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Abstract

The political context of citizen participation in North American governments since World War II has largely been one of failure of non-elites to influence governments at all levels to accommodate their values and interests. Among concepts of government designed to facilitate the political efficacy of such groups is that of decentralization of some powers of municipal government to the "neighborhood" or local area level in large cities. Municipal decentralization theory rests on assumptions that common interests can be identified with a definable local area and that political processes at that level reflect local political values and interests. The general hypothesis was that political processes in local areas reflect the diversity of political values and interests of the local area population and thus have the potential to legitimize decision-making at that level. Review of literature on democratic theory led to a postulate that a political process which reflects a constituency's values and interests is pluralistic and is perceived to be legitimate by political actors. It was also postulated that lines of political cleavage in the urban land development control issue area, the issue area chosen for this research, would follow social class lines. Working hypotheses were constructed based on the above two postulates and a definition of "legitimacy" of government. The general hypothesis was sustained by a limited comparative study of local area political processes in the Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodlands local areas of Vancouver, by study of one politically salient site-specific land development control issue in each. A combination of decisional and reputational techniques was used to identify influential political actors at the local area level and to identify key events. A qualification was observed in political actors' perception of legitimacy of a hypothetical local area government with some powers in land development control: the electoral process was perceived by most to be an inadequate instrument of citizen control of government at that level. It was concluded that further research was warranted in means of facilitating political integration at the local area level, as existing community councils did not perform that function in the issues studied.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

I Citizen Participation: The Political Experience

A comprehensive history of citizen participation in the last thousand years of western society would note that during the middle ages an individual's survival depended on complete subservience to tradition and the religious-government hierarchy. This relationship between the citizen and the church-state began to change with the development of artisan's guilds in cities to advance and protect their marketable skills. For the first time in history control of some public affairs passed from the church-state to a voluntary, "private" organization.

Later, the craft guilds became important political influences in towns and cities. In a political sense, power was more diffused, but the effect on the power structure was that the size of the elite ruling class merely increased to include artisans, urban land owners, and merchants (Cunningham, 1972, pp. 590-592).

The spirit of individual rights and democratic government in which some early English North American settlements were launched was illusory: the renowned New England town meeting was often dominated by local elites. The subsequent extensions of the franchise did not lead to broad diffusion of power. In urban centres in the U.S., for example, participation in local
politics became restricted to becoming involved in party machinery. The political bosses, often in partnership with business leaders, exercised the most significant influence in municipal government (Cunningham, 1972, pp. 590-592).

It was at this time, the late nineteenth century, that voluntary associations proliferated as many people sought alternative means to provide social services. The early twentieth century urban planning advisory associations were usually groups of influential businessmen. Since World War II, the historical pattern of domination of social programs by elites has prevailed, although generally unsuccessful attempts have been made by non-elites to control programs (Cunningham, 1972, pp. 591-594).

Most participants in American urban renewal and juvenile delinquency programs were businessmen, white planners, and leaders of civic groups and interests--the civic, business, educational, and political elite (Cunningham, 1972, pp. 592-593; Collier, 1968, p. 21). In both the U.S. and Canadian urban renewal programs, the function of the appointed participants was usually to "sell" the program to opponents, and to clothe public officials' plans with the democratic ritual of approval by the "citizens" (Stenburg, 1972, pp. 191-192; van Til and van Til, 1970, pp. 313-316; also: Somerville, 1968, p. 6).

The residents of urban renewal areas were usually the victims, not the beneficiaries, of "civic improvement" (Smith, 1970, p. 482; Dennis and Fish, 1972, p. 313).
The American poverty program, ushered in by the 1964 Economic Opportunities Act, was intended to enhance the political efficacy of non-elites ("the poor")—the "sole optimistic note" of the urban renewal experience, according to the van Til's—by "maximum feasible participation" of the target groups in at least the administration of the program at the neighborhood level (van Til and van Til, 1970, pp. 317-318). The experience of the elected Citizens' Advisory Boards in the Model Cities program was that relatively few city governments allowed the Boards to exercise any important planning functions, a responsibility generally given to the City Demonstration Agency appointed by the mayor (Arnstein, 1969, pp. 218-224). The Advisory Boards did exercise some administrative powers, but the only significant impact of the programs in Model Neighborhoods was in temporary, low-skill employment. The majority of employees—especially in the professional and managerial positions—were drawn from outside the target areas (Harrison, 1973, pp. 43-44).

The van Til's gloomily report that many poverty programs, as with the urban renewal programs, have ended in stalemates between elite groups holding legal authority and non-elites holding a veto power. The role of the poor has evolved to one of "advising" social service agencies which are dominated by middle class civil service professionals. They also note that early intentions to "organize the poor" failed because the effect of community organization was to enhance the upward mobility of indigenous leaders and not to build strong
indigenous organizations, a view shared by Howard Hallman and Carl Stenberg. The result has been that there is no pluralist accommodation of the interests of elites and non-elites in the American poverty programs, and little impact on the groups they were intended to benefit (van Til and van Til, 1970, pp. 318-319; Hallman, 1970, pp. 214-218; Stenberg, 1972, pp. 192-193; Mogulof, 1970a, p. 93).

Canadian experience with urban renewal has paralleled that of the United States. In many cities, residents of renewal areas have organized themselves to protect themselves from their local government. The orientation of most citizens' groups in urban development issues in general has been reaction to crisis situations, although the Trefann Court urban renewal program in Toronto and the Highway 417 alignment project in Ottawa provide examples of post-protest power sharing with at least some of the most directly affected residents (Committee on Government Productivity, 1972, pp. 5, 7; Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1970, p. 16; Connor, 1972, pp. 19-20). Wilson Head, among others, asserts that a movement is beginning among the poor and socially disadvantaged to take action to improve their immediate environment—the "bread and butter" issues—focussing on public agencies not meeting the needs of their clients (Head, 1971, p. 22; Carota, 1970, pp. 13-15).

What is the significance of citizens organizing themselves for protection against their own government? It is apparent that the growth of such groups reflects frustration with existing formal government structures and the inability of many

The continuing poverty of some in a generally affluent society and the depersonalization and narrow rationality of centralized bureaucracies have alienated many low-income people from urban government (Head, 1971, pp. 16-18; Committee on Government Productivity, 1972, pp. 12-13; Schaar, 1969, pp. 302-309). Paul Vrooman feels that the feeling of helplessness and loss of control of government is no longer restricted to the urban poor—all classes are attempting to gain some control over decision-making structures. The failure of the electoral process lies in the belief that that mode of participation permits only a choice among ruling elites (Vrooman, 1972, p. 3; Committee on Government Productivity, 1972, pp. 13-14).

A different argument resulting in a similar conclusion, is made by Levy and Truman that the loss of legitimacy is due to lack of well-defined options and lack of efficient communication between electorate and candidates, thus avoiding the stratification analysis made by Vrooman (Levy and Truman, 1971, p. 178). Maurice Egan, speaking on the social problems in Canadian cities, senses a dilemma in that government "for and by the people" may not be "effective, efficient, and just"—this supports a growing concern with the process of government, and relatively less concern with the policy output (Egan, 1970, p. 127; Clague, 1971, p. 32; Zimmerman, 1972, pp 224-225).

The concept of "legitimacy" of government is very much at
the heart of the problem. Philip Green has indicated that pluralism in liberal democratic government can be accommodated only as long as there is consensus on the legitimacy of the existing social and legal structure (Green, 1969, pp. 253-254; also Parry, 1969, p. 127). Legitimacy, in this sense, means the capacity of a political system to build and maintain the belief that the political institutions are the most appropriate and are considered "right" and "proper" (Schaar, 1969, p. 283).

II Legitimization of Government: Decentralization as Antidote

Numerous suggestions exist for improving the political contact between the most highly alienated--especially those low on the socioeconomic scale--and the urban government (Kahn, 1966, p. 11). Many writers feel that decentralizing the decision-making process will result in a more responsive government--a government wherein local needs and desires could be more adequately recognized and therefore more likely reflected in policy (Head, 1971, p. 26; Webster, 1971, pp. 2-3).

Early arguments favoring centralization of urban administrative structures--based on efficiency and nonpartisanship--are being devalued as perceived needs for submunicipal control of certain public services are expressed. Most urban decentralization proposals, whether political or administrative in nature, rest on the concept of social and political interaction at the neighborhood level as an antidote for the remoteness of the central city government from most
citizens. Most advocates of decentralization call for some form of neighborhood council, taking the representativeness and responsiveness of that group to the area's constituents as an article of faith (Schmandt, 1972, p. 583).

There has been little empirical research on the degree to which the political interests and values of a local area population are reflected in the local area political process involved in resolving locality issues. If this key assumption in municipal decentralization theory, that local area political process reflects the diversity of local area political interests, is invalid, local area government is not going to legitimize government decision-making at that level. This research is an empirical test of that assumption in municipal decentralization theory.

III Focus of Research: The General Hypothesis

The focus of this research is on the relationship between the nature of the political process and the diversity of political values and interests on salient issue areas, both at the local area level. Decentralization of some powers of municipal government to the local area level as a means of legitimizing decision-making rests on the political process reflecting that diversity.

The general hypothesis is therefore "that political processes in local areas reflect the diversity of political values and interests of the population and thus have the potential to legitimize decision-making at that level".
The general hypothesis will be tested in the issue area of urban land development control. This issue area is selected for two reasons. The first is that such issues are politically salient to some (not all) instrumental voluntary organizations active at the local area level. The second is that some land development control powers are among the powers which would probably be devolved to local area governments in future political decentralization of large urban areas, as in the recent political restructuring of the City of Winnipeg (Axworthy, 1973, p. 5).

The general hypothesis will be tested by a comparative study of two "local areas" designated by the City of Vancouver in 1969 for certain planning and administrative purposes—Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodlands. These two areas are selected because their populations differ in degree of diversity in socioeconomic terms. The areas are quite similar in many other respects, as will be detailed in Chapters 4 and 6.

The key words in the hypothesis are "political processes". Two related, but important, aspects of political dynamics are explicitly not studied—the "representativeness" of the political stratum and the policy outputs of the political process. The reason for emphasis on political process will be outlined in Chapter 3. This does not imply that process is more important than the congruence of leadership values and apolitical residents' values and the "representativeness" and accountability of leaders to constituents (Agger and Swanson, 1964, pp. 261-322). The work of researchers concerned with the
value congruence question and with policy outcomes is important (for example: Sigel and Friesema, 1965; McClcsky, Hoffman, and O'Hara, 1964; Bonjean, 1971a, pp. 32-35; Rose, 1962, pp. 837-838). Their findings must be considered before attempting to build an ideology with respect to political decentralization of municipal government.

The value of this work will be in two areas: it may draw the attention of researchers to a relatively neglected aspect of the discussion on municipal decentralization, and, it should assist those with operational interests in citizen participation in municipal government, including politicians, administrators, and community development workers. It should be of considerable interest to municipal planners who are more and more involved with people actively pursuing locality interests through somewhat permanent neighborhood councils or associations.

IV Organization of Research

A more complete outline of municipal decentralization theory comprises Chapter 2. This is done to identify difficulties in designing working hypotheses to test the general hypothesis. Chapter 3 is a tracing of democratic theory, with emphasis on post-Industrial Revolution changes. This is presented for a specific purpose: to outline the current concept and characteristics of a political process which "reflects the diversity of political values and interests of the population" (from the general hypothesis). Working hypotheses are designed in Chapter 4, utilizing the concepts and definitions developed
in the previous two chapters, plus postulating lines of political cleavage in urban land development issues. Chapter 5 details the research design, including methodology and specification of needed information. Research findings and analysis of raw data comprise Chapter 6. Conclusions with respect to working and general hypotheses are drawn in Chapter 7, as are applications of the research to municipal decentralization theory. A direction for further research suggested by this work is also included in the final chapter.
Chapter 2

Municipal Decentralization Theory

I Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to supplement the description of municipal decentralization theory given in Chapter 1. Certain difficulties in testing hypotheses relating to the theory will be identified for use in designing the working hypotheses.

II Municipal Decentralization Theory

Henry Schmandt describes the theory of urban government decentralization as being at the convergence of two themes in sociological and political theory: federalism (local autonomy and intergovernmental relations) and the neighborhood (as a planning and administrative unit) (Schmandt, 1972, p. 572).

A. Federalism: Local Autonomy

Both the U.S. and Canada have been, and still are, concerned with the division of political power between states or provinces and the national government. At the municipal level, political and administrative power is delegated from the province or state to municipal government. It is at the municipal and submunicipal level that delegation of power to submunicipal units involves specifying whether the power delegated is political (i.e., to officials responsible to a
submunicipal electorate) or administrative (i.e. delegation of greater discretionary power within a hierarchical public agency to employees at the local service outlet level) (Crawford, 1954, pp. 48f).

In administrative decentralization, the focus is on reducing the unresponsiveness of public bureaucracies, even though this often means degrading traditional administrative values of efficiency and economy of scale. The rationale for delegating greater administrative discretion to the outlet level is that officials at that level would tend to concentrate more on smaller areas and would therefore be more responsive to their clients; this would result in better service and more effective programs.

In political decentralization, the focus is on facilitating the intervention by the presently alienated groups in the decision-making process insofar as "local" matters are concerned. In this context, decentralization is seen as a means of facilitating mobilization of political power in neighborhoods, and developing the self-consciousness of residents as a political force, and thus enabling some direct citizen control over the public institutions serving the neighborhood (Schmandt, 1972, pp. 576-577).

It is clear that in conducting a comparative study of the relationship between political process and population characteristics that the areas studied should have very similar governing structures and means of political integration. The structure and means of selecting a local area government (or
other representative body) could influence the nature of the political process.

B. The Neighborhood as a Political Unit

The neighborhood has been the subject of much sociological and political conceptualization. Early theoretical work began with Perry's "neighborhood unit" concept of the neighborhood as an area having all the public facilities and amenities required by families, in the vicinity of the home (Keller, 1968, p. 87). In the physical sense, it is related to Ebenezer Howard's "Garden City" concept; sociologically, Perry felt this environment would enable people to know their neighbors, participate in public affairs and generally achieve self-fulfilment through intense, mutually supportive social interaction within the neighborhood (Schmandt, 1972, pp. 573-574).

The neighborhood unit concept has been severely criticized, and there is still disagreement over the spatial manifestations of social networks. For example, Barry Wellman feels that urban society has become despatialized—most interaction taking place within "selective communities" with little geographic concentration of interests. He does admit that some functions have a locality context (property interests and housing tenure, for example) (Wellman, 1971, pp. 283-285).

Another theoretical approach to the neighborhood has been the "natural area" concept—areas indicated by distinctive ecological (human) and physical characteristics (Schmandt, 1972,
pp. 574-575). This perspective is adopted by Milton Kotler and Alan Altschuler in their arguments for neighborhood government—Kotler proposes that urban neighborhoods were originally towns and villages with local political unity and that therefore a historical basis for self-rule exists (Kotler, 1969, pp. 5-6, 27). Altschuler refers to ecological concentrations of minority groups in urban areas which, because of relative immobility of these groups, results in greater group identification with the neighborhood. This view is supported by experience in the U.S. Community Action Programs (Altschuler, 1970, p. 129; Capoccia, 1973, p. 250).

The purpose of this discussion on neighborhood concepts is intended only to illustrate that the term "neighborhood" has been inconsistently and widely used in sociological and planning literature. Sometimes it is used to describe a geographic area; sometimes it describes a set of activities or perceptions associated with an area. Little can be concluded or assumed about social dynamics, differentiation, or political process in urban "neighborhoods" (Keller, 1966, pp. 67-73).

C. Municipal Decentralization Theory: Major Assumptions

The theory and rationale supporting both administrative and political decentralization are based on two assumptions: that common interests can be identified with a definable submunicipal geographic territory (Zimmerman, 1972, p. 225), and that the political dynamics at that level will reflect local values and interests and thus legitimize the decision-making process at that level, from the point of view of the area constituency.
The potential difficulties in research in decentralization theory lay in several areas suggested by the above outline. The first is that areas being compared must have very similar legal and political statuses and structures. The second is selecting issue areas politically salient to the local area population. A third is postulating the lines of cleavage in each issue area, relating to the social structure of the local community. A fourth is the difficult problem of defining "legitimacy" of political processes and government. These considerations are included in the chapters on democratic theory and design of working hypotheses.
Chapter 3

Democratic Theory: The Responsive Government

I Introduction

The general hypothesis calls for testing whether a particular political process "reflects the diversity of political values and interests of the population". The purpose of this chapter is to outline the current concept and identify the characteristics of a political process which has that characteristic. The body of theory which is at the focus of this quest is that of liberal democratic theory. The evolution of the theory will be traced and the current concept and characteristics of a responsive political system will be outlined to use in developing working hypotheses.

II Evolution of Liberal Democratic Theory

Theories of democracy can be traced back in human history at least as far as the era of the classical Greek city-states. The example of classical democracy used most often is that of the Athenian Ecclesia, a governing body open to all free male adult citizens, checked only by a council of five hundred citizens drawn by lot from the population (Cunningham, 1972, pp. 590-591). Theory has evolved from that time to the present; the result, as it is understood in western nations, is the theory of liberal democratic government. Frederic Thayer asserts that there is general agreement on the broad outline of the theory,
and that it seems equally applicable to all western "democratic" governments (Thayer, 1971, p. 6). Understanding this theory, especially its recent development with respect to North American political systems, is necessary in social policy design because change in North American governmental structures will almost certainly be made in its context (Greer and Mirar, 1964, p. 70).

David Ricci and Frederick Thayer have traced the evolution of democratic theory from the nineteenth century to the present. Their work, amplified by other writers*, will be used here for a broad-brush description.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century concepts of liberal democracy were based on three assumptions: that most men are rational, that the individual and not the group is of prime political importance, and that the collective interest of a society is best represented through an electoral system (Ricci, 1971, pp. 10-11). Various political events of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such as the emergence of the political "boss" in American municipal government, cast doubt on the validity of the basic assumptions of early democratic theory, and American scholars sought to redefine the theory (Ricci, 1971, pp. 50-51).

Although he wasn't the only theorist attempting to recast democratic theory, Joseph Schumpeter is generally considered to have been first to give a full exposition of the new "process theory" in his 1942 book *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (Ricci, 1971, p. 52). Schumpeter's definition of democratic
process is "...that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote" (Schumpeter, 1942, p. 269). The theory accommodates pluralism, political parties, and elites by adopting a competitive or "marketplace" approach to the electoral process. The concept of the political system is that of a more or less competitive arena in which groups compete for power and in which individual political actors recognize and articulate the values and interests of their reference groups (also: Kirlin and Erie, 1972, p. 175; Lowi, 1971, p. 74; Freund, 1948, p. 342).

The individual citizen participates in the political process and controls his representatives only by voting. Pluralist and other group theories never included this premise, and the issue of influence has never been resolved in the theory. Competition among political parties is to ensure that meaningful alternatives are presented to the voter (Ricci, 1971, p. 60; Freund, 1948, p. 342). The "public interest" remains a nebulous but presumably proper balance of power among competing interests. The principle feature of this model of democracy is the pluralist competition for power, with the role of the citizen being one of periodically indicating his political desires through the electoral process (also: Kirlin and Erie, 1972, p. 175).

Some of the weaknesses in the "process theory" were identified by 1950. The assumption that the electoral process had greater power over elected representatives than any other
form of power (industrial lobbies, for example) was attacked because it was clear even at that time that the voter did not have a variety of meaningful electoral choices (Ricci, 1971, p. 61). The assumption that most citizens are incapable of defining their own best interests meant that stability and a democratic ethic in government depended on a low level of political activity on the part of the electorate. This led to the conclusion that stable democracy rests on a generally tolerant and apathetic citizenry—a puzzling contradiction (Thayer, 1971, pp. 6-13; Corry, 1959, p. 85). From an ideological perspective, the theory was denounced by some who felt that ignoring the outcome of the political process inferred that existing policies and practices were appropriate (Ricci, 1971, p. 61). This omission from comprehensive theories of democracy has been drawn to the reader's attention in Chapter 1.

David Truman added the concept of "interest group" to the process theory in an attempt to make theory and reality somewhat more congruent. This concept is still an integral part of democratic theory, as will be discussed later (Ricci, 1971, p. 82).

The next phase in theoretical development was marked by Floyd Hunter and C. Wright Mills' works of the early 1950's on influential elites at the local and national levels respectively. Hunter found in his study of Atlanta, Georgia, that a very few people controlled the city's political actions, and that this elite group did not generally derive their power
from formal public positions (Hunter, 1953, pp. 81-105). His methodology—the "reputational technique"—consisted of having "key informants" or "judges" identify the community's "leadership pool", followed by cycles of interviewing persons named who identified and ranked other leaders (Hunter, 1953, pp. 262-272). Mills' technique became known as the "positional technique"—he felt that power did not accrue to the individual, but only to the formal position held by the individual (Mills, 1956, pp. 10-11).

The next major impact on democratic theory was due to the early 1960's work of the "pluralist school", introduced to North American political science by Dahl, Polsby, and Wolfinger (Ricci, 1971, pp. 126-127). Though many political scientists attribute the birth of pluralist theory to Robert Dahl, the origin can be traced to the 1939 writings of J.S. Furnivall, who defined a "plural society" as "a society comprising two or more elements or social orders which live side by side, yet without mingling, in one political unit" (Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972, pp. 10-11). Furnivall based his theory on cultural pluralism in an international sense. He found that "lines of cleavage" reflected racial, linguistic, religious, and sometimes tribal groupings, especially when ethnic and occupational associations were pronounced. Such a society, he propounded, was integrated only by inter-group economic exchanges and survived as a political unit only because of external force. Whether the fact that Furnivall was an economist and a colonial administrator in Netherlands India influenced his conceptualization will remain a speculative point in this thesis (Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972,
He did apply his theory to societies where ethnic-occupational associations were weak; his principle tenet was that the stability of such societies was enhanced by the extent to which groups and individuals have a number of politically relevant "cross-cutting" affiliations (Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972, p. 57). This concept is found in Dahl's later writings, but is not made explicit in his major introductory work *Who Governs?* (Dahl, 1967, p. 277).

Nelson Polsby attacked the elitist model of politics on several grounds. He stated that nothing categorical can be assumed about community politics—he charged that Hunter's hypothesis that an elite would be found was self-fulfilling because Hunter had assumed that social stratification theory was directly applicable to political analysis. He further charged that Hunter's single-point-in-time analysis was faulty because political systems tend to be dynamic—actors and issues change over time, and the distribution of power changes with them. He was especially critical of the reputational technique of leader identification, arguing that since human behaviour is in part influenced by inertia, overt political activity and individual political roles are of greater consequence than mere reputation for power-holding. In brief, he contended that pluralist theory was correct, because it accounted for actual exercise of power and outcomes of political struggles (Polsby, 1963, pp. 113-121).

Robert Dahl provided an empirical basis for pluralist theory in his oft-quoted case study of New Haven, *Who Governs?*
(Dahl, 1961). The key elements are the focus on decisions and issue areas (the "decisional technique"), the differentiation of actual and potential power (the political "slack" concept), differentiation of public and private power structures, coining the phrase "political stratum" to describe those persons active in public affairs, and relating political "resources" to individual and group power-holding (Dahl, 1961, pp. 90-102, 164-165, 226-228, 271, 279, 305).

Criticisms of the pluralist theory of Dahl et al were not lacking (Zimmerman, 1972, p. 225; Ricci, 1971, p. 140). Several writers feel that pluralism a la Dahl is nothing more than process theory in detail. The same acceptance of limited political participation, competitiveness, and appeals to reference groups apply (Ricci, 1971; pp. 152-157). Democratic norms are implied and meaningful choices are assumed to be presented through the electoral process (Ricci, 1971, p. 149; Prewitt, 1970, pp. 208-216; Greer and Mirar, 1964, p. 68). David Ricci feels that the single major defect in the theory is the implicit assumption that apolitical citizens are satisfied with their government (Ricci, 1971, pp. 156-157, 166). This criticism also casts doubt on Dahl's concepts of political "slack" and non-cumulative resources—political inertia may not reflect satisfaction if citizens don't have political resources which they could use if dissatisfied (Ricci, 1971, p. 166). The methodology used in the New Haven study was also attacked—Bachrach and Baratz focussed on the heavy emphasis on the political decision, expressing the view that the "non-decision"—the policy or issue suppressed from public debate—is
as important as decisions actually made (Bachrach and Baratz, 1963, pp. 632-642; also: Scoble, 1971, p. 113; Ricci, 1971, p. 163; Key, 1964, p. 57).

Generally speaking, the principle criticism of pluralist theory was that the political system was not as responsive, and political power was not as diffused, as Dahl had claimed (Zimmerman, 1972, pp. 224-225). Even though organized group conflict is indicative of pluralism, the internal politics of groups may not be either egalitarian or responsive to the membership (Lowi, 1971, pp. 74-76). William Scott's statement provides a succinct summary of the weakness of pluralist theory: the pluralist conception of the democratic political system is one of "islands of despotism in a sea of constitutional pluralism accompanied by the hope that equity, justice, and social good comes out of it all" (Scott, 1969, p. 47; also: Greer and Mirar, 1964, p. 65).

Where does this leave democratic theory? Political scientists are currently developing concepts of political systems centered on interest groups (Verba, 1965, p. 468; Lowi, 1967, p. 12; Lowi, 1971, pp. 74-76; Tunnard, 1973, p. 103). What are the characteristics of what Lowi has termed "interest group liberalism" (or Tunnard's "partisan mutual adjustment")? The key feature, according to Lowi, is that public policy is to be formulated in terms of organized interests. The role of government is to ensure access of groups to the decision-making process and to ratify the agreements reached among participating groups. It is therefore little more than a vulgarized version
of pluralist theory (Lowi, 1967, p. 12).

The concepts of "legitimacy" and responsiveness to unorganized groups are missing from these constructions. The political context of citizen participation in North America, as outlined in Chapter 1, suggests that legitimacy and responsiveness to the unorganized must be ensured in a political process which "reflects the diversity of political values and interests of the population" (from the general hypothesis). The recent work of political philosophers who attempt to broach this problem is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

While the democratic theory outlined above is applicable to all western democracies (Thayer, 1971, p. 6), its detailed interpretation varies among nations. The American interpretation has stressed the accommodation of highly organized interest groups, a thought which can be traced to Madison's concern in the *Federalist Papers* #10 with the dominance of factions in small jurisdictions (Madison, 1788; Head, 1971, p. 14). The Canadian interpretation has stressed democratic leadership—politicians propose hypothetical policies, listen to reactions from the electorate and interest groups, and modify proposed policies to make them acceptable to most interests (Whalen, 1960, pp. 5, 193). Tracing the variations in this theme and applying that knowledge to design of specific public structures involving "citizen participation" is beyond the scope of this research. The point is raised only to warn the reader that application of general democratic theory to a specific political situation requires further, careful
research.

III The Responsive Political System

Buckhart Holzner depicts the political system as part of the integrating mechanisms of society, wherein power relations among subsystems are integrated (Max Weber's "social order on the basis of interest constellations"), and value integration is based on values associated with culturally defined positions. In this model, the legitimacy of government is determined by the nature of the relationship between the power relations system and the value system, and to a lesser degree, the operative system (the daily meshing of institutional operations and the community). Presumably, if value differentiation is not reflected in the power (or political) integration system, the legitimacy of the structure and process of government is weakened (also: Bonjean, 1971a, p. 24).

Holzner adds that integration in society is not necessarily based on a high degree of socio-cultural unity or on a high degree of socio-personal integration, nor is value and power differentiation among groups equivalent to disintegration (Holzner, 1967, pp. 59-60). This view is reinforced by John Walton's interpretation of recent empirical research by Perucci and Pilisuk, and Molt which suggests that the greater the number of political (or instrumental) organizations in a power system (urban government, for example) the greater the number of intergroup linkages and the denser the "power network", and thus the more likely are policy outcomes reflecting the diversity of
positions. He concludes that broad participation in the political system does not indicate dysfunction (Walton, 1973, p. 326). Consequently, not only must the power structure in decision-making be increasingly pluralistic as values and interests diversify in the community in order to approximate the democratic ideal, but the process of decision-making itself must be perceived by the participants as legitimate (Vrooman, 1972, p. 3; Rein, 1969, p. 233).

Amitai Etzioni has laid a philosophical foundation for politically responsive and responsible government in The Active Society (1968). He terms such a system as an "authentic political community"—a community which is self-sufficient in coercive (legal) power, which can make significant and effective decisions in resource allocation, which is perceived by most politically active citizens as legitimate, and which both appears to be and is responsive to basic human needs (Etzioni, 1968, pp. 668-669). This concept is supported by Alvin Toffler and Richard Sennett who argue that the political system must be opened—only by bringing in angry minorities and those not benefitting from the existing electoral process as full partners can people come to be in control of themselves (Toffler, 1970, p. 422; Sennett, 1971, p. 198). This proposition is close to Rousseau's belief that freedom is based on obedience to rules formulated in a decision-making process accessible to all (Hart, 1972, p. 610).

The current concept of responsive government appears to be that of pluralism, especially in the form of organized group
competition for public support, overlaid with the perception of the constituency that the political system and government are legitimate (Presthus, 1970, pp. 109-110). The characteristics of a pluralistic, legitimate political process therefore include:

1. Competition among centres of power and influence within the political community.
2. Access to the political system for both groups and individuals.
3. Participation by individuals in different kinds of political organizations.
4. Perception of the constituency that the means of selecting representatives and their activity as legitimate.

The above characteristics will be used in developing working hypotheses in the next chapter, and in analyzing research findings.
Chapter 4

Political Process and Community Structure: Developing Working Hypotheses

I Comparative Analysis—The Variables

A simple definition of "community" is "a conglomeration of people living in the same geographic area" (Leissner, 1973, p. 3); the use of "conglomeration" implies that individuals may be different in many ways. A more exacting definition is "that combination of social units and systems which perform the major social functions having locality relevance" (Warren, 1963, p. 9). The addition of "social units and systems" in the definition suggests structural relationships among groups of individuals, resulting in the performance of a social function.

Comparative analysis of political processes in different communities is relatively recent—case studies in this field were almost the rule until the mid-1960's (Clark, 1968, pp. 3-5). Explanatory propositions in social and political science can be more confidently based on comparisons between communities (or other research unit, depending on what is being studied), although the rich detail of single-community case studies is invaluable in exploratory studies (Bonjean, 1971a, p. 172).

A key element in comparative analysis is specification of variables. The dependent variable in the general hypothesis is the nature of the political process: the relative degree of pluralism exhibited and the legitimacy of the political process.
as perceived by the political actors. The independent variable is the political value system of the community. All other significant variables would ideally be controlled to the same value; in practice, some approximate standardization is unavoidable.

Clark studied the economic, social, and political science literature on political process and derived ten major variables significant in community decision-making (Clark, 1968, pp. 17-22). These are:

1. Inputs to the community: the degree of autonomy of the community in decision-making affects the way incoming resources are converted to outputs (the size of the budget, restrictions on use of senior government funding, etc).
2. Characteristics of the national society: major cultural differences among nations.
3. Demographic characteristics of the community: age, size, growth rate, ethnicity, educational levels, occupational structure, etc.
4. Economic function of the community: the economic base, diversity of employment opportunities, etc.
5. Legal-political structure: ward vs at-large elections, city manager vs mayor government, inter-governmental agreements, etc.
6. Integrating mechanisms: the structural characteristics of the political process, such as political parties, voluntary organizations, etc.
7. Community values and norms: these influence the
decision-making process by limiting the range of "acceptable" policy outputs.

8. Leadership characteristics: leaders' social backgrounds, demographic characteristics, values, interests, etc.

9. The "decision-making structure": the political interaction among political actors within the community in influencing choices among alternate goals relating to maintaining or modifying institutions or facilities that involve the majority of community residents.

10. Community outputs: the actual results of the political process, such as election results, budget-setting, program approvals, etc.

Clark's construction of the relationship between the social and political characteristics of a community are paralleled in Roland Warren's discussion of the social structure and the social functions of a community. Warren identifies five social functions having locality relevance (Warren, 1963, pp. 9-10):

1. Production-distribution-consumption systems
2. Socialization
3. Social control
4. Social participation
5. Mutual support

The function being considered in developing and testing the general hypothesis is that of social control—the process through which the members of a community are influenced by the
group toward conformity with its norms (Warren, 1963, p. 11). The political process is one of several processes by which social control and integration are achieved—others include control by the family and by institutions such as public schools.

In order to examine the relationship between political process and the social structure of the local area, several variables suggested by Clark and Warren should be controlled. The legal status and organization of the local government is very important (see also: Chapter 2 of this thesis and Milbrath, 1965, pp. 5, 90). Only formally constituted bodies, generally municipal governments, have coercive power in land development control in Canada. To control this variable, the local areas selected should have the same legal-political status. This has been accomplished by selecting two local areas in Vancouver which have been designated by the City and which have equal and similar legal status insofar as land development control is concerned (City of Vancouver, 1973a, p. 4).

This selection also controls "community inputs" and "community outputs" in Clark's construction, in that Vancouver's local areas in fact do not have statutory rights to tax revenue or other public "inputs". With no coercive powers in land development, both areas lack equally in policy "output" in that issue area. An input which may be relevant is that some local area organizations receive funds for programs from senior governments. Both have city-assisted information centres, for example. The potential of individuals and groups to act
politically can be compromised if the city withdraws the funds on which their survival depends (Apostle, 1972, p. 7; National Council of Welfare, 1972, pp. 27-33). The autonomy of groups, in that context, will be included in information-gathering to confirm control of this variable. Another input to be controlled is the "visibility" of the leadership (Bonjean, 1971a, p. 24; Booth and Babchuk, 1973, p. 82). Both areas have a community newspaper and in both areas, the political groups have distributed literature in the community on their activities. Both areas are within the distribution area of city daily newspapers and radio and television.

Subject to checking the relative autonomy of politically active groups from fund-source influence, the two areas are similar in "inputs". With no coercive powers in land development, both local areas are identical in lack of policy "output".

Clark's "economic characteristics", synonymous with the production-distribution-consumption system characteristics in Warren's social function delineation, are more difficult to control in Vancouver's local areas. Bonjean suggests that size, economic base, and human ecology zonal classification are good indicators (Bonjean, 1971b, pp. 7-9). Some early work by Scott Greer and Peter Orleans suggests that some differences in inner city and suburban areas are reflected in political behaviour, but it was not clear whether scale, social composition, or legal-political structures were the primary cause. This would add some legitimacy to controlling on human ecology indicators.
(Greer and Orleans, 1962, p. 645). In population size, the two areas are roughly equal. Both areas are residential areas, characterized by a mix of single-family, duplex-conversions, and some low-rise apartments; both have commercial land-uses along arterial streets; and both are adjacent to industrial areas, as shown on the map in Appendix B (City of Vancouver, 1973c, p. 22).

Human ecology concepts have rarely been applied to political analysis (Almy, 1973, p. 914). While the sub-social model based on biological analogies has largely been discredited, some concepts are still used by urban geographers to describe economic activities in urban areas—the processes of competition, invasion, succession, and dominance (Pahl, 1968, p. 5; Reissman, 1964, pp. 111,114). In this respect, both areas are similar—both were originally single-family home areas which are now in the process of "invasion" by higher-density residential uses. The political history of each area does not significantly differ. Both areas were included within the 1886 City of Vancouver boundary, as shown on the map in Appendix C.

The "integrating mechanisms" variable is related to the legal-political structure. In a legal-political environment where no legislative or administrative powers are delegated by law to submunicipal political bodies, political integration at that level can take place only through individuals and/or voluntary associations acting in a legally informal fashion. The composition and organization of the political stratum may well vary and be reflected in "leadership characteristics" and
"decision-making structure". In both communities being researched, political integration at the local area level has generally taken place by interaction between voluntary associations and, more rarely, individuals.

The above sketch of the variables involved in a comparative study of the relationship between political process and social structure in Vancouver's local areas suggests that only the issue area must be defined and carefully controlled for a comparison of Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodlands. This variable is discussed in the next section, and working hypotheses are derived in the final sections of this chapter.

II Selection of Issue Area

Floyd Hunter studied the distribution of influence in Atlanta and concluded that there was a single pyramidal "power structure" which dominated policy-making at the city level. He found that decisions on policy were executed through numerous groups of "second string" political actors (Hunter, 1953, pp. 57, 96-97, 214-223). More recent research suggests that political activity is significantly influenced by the nature of the political issue itself—the "issue area"—and that a variety of issue areas should be studied before constructing a comprehensive model of the political process (Berk et al., 1973, pp. 573-574; Bonjean, 1971a, p. 30; Ricci, 1971, p. 163). Theodore Lowi conceptualizes political process as an "ecology of power structures"—each issue area is associated with a set of political actors behaving in a characteristic way. There may be
overlap among the issue-oriented groups, and the political process in various issue areas may differ markedly (Lowi, 1964, p. 229-230; Bonjean, 1971a, p. 30). Other researchers have found that the decisional technique of political process analysis reveals the nature of objective conditions in specific issue areas of great political concern, such as race relations in the U.S. (Berk et al, 1973, pp. 590-591).

The purpose of this research is to learn something about political process in "neighborhoods". It is hoped that this will be useful since submunicipal units with some self-governing features have already been included in public programs (neighborhood corporations in the Model Cities program, for example). It is most useful to study political process in the context of a salient issue in Vancouver's local areas.

Canadian experience immediately suggests that urban land development and redevelopment have been major issues. In a recent study of the Don District in Toronto, an area generally low in terms of socioeconomic status, researchers found that most residents' and tenants' organizations had been organized in response to redevelopment proposals, and that that issue area had remained of prime concern to those groups over a period of time (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1970, pp. 103,113-122; also: Apostle, 1972, p. 7; Repo, 1971, p. 60). Scanning Vancouver daily newspapers and the Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodlands weekly newspapers confirms the assertion that land development issues are of great concern to those who are politically active at the "local area" level. While other
issue areas may be important in the local area context, the issue area selected for this research is urban land development.

III Lines of Political Cleavage: Working Hypothesis I

The general hypothesis is "that political processes in local areas reflect the diversity of political values and interests of the population and thus have the potential to legitimize decision-making at that level". In a political system involving leadership, the hypothesis is recast to one of leaders reflecting the degree of divergence of values and interests in the community (Bonjean, 1971a, p. 24; Clark, 1971, p. 28). Referring to the previous section on variables, the variables relevant here are demographic and cultural characteristics and the decision-making process. The latter variable, the decision-making process, is related to the above general hypothesis in the sense that the political process is pluralistic to the extent that leaders differ in their values (Clark, 1968, p. 28).

Determining the most probable lines of cleavage in values and interests in the community is more difficult. Ideally, this would be determined by extensive surveying on perception of issues and political attitudes. Since this cannot be done in this research, the lines of political cleavage will be postulated from other research.

Mack and McElrath postulate that highly urbanized societies are characterized by three broad systems of distribution and deprivation based on occupational groupings, ethnic or migrant-
status groupings, and life style groupings. In the first group, specialization of labor in industrial society has resulted in reference groups for social norms and political ideology based on occupational groupings; the occupational subculture can be a substitute for community structure. Class status is partially determined by the mutually reinforcing variables of income, education, and behavioural norms. Ethnic and migrant differentiations tend to be temporary phenomena, although ethnicity remains relevant much longer (Mack and McElrath, 1964, pp. 29-30).

Herbert Gans found that social networks in the Boston West End were defined by a combination of class and ethnic lines (Gans, 1963, pp. 14-16). A similar conclusion was drawn by Caplow and Forman in their 1950 study of residents of married university students' housing (Caplow and Forman, 1950, p. 366). A similar social network was noted in a study of the Italian communities in Toronto—social relations were defined by ethnic group. Class differentiation was not apparent, perhaps because most people in the community were first generation, of a fairly uniform lower social status, and concentrated geographically (Jansen, 1971, pp. 473-474).

The final dimension, life style, seems to be a continuum from central city, small family, young or aged apartment dwellers to the suburban family groups, except for some ethnic and migrant groups concentrated near the city centre. There is a class dimension inherent here—from low or working class to middle class (Mack and McElrath, 1964, p. 31).
The relationship between social structure and political values is complex—the Toronto Italian community study referred to above states that political activity and values vary within the community, even though it is socially and economically highly segregated from other urban groups (Jansen, 1971, pp. 473-474). A recent survey of white, native-born residents of Detroit indicates that there are no statistically significant relationships between ethnic or religious affiliations and political attitudes, although a few ethno-religious groups do indicate some differentiation in political orientation (Laumann and Segal, 1971, pp. 36, 55). It appears that consensus in political attitudes and ethnic or religious group cohesion are not necessarily the cause or consequence of the other (Enoch and McLemore, 1967, p. 178).

A more direct link between political values and social structure at the local area level may be found in considering residential selection patterns. It is known that occupational and educational groups tend to concentrate in selection of residential area (Duncan and Duncan, 1965, pp. 493-503; Keller, 1968, pp. 90-92). Gans reports in The Levittowners that people generally prefer neighbors whose life style and child-rearing practices are similar to their own (Gans, 1967, pp. 154-181; also Gans, 1968, p. 111; Rex, 1968, p. 219-221). William Whyte found that even in suburbs characterized by low social interaction between neighbors, residents were of similar socio-economic status and tended to share political beliefs and have common life styles (Whyte, 1957, pp. 310-344). Timothy Almy's
recent analysis of electoral behaviour confirms Whyte's statement—residential location is at least partly based on class considerations (Almy, 1973, p 914).

The Webbers have postulated that the population is on a class continuum in perception and use of space, ranging from aspatial community perception by the intellectual elite to intense localism in social networks and perception on the part of what they call "working class locals" (Webber and Webber, 1967, pp. 37-44). Michelson describes the continuum as upper middle class "community oriented" to working class "home oriented" (Michelson, 1970, p. 115; also Alford and Scoble, 1968, pp. 1204-1205).

If different classes live in close proximity to each other, are these differences manifested in political activity? In the Toronto Don District Study, researchers found that middle-class people were buying and renovating delapidated houses in the District. The effect was similar to commercial development in that the subsequent higher land values were reflected in rent and property tax increases on adjacent housing, and the available low-cost housing needed by working class people became more scarce (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1970, p. 10; also: Repo, 1971, pp. 63, 67).

Working hypothesis I is set in the context of urban land development issues. It is postulated that class differentiation in the local area population, as indicated by socioeconomic differentiation, is more significantly associated with political value and interest differentiation than is ethno-religious
differentiation. Working hypothesis I is therefore: "that the degree of pluralism exhibited in the political process at the local area level is associated with the degree of socioeconomic differentiation in the local area population".

IV Legitimacy of Local Area Political Process: Working Hypothesis II

John Schaar identifies three definitions of "legitimacy" in current use in political science. The first involves the capacity of the political system to create and maintain the belief that existing political institutions are the most appropriate for the society. The second is the degree to which the institutions are valued for themselves. The third includes the criteria that the institutions are morally proper (as distinct from "appropriate", which may include accepting a political decision as correct even though some effects of the decision may be morally repugnant) (Schaar, 1969, p. 283).

A narrow view of the legitimacy of government is that a governing system is only legitimate to the degree that persons with "real" political influence act only when occupying elected or politically appointed public positions (Bonjean, 1971a, pp. 24-25; Seeley, 1956, p. 364). In the context of political integration through voluntary associations at the local area level, tests of legitimacy must apply to a hypothetical elected local area government with some coercive powers in land development control. This is a somewhat limited piece of information—a real-life local area government may attract participants somewhat different from those active and
influential in voluntary organizations. In the absence of real-life local area government in Vancouver, the perception of legitimacy of such governing structures will be of a hypothetical elected local area government with coercive powers as noted above.

Working hypothesis II is therefore "that political actors at the local area level currently active in land development issues perceive the legitimacy of an elected local area government with powers in that issue area to be significantly greater than that of the existing City government system".
Chapter 5
Research Design

I Introduction

The two working hypotheses formulated in the preceding chapter require four sets of information for testing. Both hypotheses are to be tested in the context of a land development issue—the specific issue must be defined for each local area. The first hypothesis includes two elements: the relative degree of internal socioeconomic differentiation between the two areas, and the relative degree of pluralism exhibited in the political process of each. The second hypothesis requires determining the perception of each area's political leaders with respect to the legitimacy of an elected local area government, with coercive powers in land development, compared to that of the present City government. The methodology used to satisfy information requirements is outlined in the following sections of the chapter.

II Selection of Land Development Issues

In each local area, one land development issue was selected. In order to select an issue having approximately equivalent significance to the local area population, the following criteria were applied:

1. The issue must have been politically salient to at least one group of persons resident in the local area.
2. Political activity at the local area level had to
be overt to the extent of some activity being carried out in public.

3. The land development issue had to be related to a specific site within the local area.

4. The land development issue had to be a specific proposal for altered use of land in a predominately residential part of the local area.

5. The political activity at the local area level had to be concentrated in the last two years (to be able to find the persons involved, and before memories faded).

6. The political process had to have reached some form of resolution by the date of field research.

7. The legal coercive power in the land development issue had to lay with the same body in each case.

8. The participants at the local area level, once identified, had to be willing to be interviewed and to discuss the issue with the researcher.

The specific issues were selected by a combination of two methods: "key informants" and published accounts of the issue. Key informants were the community development workers associated with the area council in each local area. Published accounts included the local area weekly newspapers, the Vancouver Sun, area council annual and special reports, and City Council minutes of meetings and staff reports.
III Socioeconomic Differentiation

The relative degree of social class differentiation in each local area involves using socioeconomic status as an indicator. It was hoped that 1971 census material on income, education, and occupation characteristics at the census tract level would be available for this purpose. Unfortunately, this was not the case. The only 1971 data available is on housing, population, age structure, mother tongue, and household structure.

The problem was resolved to a satisfactory degree by use of results of other recent research. This comprised reports of the City of Vancouver, area councils in Kitsilano and Grandview-Woodlands, and social service agencies. The effect on this research has been to prevent a substantial degree of quantification of the research findings insofar as this variable is concerned. This is not a grave problem because only the relative degree of internal vertical differentiation of two local areas was required.

IV Political Process

The nature of the political process was determined by a combination of reputational and decisional techniques. When the task of identifying the specific land development issue was completed, the "key informants" noted above were asked to identify those residents or local area groups who had been politically active and influential at the local area level in the specific land development issue being studied. This list was used to establish the first set of interviews. Each
interviewee was asked the same question, and the list extended where applicable. The sample was therefore a "snowball" sample—the list of interviewees had the potential to grow, depending on the responses of the people on the first list (Kadushin, 1972, pp. 272-273). Interviewing terminated when no further contacts remained on the expanded list.

Interviews were conducted without a highly structured questionnaire. Each interviewee was asked to describe the political activity with emphasis on the circumstances surrounding and reasons for decisions made by himself (and his group, if applicable). The researcher followed the line of questioning during the interview in the manner suggested by Robert Dahl to determine who made the decisions in the political process and why the decisions were necessary for attaining the interviewee's goals (Dahl, 1960, p. 26). Particular attention was paid to the nature of the competition for public support, inter-group bargaining, and coalition-building process. This procedure established the identity and interests of leaders and the degree of pluralism exhibited in the political process (Clark, 1971, p. 54). Where narratives were not congruent with other interviewees' accounts, return telephone calls were made to determine the corrected accounts.

Published materials were used to provide specific dates of key events and similar less subjective information. Sources included both area councils' files, City of Vancouver staff reports and minutes of meetings, and newspaper accounts of specific events.
Leaders of groups were asked to identify their source of funds, if their activities were being funded by sources other than their membership. This information was cross-checked against written material where available (area council annual financial reports, for example).

V Perceived Legitimacy of Elected Local Area Government

The perception of the relative legitimacy of elected local area government was determined by use of a structured question during the interview. The researcher briefly described a hypothetical elected local area government which would have statutory power in land development control in issues of the type under consideration. The question followed: "Do you feel that such a local area government would be more appropriate than the present City Council level for making such decisions?". The respondent's answer was noted including any conditions or qualifications the interviewee put on his reply.
I Community Profiles: Vertical Differentiation

Information gathered on the local areas of Grandview-Woodlands and Kitsilano comprises both the interpretations of other researchers and a limited amount of 1971 census material. The intent is to compare the two areas on the basis of the degree of socioeconomic differentiation in the population of each. Other information is included to give the reader unfamiliar with the areas a sketch of general community characteristics.

About 27,000 persons live in Grandview-Woodlands. The area was one of the first settled in Vancouver in the late nineteenth century. Most of the homes were constructed prior to the 1920's as was the False Creek industrial area abutting the area's west side (Grandview-Woodlands Area Council, 1972, p. 2). During the post-World War II period, the area has absorbed a great influx of immigrants, chiefly Italian, and a correspondingly great exodus of the original Anglo-Saxon population (Woodland Park Area Resources Council, 1965, p. 3). More recently, large numbers of Portuguese and Indian immigrants have settled in the area. The area serves as a permanent residence for many immigrants, and some relocate elsewhere after becoming established in Canadian urban life (Grandview-Woodlands Area Council, 1972, p. 2). The Italian community, comprising about
35% of the population in 1961, is concentrated in areas east of Victoria Drive, close to Nanaimo Street.

The chief attractions of the area to its residents are low-cost housing and proximity to the central business district of Vancouver (Grandview-Woodlands Area Council, 1972, p. 2). A 1965 study characterized the population as being predominately low-income, low in occupational skills, and relatively low in housing conditions (Woodland Park Area Resources Council, 1965, p. 2).

The 1971 census revealed that about 65% of all households are primary family households (where the head of the household is also head of the family occupying the dwelling). The housing stock is approximately equally divided between single family dwellings (includes a very few attached dwellings) and apartments. About 80% of the single family dwellings are owner-occupied (Statistics Canada, 1973; United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area, 1973). A large portion of Grandview-Woodlands between Commercial and Nanaimo is designated a "duplex and conversion area", and a somewhat smaller area between Clark and Commercial designated as "apartment area" (City of Vancouver, 1973b, pp. 16, 41).

In summary, Grandview-Woodlands is an area of Vancouver attractive to newly-arrived immigrants and low-income people because of its low-cost housing and proximity to the central business district. In socioeconomic terms, it is predominately of low income, education and occupational status.
Kitsilano is similar to Grandview-Woodlands in several respects. Both are roughly equal in population—Grandview-Woodland's 27,000 to Kitsilano's 34,000. Both are equally proximate to the central business district and both have an industrial district abutting one boundary. Their settlement histories are also similar—both were settled as single-family dwelling areas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Both have retail commercial concentrations along arterial streets (Kitsilano Area Resources Association, 1972, p. 4). Parts of Kitsilano are also designated "apartment" and "duplex and conversion" areas (City of Vancouver, 1973b, pp. 16, 41). These characteristics are illustrated on the map in Appendix C.

Kitsilano differs from Grandview-Woodlands to a significant degree in housing characteristics—only about one third of the dwellings in Kitsilano are single family, the balance being apartments. However, the ownership ratio in the single family dwellings is roughly equal to that of Grandview-Woodlands. These characteristics parallel the area's demographic structure. About 50%, as opposed to Grandview-Woodlands' 35%, of households are non-family households (United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area, 1973). The age structure in Kitsilano is weighted toward the two age groups 20 to 34 and over 65 (United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area, 1973). This is due to the predominance of family households in Grandview-Woodlands, with an associated concentration of middle-aged parents, compared to the predominance of the retired elderly and university student-young professional groups in
Another significant difference between the two areas is in ethnic composition. The only significantly large non-English speaking ethnic group in Kitsilano is a small Greek community. The total non-English speaking group in Kitsilano comprised less than 20% of the total area population in 1971, compared to 45% in Grandview-Woodlands (Statistics Canada, 1973).

The Kitsilano population includes a broad spread of income and educational groups, and because of the influence of people associated with U.B.C., a broad spread in occupational groups (Kitsilano Area Resources Association, 1972; Mayhew, 1967a, Appendix 4). A summary of relevant statistics comparing Grandview-Woodlands and Kitsilano to other local areas of Vancouver is attached as Appendix D.

In conclusion, the Kitsilano population is characterized by a significantly greater socioeconomic differentiation than is Grandview-Woodlands'. This is associated with a greater spread in age structure and significant differences in household characteristics. The Grandview-Woodlands population is significantly more diverse in ethnic terms than is Kitsilano's. The Grandview-Woodlands Italian community, the most significant ethnic group in that local area, is concentrated in the easterly part of the area, the area of the specific land development issue chosen for study in this research.

II Political Process
The political process in each of the local areas is described here in the context of a specific land development issue identified as specified in Chapter 5. The merits of the development proposals from a physical or social planning point of view are not considered except to identify the political values and interests of the various participants in the political process. Sources are not referenced because the account is written as an amalgam of the information garnered from interviews, news stories, petitions, and other sources mentioned in the preceding chapter.

Using the "snowball sample" method described in Chapter 5, a total of five people were interviewed in Grandview-Woodlands and six in Kitsilano. Interviews were carried out between January and March, 1974. Each interview lasted from one-half to two hours, with the most typical being about one hour. The researcher was warmly received by all interviewees, and all seemed to make a genuine effort to fully describe and explain their roles and actions in the events being probed.

A. Grandview-Woodlands: Safeway Parking Lot Extension

The land development issue selected for this local area is the Safeway store parking lot extension issue. In 1960, Canada Safeway requested and obtained a development permit to build a retail outlet at the intersection of Charles and Nanaimo Streets. The Safeway lot was spot-zoned from C1 (retail stores serving day-to-day needs of the immediate neighborhood) to C2 (retail stores and business serving day-to-day needs of several
neighbors ie: a large district of the city). The store area was then and still is surrounded by single family dwellings in an RS1 (single family dwelling) zone. About five years later, the store was converted to a discount operation. The effect was to attract more customers; parking and traffic congestion problems developed in the streets around the store. In 1970 and 1971, the nearby Safeway stores at 1st and Commercial and at Hastings and Kamloops Streets were closed. Traffic and parking problems worsened in the immediate area of Charles and Nanaimo as even more customers came to that store. The problem was discussed in City Council as complaints were received from individuals in the area, but no action was taken.

In January, 1972, Canada Safeway applied to extend its parking lot so that the store, the original parking lot, and the proposed parking lot would occupy all of the block bounded by Nanaimo, William, Kamloops, and Charles Streets. This would involve removal of six dilapidated houses owned by Safeway. The application was considered by the City's Technical Planning Board after notice of the application had been sent to neighboring property owners.

The Grandview-Woodlands Area Council heard of the application and decided to have their community development worker (Michael Clague) contact the residents in the store area. This was done even though the store is not within the Grandview-Woodlands local area by its strictest definition, being on the opposite side of the boundary street (Nanaimo) between Grandview-Woodlands and Hastings-Sunrise. The reason for
intervening, as cited by the then president of the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council, was that there was no organization in Hastings-Sunrise able or willing to do so.

The result was a response by several residents who opposed the parking lot extension. The basis of this opposition was that the extension would merely make the store more accessible to the motoring customer, would therefore attract more customers to the area, leading to further expansion of the store and/or parking lot into the adjacent residential area. The person regarded as leader by those indicating a desire to actively oppose the extension was Carlo Augusti. That individual lived across the street from the existing parking lot and had lived in the area since the store was built in 1960.

In March, 1972, the Technical Planning Board approved the Safeway application, but referred it to City Council because there were indications that some residents were opposed. City Council referred the application to the City Planning Commission which in July, 1972, recommended refusal. In August, Carlo August raised a petition in the general area of the store with the help of members of an Opportunities for Youth project team working in the area. This project, the "Venture in Community Collaboration", complemented the Area Council's Community Planning Information Project by involvement in physical planning concerns in the local area. The involvement of two of the team members, planning students from U.B.C., was in researching City planning policy and drafting a brief arguing for the opposition. Carlo Augusti organized the petition campaign and managed to get
about fifteen signatures in the few days remaining before City Council met in August, 1972, to consider the application again.

Carlo Augusti's wife presented the petition at the City Council meeting; no other delegations spoke on the matter. The application was refused by Council by a substantial majority.

In the municipal election in the fall of 1972, most of the long-time Non-Partisan Association (NPA) aldermen, who held the majority of Council seats, were defeated by The Electors' Action Movement (TEAM) candidates.

In April, 1973, Canada Safeway applied again to extend the parking lot in a manner identical to the first application. Once again the Technical Planning Board sent notices to adjacent property owners and some individuals expressed opposition to the proposal. A Safeway staff member visited the householders in the immediate area to explain the reasons for the expansion and to show plans of the proposed changes. During the spring of 1973, Carlo Augusti spoke at an Area Council monthly meeting urging them to take a stand on the issue. The Area Council decided not to do so because of a perceived need to maintain "broad support" in the area.

Again, the Technical Planning Board approved the application but referred it to City Council. Council approved the application in December, 1973, perhaps because they were unaware of the opposition generated by the first application and perhaps because of lack of resident opinion voiced at the Council meeting itself.
The residents were not aware that Council was to consider the application at their December meeting. When news of the decision reached them, several adjacent property owners sent a letter to Council requesting an opportunity to present a brief opposing the application. Council agreed to the request, and the date for hearing briefs was set at 5 February, 1974.

During December, 1973, and January, 1974, a number of residents in the store area formed two groups. The first group, organized by Carlo Augusti and his wife, argued in favor of the parking lot extension. The switch in objective should be noted—Carlo Augusti now felt that the solution to the parking and traffic congestion problem lay in increased off-street parking capacity. The support was conditional: no expansion of the store itself, night-time unloading of supply trucks to cease, and Safeway employees were to park on the Safeway lot. Carlo Augusti offered a three-fold reason for his switch to the researcher: the Safeway public relations effort had impressed him with the merits of the expansion; the earlier practice of night-time unloading was stopped prior to the Council meeting in February; and the new store manager allowed employees to park on the premises. A further reason may be that Augusti and some of his neighbors felt that they had been harassed by Safeway when the first application was being processed (selective vandalism shortly after complaints to police about illegally parked customers' cars, Safeway trucks frequently blocking the driveways of those most active in opposing the application, etc). The Augusti's raised a petition, signed by about one
hundred people living in the immediate area, in favor of the expansion. They persuaded Andy Livingstone, a resident of the area and former Vancouver Parks Board chairman, to present the petition at the February meeting. The leader of the opposing group viewed this choice of spokesman as being motivated by Carlo Augusti's desire to remain inconspicuous at the February Council meeting.

Several other people living close to the store felt that the parking lot extension should not be allowed. Finding themselves without an aggressive, articulate leader, they approached Joe Ferrara to help them in organizing and presenting an opposing argument to City Council. That individual, a school teacher at Notre Dame Regional High School, lived some distance from the Safeway store but within the Grandview-Woodlands local area (at Adanac and Commercial). The group raised a petition among residents living close to the store and were able to get about ten signatures. Some residents signed both petitions. John Brouwer, a Neighborhood Services community development worker (and former member of the OFY team helping Augusti in 1972), working closely with the Area Council, assisted Ferrara in drafting a brief opposing the extension. This was done with the Area Council's approval, although that body itself still chose to remain publicly neutral on the issue.

The argument of Joe Ferrara's group was that the parking lot should not be extended because this would attract more customers, leading to further expansion of the store, and eventually further encroachment in the residential area. The
problem of on-street employee parking was identified. The group's opinion was that the parking lot application should be refused; the store should continue to use only day-time unloading; and that the Safeway lot be downzoned to C1 (neighborhood commercial) to prevent further store or parking lot expansion without a public hearing for zoning change.

There was some friction between the two factions—some residents viewed Carlo Augusti's switch of objective as a capitulation to pressure and/or slick public relations work on Safeway's part. However, Carlo Augusti and Joe Ferrara both stated that they didn't feel that each other's objectives were mutually exclusive. Both groups wanted on-site employee parking, permanent cessation of night-time unloading, and some assurance that there would be no further expansion of store or parking lot.

On 5 February, 1974, Andy Livingstone and Joe Ferrara presented their respective arguments and petitions before City Council. A number of residents from each group were present in a show of support. Council's subsequent decision was to allow the parking lot to be extended and to instruct City planning staff to downzone the Safeway properties to C1 (neighborhood commercial).

The narrative ends here. City staff are implementing the zoning change at their customary pace, Safeway is preparing to expand its parking lot, and neither group of participants at the local area level are doing more than keeping a wary eye on the proceedings.
B. Kitsilano: 13-Story Highrise for Senior Citizens

The land development issue selected for Kitsilano is the proposed thirteen story highrise for senior citizens at the intersection of 7th Avenue and Maple Street. On 8 May, 1973, the Shalom Branch No. 178 Building Society of the Royal Canadian Legion ("the Legion" hereafter) applied to the City to build a thirteen story apartment building in Kitsilano. The building was to be a limited dividend senior citizens' housing project sponsored by the Legion and partially financed by the provincial and federal governments.

Although the structure and use of the building satisfied the City zoning and building bylaws, the application went to the Technical Planning Board for approval because the building faced on more than one street. The Technical Planning Board approved the project in mid-June but referred the application to the civic Design Panel. The Design Panel considered the project on 9 July, 1973, and recommended that the Technical Planning Board refuse the application because of architectural incompatibility with the surrounding area, in which the tallest buildings are three story walkup apartments. The Technical Planning Board contacted the developer's architect, who refused to scale the building down to three stories.

The first indication in Kitsilano that an application had been made was that the Kitsilano Area Resources Association ("KARA" hereafter) community worker, Dave Todd, heard of the application in the second week of July, 1973. A KARA bulletin
was printed on 19 July and distributed in Kitsilano with KARA's newspaper *Around Kitsilano*. KARA advertised an information meeting to be held on 26 July. At that meeting, chaired by Dave Todd, two views were expressed by persons attending--some were in favor of the project and some opposed. A second meeting was called for 2 August.

The Technical Planning Board met on 27 July and received the Design Panel's recommendation to refuse the Legion application. The Board felt that the project should not be refused solely on the basis of architectural considerations, as the proposed structure satisfied the building and zoning requirements. The application was sent back to the Design Panel for its reconsideration.

Several different opinions were expressed at the 2 August meeting in Kitsilano, again chaired by Dave Todd. The developer's representative defended the project as a badly needed housing facility for the elderly. A Mrs. Gertrude Campbell, a pensioner living in an apartment building next to the site of the proposed highrise, spoke strongly in favor of the project. Her argument was that low-cost housing for the elderly is needed badly and that a three-story structure covering most of the site would not only provide fewer units but would block the views and air circulation enjoyed by the residents of the immediate area. Shelagh Day, also a resident living close to the site, argued strongly against the project because the highrise would be an unsuitable housing form for senior citizens and would be the first highrise in that area of
Kitsilano and would therefore set an undesirable precedent. Jacques Khouri, representing the West Broadway Citizens' Committee ("WBCC" hereafter), spoke against the project on the same grounds. It was decided that attempts be made to arrange a meeting of all interested parties including the developer, city government, and the financing institution (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)).

At this time, Dave Todd began working with Shelagh Day in organizing a protest group. Space was provided for the WBCC organizers in the KARA Information Centre on 4th Avenue.

On 6 August, the Design Panel reaffirmed their original opposition to the proposal. The application was returned to the Technical Planning Board with a strong reaffirmation of their adverse recommendation.

Mrs. Campbell began to organize a group in favor of the proposal. Her argument was unchanged: the low-cost housing units were badly needed by senior citizens, and the highrise was the proper use of the site because of light and air circulation needs. She campaigned in the immediate area to raise a petition. Most of her support came from other senior citizens. She made her feelings known to the Legion to encourage them to proceed.

A meeting was arranged for 15 August in accordance with the decision made at KARA's 2 August meeting. Participants included Shelagh Day, Mrs. Campbell, Dave Todd, Jacques Khouri, Alderman Harcourt, a CMHC representative, and the Legion's architect.
There was no indication on the part of the Legion and CMHC representatives that the project would be reconsidered. Alderman Harcourt failed to find a common ground for further discussions, and stated that the Legion's compliance with building and zoning bylaws left little potential for intervention on City Council's part (even though Council can refuse virtually any permit on general grounds).

Shelagh Day called a meeting for the next day, 16 August. Mrs. Campbell did not attend, and her supporters were not evident. Jacques Khouri, the WBCC leader, urged those present to form a united opposition under WBCC leadership. His motion received no support, and Shelagh Day, describing herself as the leader of the "Kitsilano Citizens' Committee" ("KCC" hereafter) stated that her group would remain independent.

Virtually all of WBCC's members at the time lived in the Broadway and MacDonald area of Kitsilano, and had previously concentrated on issues in that area and along West Broadway. Their deliberate decision to become involved in the 7th and Maple proposal, according to Khouri, was based on two factors: the desire to strengthen WBCC in other parts of Kitsilano, and the opposition to the unprecedented construction of the highrise.

The Technical Planning Board met the following day, 17 August, and considered the Design Panel's reaffirmed opposition to the highrise. The Board still felt that the project should be approved and, because of the lack of agreement with the Design Panel, referred the application to City Council for its
Shelagh Day and the KCC began to prepare a brief and raised a petition of opposition to present at the City Council meeting. She also wrote letters to City staff to express her views; Dave Todd assisted in these activities. There was some friction between Day and Khouri: Khouri felt that Day's decision to mount an independent opposition campaign prejudiced the chances of stopping the project. Day felt that Khouri had an ulterior political motive in trying to build a coalition—perhaps undermining the claim of KARA, at that time leaderless and inactive, to being "representative" of the community. Khouri and the WBCC prepared a brief and raised a petition in Kitsilano.

At the City Council meeting in mid-September, the three views were apparent. Shelagh Day presented the KCC brief and petition, supported by the presence of about fifty members. The WBCC position was presented by Jacques Khouri, backed up by about one hundred supporters. Mrs. Campbell's petition was heard. Council approved the Legion application by a six to four vote.

After the September meeting of Council, the WBCC and the KCC both determined to persevere in their activity in the hopes of forcing the developer to halt the project. However, Khouri and the WBCC broke away from KARA assistance and the friction with Day's group intensified. The WBCC established their own information centre close to the KARA centre. In addition, Nathan Karmel, a community organizer sponsored by the
Neighborhood Services Association and loosely connected with KARA, began working with WBCC. WBCC's campaign now began to focus on the financing institution, CMHC, and the group spent October organizing a confrontation with that organization.

WBCC called a public meeting for 12 October. Jacques Khouri spoke on his group's action since the Council meeting—a petition signed by about six hundred people and pressure on CMHC's branch manager and the Legion's regional secretary. A number of organizations were represented, including Day's KCC. The participants agreed that organized resistance to the project should continue. It was resolved that Shelagh Day and Nathan Karmel go to Victoria to put pressure on the provincial government to refuse the provincial share of funding for the project. This was done and on 25 October, Norman Levi and Rosemary Brown, the Burrard area MLA's, released a statement severely criticizing the City Council for its decision and hinting that the provincial government would review its funding plans for the project.

Nathan Karmel and Jacques Khouri urged a number of civic organizations in Kitsilano to support WBCC in its campaign. Most, about twenty, did endorse WBCC's stand, and a very few (the Kitsilano Ratepayers' Association included) were opposed. However, none of these groups became actively involved in the ensuing political activity.

Jacques Khouri and Nathan Karmel were working on a demonstration at the CMHC branch office in Vancouver and an intended appearance before City Council. Shelagh Day and Dave
Todd found themselves being excluded from strategy planning sessions and felt that they were being manipulated solely to enhance WBCC's credibility. A WBCC public meeting for organizing the demonstration was called for 20 November. Employees of the Greater Vancouver Regional District and CMHC were present in what appeared to be passive observer roles. Printed instructions for demonstrators were distributed, including instructions on how to disrupt CMHC operations (switchboard jamming, for example). The following day, these instructions were printed in the daily Wasserman column in the *Vancouver Sun*, causing Khouri some embarrassment but gaining the group some publicity in the form of a television interview shortly thereafter. That evening, City Council refused Jacques Khouri permission to present the petition and brief, putting him off one week.

The demonstration at CMHC took place on the next day, 22 November. The branch office was picketed by WBCC and KCC members and CMHC's operations were disrupted to a degree. The branch manager, Bob Ford, met with Khouri but refused to yield to demands to hold a meeting with the developer and the citizens' groups.

Shelagh Day, the KCC, KARA, and Dave Todd now ceased cooperating with Jacques Khouri, the WBCC, and Nathan Karmel. Shelagh Day withdrew from the political activity and the name of her group fell into disuse. Dave Todd and Nathan Karmel disagreed on the merit of the WBCC campaign on numerous occasions. KARA, without a chairman since July, finally elected
a new leader in November (Gavin Perryman) but did not take a public stand on the issue. Privately, considerable friction developed between the KARA and the WBCC leaders.

The focus of political activity on both KARA and WBCC's part shifted to the upcoming debate on the general downzoning of Kitsilano to exclude highrises. WBCC maintained some pressure in the form of letters and requested meetings with CMHC and in reminding the provincial government about Levi and Brown's earlier statements on provincial funding. At the February general meeting of the WBCC, it was resolved that any and all tactics be used to stop the two highrises then proposed for Kitsilano, including the one at 7th and Maple.

The pressure on the provincial government to withdraw its funding apparently was effective. The Legion decided to change its funding to a federal government-Legion cost sharing arrangement. This required City Council approval, which was given by a six to five vote at Council's uneventful 5 March meeting. The WBCC did not switch their focus from CMHC back to Council solely for that meeting. On 7 March, WBCC met with Michael Audain, the province's housing adviser, to discuss the two highrise buildings proposed for Kitsilano, including the one at 7th and Maple. Alderman Harcourt, present at the meeting, informed the group that building and development permits had been issued to the Legion for its project.

The political activity on this issue may not be over yet--WBCC is continuing its campaign to stop the project by pressure on the Legion, harassing the Legion Shalom Branch president's
construction company at its other construction sites, and pressure on CMHC. It is apparent that the WBCC is the only local area group still active in this specific issue. KARA has concentrated its activity on the downzoning debate and on the campaign for local area planning for Kitsilano. WBCC has been somewhat less active in those two areas.

C. Analysis

One task involved in testing working hypothesis I is to determine the relative degree of pluralism exhibited in the political processes at the local area level in resolving the issues studied. As suggested in Chapter 3, page 27, the criteria used to determine the degree of pluralism include: competition among centres of influence, access to the political system for both groups and individuals; and participation of individuals in different political organizations.

The first characteristic is competition by different groups for public support. Competition in both local areas was evident in that more than one position in the respective issues was politically articulated. In Grandview-Woodlands, the initial phase involved only one political position—that of Carlo Augusti in opposition to the parking lot extension. In the second round, that person switched to political activity in favor of the opposite position, and was able to build a stronger support group than he had previously. The former supporters of Augusti found a new leader in Joe Ferrara, and campaigned in opposition to the proposal. The difference in political value and interest of the two groups on the issue was not so great as
to prevent Augusti from taking what appears to be an opposite stand. Leaders of both groups felt that they were both in pursuit of the same objective: preventing the store from expanding its operations and relieving the neighborhood of a traffic and parking problem. The major difference in their respective objectives appears to be one of a long-term solution on Ferrara's part (downzoning) opposed to an expedient short-term solution on Augusti's part (extending the parking lot with conditions on employee parking and night-time unloading).

In Kitsilano, the range of political positions is considerably wider. Mrs. Campbell's stand was in favor of the project because of the perceived need for low-cost housing for the elderly and because the highrise was felt to be the most suitable architectural form for residential use of the site. The views of Shelagh Day and Jacques Khouri and their groups were similar to each other and were diametrically opposed to those of Mrs. Campbell. All three were able to muster considerable support for their petitions, although Day's KCC and Khouri's WBCC were the only groups still active after the City Council had approved the project in September. The difference between Khouri and Day in terms of values and interests in the issue was not great.

In both local areas, there was open public competition for support. In Grandview-Woodlands, both factions sought signatures for petitions and both factions publicly presented their arguments to City Council; also, Carlo Augusti publicly urged the Area Council to take a public stand on the issue. In
Kitsilano, the competitive struggle for public support was keener. At various times, both the KCC and WECC leaders called public meetings to rally support for their respective organizations. Activity at at least one of the meetings included appeals to form a united front under WBCC leadership. Petition-raising and public presentation to City Council were also observed in the Kitsilano case. The political process in Kitsilano is judged to have been more competitive because of the activity by both WBCC and KCC in holding public meetings to strengthen their political influence.

Access to the political activity is the second characteristic of a pluralistic political system. In both local areas, individuals and organizations appeared to have access to the political process. In Grandview-Woodlands, the two individual leaders were active participants solely on the basis of them and their few active supporters going from door to door in a small area raising a petition, and appearing as a delegation before City Council. The same pattern was found in Kitsilano—access was assured by developing some show of support in the local area. This took the form of a petition by each group, plus public meetings. Significantly large financial reserves, large memberships, or access to the media did not appear to be prerequisites to significant impact in the political activity at the local area level.

Each of the leaders interviewed was asked how independent his group was from its funding source, if applicable. Only the area councils, the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council and KARA,
have any external funding support. The Grandview-Woodlands Area Council information centre is funded by a City of Vancouver grant and its multi-lingual service by a Secretary of State grant. All other full-time paid staff, including the community worker involved in the political process studied, are funded by social service agencies. The KARA Planning Centre is funded by grants from the Urban Design Centre, the Secretary of State, and the City of Vancouver. Also, Neighborhood Services had one community worker working in the area and loosely associated with KARA at the time of the political interaction studied.

The Grandview-Woodlands Area Council and KARA (which at the time claimed to function as an area council) did not take public stands on the respective issues. However, in both cases, the organization's community development workers worked with the groups opposing the respective applications. In a sense, the giving of a political resource, the community workers, to one faction is a covert political action. If that view is taken, the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council and Ferrara's group formed a type of coalition in the second round of that activity.

The fact that Al Stusiak, the then leader of the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council, is also president of the TEAM civic party and that City Council was TEAM-dominated in the second round of the action merits scrutiny. If the Area Council were dominated by the influence of its TEAM leadership, it would have been quite probable that its activity after City Council "inadvertently" approved the second application in December, 1973, would have been different. The worker worked with a group
opposing City Council's decision; if the Area Council wished not to assist a challenge to City Council, they would have withdrawn their resource from both factions or assisted Augusti again, even though he had switched sides. The Area Council appears to have acted independently, but its public image was largely one of a neutral body on that issue.

A similar analysis of KARA is frustrated because KARA at the time was leaderless and very weak, politically. However, after formally seating a leader in November, 1973, KARA maintained a behaviour pattern very similar to that of the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council. No public stand was taken, but both Dave Todd and Nathan Karmel carried on their work with two groups. The lapse of activity on Day's part in December left Todd without significant involvement, as Karmel was helping WBCC, who had excluded both Day and Todd from its earlier planning meetings. KARA maintained its public neutrality throughout the activity on this issue.

With the exception of the Grandview-Woodlands Area Council and the Kitsilano Area Resources Association, the accessibility of groups to the political process appears to have been roughly equal. The fact that the area councils did not either take a public stand on the issues or attempt to integrate the local area political activity is significant. Those organizations' activity in permitting the involvement of their community workers with one faction indicates their interest in the issues, but probing the reason for lack of other activity is beyond the scope of this research. This point will be discussed further in
the final chapter.

The third characteristic of pluralistic political process is participation by individuals in different political organizations. In both local areas, the political process was characterized by a strong identification of leaders with their groups. The characteristics which distinguish those groups will be discussed below. In both local areas studied, the main correlate of political participation at the local area level is proximity of residence to the land development site. In Grandview-Woodlands, Carlo Augusti lived across the street from the Safeway store parking lot. All of his supporters and petition-signers in both rounds lived in the immediate area. Even Andy Livingstone, acting solely as the group's spokesman at the February City Council meeting, lived in the same area. The other faction, led by Joe Ferrara, was similarly distributed except for Ferrara who did not live in the area adjacent to the store. His role of leader was one of responding to a request from the group of opponents living in the area of the store to help them. He functioned in a manner similar to Livingstone, but was much more active in organizing and brief drafting than that person was.

In Kitsilano, Mrs. Campbell and Shelagh Day both lived across the street from the proposed highrise. Jacques Khouri lived only four blocks away, even though the group he led had previously had its membership and focus of activity some distance away. The degree to which the WBCC's initial decision to become involved in a new geographic area was influenced by
its leader's residence in the new territory is difficult to assess. There seems to be little doubt from interviews that the WBCC had been concerned with the potential of highrise development prior to the 7th and Maple proposal. Since the 7th and Maple highrise was the first proposed for the area west of Burrard Street, it is more probable that WECC would have become involved in the political action solely on that basis. Their subsequent behaviour in the Kitsilano downzoning debate supports this view.

One person interviewed in Grandview-Woodlands speculated that an ethnic cleavage may have operated in the political activity there. The superficial Livingstone vs. Ferrara view as a WASP vs. Italian factioning was suggested. This interpretation is rejected because of the dominant role played by Augusti and his predominately Italian followers in organizing the campaign. The great majority of Ferrara's supporters were Italian as well, and he is too. This is not surprising because that sub-area of Grandview-Woodlands is overwhelmingly settled by Italian immigrant-property owners. The ethnic cleavage model in this issue resolution process does not appear to be defensible.

In Kitsilano, only one leader suggested that an ethnic cleavage may have existed: Jacques Khouri. He stated that "some people" were interpreting the WBCC's no-holds-barred campaign as an attack on certain members of Vancouver's land development fraternity, which includes a high proportion of Jewish entrepreneurs owning some of the larger development companies.
The developer in this specific issue, the Shalom Branch of the Legion, provides the linkage between the local area and the Jewish land developers in this scenario. This is a curious statement coming from Khouri, who then described himself as half-Jewish by descent and not himself in favor of that interpretation of his group's action. Since other sources as described in the preceding chapter did not mention this or any other ethnic or religious cleavages, it is rejected here as far as it's significance to this political process is concerned.

In Grandview-Woodlands, no cross cutting political cleavages were sufficiently effective to enable Augusti's and Ferrara's groups to take a common stand on the issue, even though some common interests were evident to both. The same situation existed in Kitsilano, where Mrs. Campbell and the Day-Khouri grouping had no common interests. However, Day's KCC and Khouri's WBCC found sufficient common political interest to work as a coalition for a period of time (from the September City Council meeting to the November CMHC demonstration). The Kitsilano political process exhibited a degree of coalition-building based on common political objectives. This type of behaviour was not evident in the Grandview-Woodlands case.

In the case of Grandview-Woodlands, most participants were Italian working class people, with the exception of Ferrara who was "imported" by a group of that type of people. The ethnic and class homogeneity does not reflect differential propensity to participate among ethnic groups, but the effect of the settlement pattern in the area in close proximity to the land
development site. The difference in values and interests between the two factions was not so great as to prevent Carlo Augusti from leading both factions at different times, and for both Augusti and Ferrara to state that their objectives were not mutually exclusive. In Kitsilano, the principle correlate of political participation again was proximity to the land development site. There was no "common ground" between the values and interests of the Campbell group and the temporary Day-Khoury coalition. The distinguishing characteristic between the two sets of values and interests lies in life-style, social class, and perception of appropriate land-use and property rights. Because of the greater divergence in Kitsilano of values and interests articulated by the participants, the Kitsilano political process is judged to be more pluralistic in respect of the third characteristic of such systems.

In summary, the political process in Kitsilano is judged to be more pluralistic than that of Grandview-Woodlands, based on the three characteristics relating to process and participants outlined in Chapter 3.

III Legitimacy of Local Area Elected Government

Information for testing working hypothesis II was gathered as described in Chapter 5. This analysis is based on the results of interviews with leaders of groups identified as described in that chapter--three in Grandview-Woodlands and five in Kitsilano. These low numbers prevent any form of statistical analysis; the responses are analysed qualitatively, with the
intent of identifying areas of agreement and disagreement among interviewees' responses.

An area of agreement among all interviewees was that elected local area government with some land development control powers would be more appropriate and responsive to the area's political values and interests than is existing centralized City government. This feeling was based on geographic proximity to elected representatives and a feeling of greater confidence and familiarity in approaching local area political leaders. This response must be interpreted with the knowledge that the interviewees had themselves been identified by others as local area political leaders in the specific issue studied. The same response should not be assumed to be typical of apolitical individuals.

The general expression on the suitability of the electoral process for selection of political leaders was that that method was preferred to any other. Some concern was expressed by respondents about the "accountability" of elected leaders. There was some disagreement here—interviewees in Kitsilano were considerably more skeptical about the use of only an electoral process for selection and control of local politicians than were those in Grandview-Woodlands. Some felt that the need for special interest group political action would never be obviated by local area government in the land development control area. One person, in a philosophical moment, felt that human beings were "too complex" to expect "responsible and predictable behaviour from politicians" especially if their power depended
only on an annual or biannual election in an "apathetic neighborhood".

There was general agreement among those interviewed that local area government would be relatively more responsive and appropriate to local area political values and interests in land development issues than is existing centralized city government. However, there was no agreement that the electoral process alone would ensure the accountability and responsibility of local area government. Respondents in Kitsilano saw a need for continual vigilance on the part of the citizenry, regardless of the level of government involved.
Conclusions and Applications

I Conclusions

A. Working Hypothesis I

Working hypothesis I is "that the degree of pluralism exhibited at the local area level is associated with the degree of socioeconomic differentiation in the local area population".

The independent variable is "the degree of socioeconomic differentiation in the local area population". The population of the Kitsilano local area is significantly more heterogenous in socioeconomic terms than is that of Grandview-Woodlands. However, the Grandview-Woodlands population is relatively much more diverse in ethnic terms than the Kitsilano population.

It must be noted that in both local areas, the principle correlate of political participation was proximity to the specific land development site. In Grandview-Woodlands, the settlement pattern has resulted in the area around the land development site being settled predominately by Italian immigrant property-owning families. The ethnic diversity in Grandview-Woodlands did thus not have a significant potential to operate as a social force in the political process there.

The political process in Kitsilano was judged to be more pluralistic than that of Grandview-Woodlands. This was evidenced by relatively greater diversity of values and
interests articulated in the political process, greater competition among groups for public support, and coalitions formed among some groups, in Kitsilano. The range of positions taken in Grandview-Woodlands was narrower, there was less public competition for support, and there was no evidence of coalition-building, attempted or successful. Working hypothesis I is therefore sustained.

B. Working Hypothesis II

Working hypothesis II is "that political actors at the local area level currently active in land development issues perceive the legitimacy of an elected local area government with powers in that issue area to be significantly greater than that of the existing City government system".

All leaders interviewed responded that elected local area government with some land development control powers would be more responsive to the local area population's political values and interests than is the central City government. This was reinforced by the response that such a government would be the most appropriate for that purpose. The reasons given centred on the geographic proximity of the individual to such elected representatives and the relatively great familiarity and confidence with which one could approach such persons. However, the response was qualified in that most respondents expressed the feeling that the electoral process alone was insufficient to ensure the accountability of the elected to the electorate.

Working hypothesis II, with some qualifications, was
sustained. Elected local area government has some potential for legitimizing governmental intervention in land development control, as perceived by those currently active at the local area level in that issue area.

C. The General Hypothesis

The general hypothesis was "that political processes in local areas reflect the diversity of political values and interests of the population and thus have the potential to legitimize decision-making at that level".

The first working hypothesis dealt with the first part of the general hypothesis. It was concluded that increasingly pluralistic political process was associated with increasingly greater socioeconomic, and hence social class, differentiation in the local area population. The second working hypothesis dealt with the potential for legitimization of decision-making at the local area level. This hypothesis was sustained, with some qualification related to the electoral process as the primary instrument of citizen control.

Both of these working hypotheses were tested in the issue area of land development control in primarily residential urban areas. An important note is that horizontal differentiation, in the form of ethnic divisions, did not have the potential to operate as a significant political force in the cases tested in the field study.

It is therefore concluded that the general hypothesis is sustained, with two major qualifications. The first is that the
effect of cross-cutting cleavages due to ethno-religious differentiation was not sufficiently strong in the cases studied to prevent value and issue differentiation on the basis of social class to predominate in the political process involved in urban land development control. The second is that legitimization of the decision-making process in land development control at the local area level does not rest solely on the electoral process as the primary instrument of citizen control of governing bodies.

II Applications and Further Research

A. Municipal Decentralization Theory

The general hypothesis relates directly to the principle assumptions of municipal decentralization theory: the identification of interests with definable geographic territory, and the reflection of local values and interests in the local political process.

The research was focussed on land development control issues for two reasons. These issues are politically salient to some (not all) locality groups, and, some land development control power is being devolved to local area councils, as the current structure of the City of Winnipeg suggests. Different political behaviour at the local area level may be characteristic of other issue areas, such as mental health, social welfare administration, or education.

Land development issues of the type studied (proposed
changes in land-use in residential urban areas) are clearly identified with a definable geographic area. This was evidenced by the observation that the principle correlate of political participation in the specific issues studied was proximity to the specific land development site. This was an especially strong correlate in the local area having a relatively homogeneous, working class population. This conclusion is qualified by the fact that this correlation left little potential for ethno-religious cleavages to influence the political process in the issue studied in that local area, because of the settlement pattern. This assumption of municipal decentralization theory is supported by this research.

The second assumption of the theory is that local values and interests are reflected in the local area political process. This assumption is confirmed by this research, with the qualification that the electoral process itself is perceived to be an inadequate mechanism for legitimizing decision-making, even at the local area level. This raises the problem of how a local area council can perform a political integration function. The observation in this research is that the area councils in each case chose not to attempt that task, even in Grandview-Woodlands where an active area council exists and where that body was publicly urged to take a stand on the issue. The response of the area council was neither taking a stand nor attempting to integrate the political activity of the two factions. Since establishing the reasons for this lack of activity were not part of this research, a speculative discussion and a suggested direction for further research in
In a general sense, this research supports the two major assumptions of municipal decentralization theory. However, some thorny problems in political integration at the local area level are suggested as well. These problems are the subject of the next sub-section.

B. Community Workers and Community Councils

This subsection is intended to suggest the direction of further work on decentralized decision-making and the role of the community worker working with a local area council. The term "community worker" is used loosely to describe any person whose intended function includes contact with the local area population for the purpose of assisting a local area council in policy formulation or community development.

In the context of citizen participation theory, community workers derive the legitimacy of their action on what Martin Rein calls "consumer preference" (Rein, 1969, pp. 233-234). In this model, the intervention of the worker is legitimized by the needs of the people to be served. Appropriate action is not prescribed from an attempted position of value neutrality but rather from the desired objectives themselves (Davidoff, 1965, p. 331; Stoloff, 1970, p. 297).

A factor is suggested by this research that upsets the assumptions of the advocacy model in this context. This is that in increasingly heterogeneous local areas there exists an
increasing diversity of political values and interests. There is no single, united "voice" speaking with the sanction of the community (see also: Seaver, 1968, p. 68; Head, 1971, pp. 18-22). The dilemma facing the worker here is that the worker's relationship with the local area population cannot be based on a simplistic concept of the client—the worker must decide "...whether he is responsible to a community or the community" (Waldo, 1971, p. 267; also: McNeese, 1972, p. 233).

Should the worker opt for advocating the interests of one faction active in the political process, the group he serves may likely be the group having a disproportionate pool of political resources, especially in the form of an identifiable, formally organized, disciplined group. In the cases studied in this research, community workers had little time to spend on community organization for the purpose of political activity in the issues. In Kitsilano, the area association's workers and logistic support went to groups already organized or in the process of completing organization. In such cases, redressing the maldistribution of political resources may be made even less possible (Mazziotti, 1974, pp. 40-41). A definable, defensible moral and political ethic is lacking to guide the worker in politically pluralistic communities where inequitable distribution of political resources exists. In such communities, the only role which frees the worker from his dilemma may be that of providing logistics support and information on request to those who approach him (Meyerson, 1973, p. 176; also: Lloyd, 1971, pp. 10-12).
An underlying assumption in the above advocacy model with respect to advocating a local area's interests is that there is an identifiable, fairly homogeneous client group. Davidoff describes this type of group as a "neighborhood organization" which represents the interests of the geographic area (Davidoff, 1965, pp. 334-335). In this research, the area councils' intended aims were found to include that role. In neither case did the councils perform that role. It is not clear whether the paralysis resulted from fear of losing senior government funding for other programs or whether the councils were not properly structured for that role or whether the lack of coercive power in the issue area nullified their integration potential. The fact that the local area political process reflects the diversity of local area values and interests provides the potential for legitimizing decision-making at that level, only if a means of political integration perceived to be legitimate can be devised (Friedmann, 1973, p. 7).

The problem of facilitating political integration at the local area level demands further research into the relationships among structure, delegated power, method of representation, resource base, and role of workers responsible to the councils. In this research, the emphasis should be on discovering what arrangements of variables seems to legitimize the decision-making process at the local area level. Perhaps experimentation is in order, because citizen participation prescriptions to date have been notoriously unsuccessful (see Moynihan, 1969, pp. 193-196). This is no small challenge, but the legitimacy of government at the local area level is the goal.
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## APPENDIX D

### LOCAL AREAS OF VANCOUVER: STATISTICAL PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Area</th>
<th>Owner Occupancy</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Mean Fam. Income</th>
<th>Occupation Index</th>
<th>Fert. Ratio</th>
<th>Families w. Children</th>
<th>Soc. Econ. Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview-Woodland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings-Sunrise</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cottage-Kens.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrew-C'wood.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria-F'view.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Park</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambie</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killarney</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marpole</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsilano</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakridge</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar-Southlands</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point Grey</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus-Ridge</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrisdale</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>