several tenants have though it is put out by Harvard. *this is not the Good News, it (our paper) is defunct*

There is also the problem of distribution: on one street the neighborhood children take the papers from the mailboxes. The tenants have had reasonably good press coverage. Before every demonstration, someone calls all the radio and T.V. programs. There has been coverage in the Back Bay Ledger, the Bay Street Banner, the Boston Globe, the Herald Traveler, the Crimson, the Record American and hospital newsletters, on all three major

television channels and on a few radio stations. We could be more meticulous, however, about always having a press release ready.

Chapter X

ELETISM AND COMMUNITY CONTROL

When the medical students found about the luncheon for the press there was some commotion about whether or not we would be allowed in. Stanton Deland, Jr. the president of AHC, asked us where the press would get information if they did not have this kind of meeting. Annoyed that he would tell the press more than he would tell us, Mrs. Robert Parks said, "let them read about it in the paper, the same as we do". What a ridiculous thing to say. Mr. Deland then replied, "Where did you go to school?" In meeting after meeting of the Fein Committee members would say something to the effect that Harvard administrators knew better than community residents what is best for the community. Because they went to Harvard and are experts in their medical field, these Doctors believe that they are expert in many other areas, such as deciding what is good for a community.

Advocates of community control, however, think very differently. We do not think seven men on the Harvard Corporation should have the power to destroy 182 units of housing unless seven members of that community have the power can destroy the same power over Harvard administrators housing. Furthermore, in a city where 4000 families are on waiting lists for leased and public housing it is questionable whether a University should deplete the supply of low and moderate income housing for any reason. (236 rents are too high to be considered low income housing).

When I represented my report to class, one student kept pointing out that Harvard owned the property, with the implication that this gave it the right to do anything with it. This is an unanswerable argument to people who think property values are more important than human values or who think that the only way to ~~ensure~~ safeguard human values is to uphold community property values. There comes a point where all one can say is that he

or she disagrees and each side must fight to maintain the values he or she believes in. Given an issue to fight over there remains the question of what means to use. Building a strong cohesive community is one good way. This means talking to people so that they understand the issues and get to know and trust one another. It does not necessarily mean violent action, although it may mean taking some illegal action, such as ignoring an eviction notice. The job of an organizer is not to make such decisions, but rather to help the residents to get to know each other and to understand how to use power so that they can make the necessary decisions. It is too early to judge whether the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard will be successful in their struggle to get adequate housing. At the very least, however, several people will have been exposed to the problems of community control.

Bibliography for the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard Association.

- Allen, Charles, Duggan, Hayden, and Zaslavsky, Alan, "The Affiliated Hospitals Complex: A critique of Harvard Expansion," April, 1970
- Landau, David, "Housing, Health, and the Harvard Medical School," The Harvard Crimson, February 19, 1970, p. 3.
- Landau, David, "A Beautiful Neighborhood Before Harvard," The Harvard Crimson, February 20, 1970, p. 3.
- Meyerson and Banfield, Politics, Planning, and the Public Interest, Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, 1955.
- Shapiro, James, "Harvard, the Affiliated Hospitals Complex, and the Community, 1970.
- Waitzkin, Howard, "Expansion of Medical Institutions into Urban Residential Areas," New England Journal of Medicine, April 30, 1970.