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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, psychology has become one of the social science disciplines that is interested in developing ways of increasing the active participation of local residents toward making their communities better places in which to live. Local resident participation is an essential element in the optimal functioning of communities in a democracy. The community as an entity is composed of the collective activities of its individual members, and in turn, the collective activities of its members influence the quality of life of each member. "...this process of self-determination...lies at the heart of a truly democratic society" (Poston, 1976, p. 69).

Although resident participation is of this crucial importance, the social science literature is replete with studies which indicate that the actual level of resident participation in community concerns is disturbingly low. "We are bombarded with...studies and reports on [the individual's]...inability to act on those issues that are vital to him, his family, and his community" (Alinsky, 1969, p. 208). In this study, it is assumed that the observed lack of resident participation or "inability to act" derives from the individual's loss of a psychological sense of community, to use Sarason's phrase. Sarason
(1974) writes:

...the dilution or absence of the psychological sense of community is the most destructive dynamic in the lives of people in our society. [This]...has been for several hundred years a theme noted and discussed with ever-increasing frequency and urgency in Western society. (p. viii)

Without a psychological sense of community, residents feel incompetent and powerless to influence those structures of their communities that determine the quality of their lives.

This study attempts to utilize conceptualizations and strategies drawn primarily from psychology to create linkages between residents and to train native resident leadership toward restoring a psychological sense of community, and thereby assisting residents in gaining competency and feeling better able to participate actively in the best interest of their community, and thus in the best interest of themselves. The specific goals of this study are to develop a psychological approach to community organization, and to explore the feasibility of this approach in a community organization project carried out in a black community.

Conceptualizations of the Community

The psychologist who aspires to effect change in an American community must begin with a conceptualizing of that community in which he expects to intervene. This poses a difficult problem, because, although all American communities have many features in common, each is unique. Warren (1972) writes:
A problem facing any student of American communities is how to be able to make general statements about communities which are widely applicable despite many gradations in size and other characteristics which differentiate one community from another. (p. 12)

In an attempt to overcome this problem, Warren (1972) presents several models for conceptualizing the community. One of the models he presents is:

...to consider some of the important dimensions on which communities differ from each other, relate these dimensions to general statements applicable in all communities, and then "locate" any particular community or type of community under discussion at a particular point along each such dimension. (p. 12)

Adopting this model in the present study, (1) Needs, and (2) Functioning (to meet needs) are chosen as key dimensions on which communities differ from each other, for the same reason Maslow (1968) chose them as dimensions on which individuals differ from each other. The general statements applicable to all communities and related to the dimensions of Needs and Functioning, are adapted from Maslow (1968), who introduced the concept of a hierarchy of needs (p. 153). Arranged in categories from lower to higher, the human needs are for survival, security, belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. These needs are progressive, in that human beings must function at a level of meeting needs in a given category before having sufficient energy to function fully at the level of meeting needs in the next category.

The dimensions of this model when applied to communities, are Needs and Functioning, and the progressive points along Maslow's needs hierarchy are used as the progressive points along the ordinal scales
of the dimensions (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Order</th>
<th>Higher Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Needs:</td>
<td>survival security belonging esteem actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Functioning: survival security belonging esteem actualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Two Dimensions on Which American Communities Differ

The characteristics of a given community are distinguished from those of other communities by where it is located along the ordinal scale of each dimension. The points representing where a community is located on each of the dimensions may be considered points of a bi-dimensional field and thereby serve as a basis for comparing one community with another. The two points, one from each dimension for a given community, are termed the community's Needs-Functioning level.

Viewing communities within the framework of their Needs-Functioning levels suggests that communities vary with regard to their level of needs and their level of functioning toward meeting their needs. A community near the higher order end of the Needs-Functioning dimension may be one in which the residents "own" their community, share in the control of its institutions, and share in important decisions that determine their community's destiny.\(^1\) From such a community we

\(^1\)See definition of ownership by Siegel (1973) on page 13 of this chapter.
may observe a strong thrust from its residents toward meeting cultural, artistic, and aesthetic needs of its citizens. By contrast, a community near the lower order end of the Needs-Functioning dimension may be one in which the residents do not own their community, and neither share in the control of its institutions, nor in important decisions that determine their community's destiny. From such a community we may observe a conspicuous lack of thrust from its residents toward meeting even some of the vital lower order needs, such as the need for survival. A notable manifestation of this conspicuous lack of thrust is apathy. One characteristic of a community at the lower order end of the Needs-Functioning spectrum is that few of its residents act as if they are aware of their right or ability to own their community and contribute toward its functioning.

Lack of awareness and the accompanying posture of apathy by most residents is not the natural condition of human beings in communities. Freire (1970) suggests that lack of awareness and apathy characterizes "those whose humanity has been stolen" (p. 28). His reference is to the oppressed, and he asserts that their condition is created through their relationship with the oppressor:

One of the basic elements of the relationship between oppressor and oppressed is prescription. Every prescription represents the imposition of one man's choices upon another, transforming the consciousness of the man prescribed into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness. (p. 31)

...oppressive reality absorbs those within it and thereby acts to submerge men's consciousness. (p. 36)
"Submerged consciousness" has the effect of preventing the oppressed from evaluating their situation in light of their own specific needs. "...because of their identification with the oppressor, they have no consciousness of themselves as persons or as members of an oppressed class" (Freire, 1970, p. 30). The condition of oppression results in the oppressed devaluing themselves and having little or no defense against the will of the oppressor. Freire (1970) writes:

Self-depreciation is another characteristic of the oppressed, which derives from their internalization of the opinion the oppressor holds of them. So often do they hear that they are good for nothing, know nothing, are incapable of learning anything—that they are sick, lazy and unproductive—that in the end they become convinced of their own unfitness. (p. 49)

Self-depreciation limits the will of the oppressed to act on their own behalf and the apparent indifference to their situation is observed as apathy. The extreme condition of oppression creates a barrier that blocks the oppressed from awareness of their own needs and functioning actively toward meeting their needs. Residents of communities at the lower order end of a Needs-Functioning spectrum bear these marks of oppression.

Although there are many American black communities that function and meet their needs at the higher order level, the majority of black communities fit the description of communities at the lower order end of a Needs-Functioning spectrum. This is especially true of black communities that make up a small minority of the total population of a city or town. With few exceptions, black communities are lodged within larger white communities and the white community
controls the flow of resources to the black community. It is the usual case that the white community systematically discriminates against the black community and systematically excludes the black community from shared values and resources (Blackwell, 1975; Boggs, 1970; DuBois, 1961; Clark, 1965; Liebow, 1967; Osofsky, 1971; Ryan, 1971; Tabb, 1970). Black community residents experience difficulty assuming any ownership for their communities because they share no control in any major institutions that effect their communities' well-being and functioning. The control of all major economic, political, social status and power resources is located in the white community. The condition of the black community is one of powerlessness, due to the oppressive relationship with the white community. The majority of black residents are dependent on the white community for jobs and other vital sources of survival needs. Freire (1970) writes:

For the oppressors, there exists only one right; their right to live in peace, over against the right, not always even recognized, but simply conceded of the oppressed to survival. And they make this concession only because the existence of the oppressed is necessary to their own existence. (p. 43)

For blacks to act in any way other than the oppressive relationship with the dominant white community suggests that they act, constitutes both a real and an imagined threat of losing even the vital sources of survival needs. Actions on their own behalf, anger, and expressions of dissatisfaction with their situation, often result in actual firings of blacks from their jobs. Simply to be born black in America is to acquire a stigma and to be labeled deviant. To speak out in protest of their situation is to acquire a second-order deviant
label of black trouble-maker, and to get "blackballed" from jobs. Especially is this true in small American towns. Examples of such measures actually taken against outspoken blacks are exposed prominently to public view and tend to reinforce imagined "threats" that have settled in the minds of blacks, due to their having endured the harsh conditions of slavery, and the slave-like condition of oppression that followed slavery. Real threats and imagined "threats" combine and serve as an overwhelming deterrent to effective action by blacks on their own behalf. Clark (1967) writes:

Those who have been deeply damaged by the ghetto seem unable to trust even their own feelings. They cannot afford the psychic luxury of depth of emotion. Even their hostility must be kept manageable. (p. 196)

Having seen little good result from their actions in the past, decreases the probability of the majority of blacks taking any risk toward improving their own condition.

Conceptualizing the community along dimensions of level of need and level of functioning has important implications for a psychological consultant who aspires to encourage change in a given community. A consultant has to spend considerable time learning about that unique community in terms of its Needs-Functioning level, and choosing, carefully and appropriately, an intervention strategy that fits that particular community. The consultant is required to work differently and have different goals depending on the Needs-Functioning level of the target community. In a relatively advanced community, goals may center around helping the people function more effectively in organizations they have already established themselves, and the emphasis is
on providing consultation aimed toward improving quality-of-life pursuits close to the self-actualizing level. A successful project in such a community may be having assisted the people with a charitable goal of perfecting and incorporating an organization with aims to feed the world's hungry. In a community closer to the lower end of the spectrum, goals may center around helping to establish and maintain previously nonexistent and temporary organizations that aim to help relieve some of the raw and cruel conditions of those in the community who are living near the survival level. A successful project in such a community may be having assisted in raising the level of consciousness of a few of that community's residents. Too, the two communities would present different styles of resistance to outside intervention, which the consultant has to evaluate specifically for the community in which he works. Furthermore, the two communities would require a different level of commitment from the consultant toward assisting the residents to a level of functioning to meet their own needs.

Strategies of Community Intervention

Rappaport (1977) distinguishes between two major classes of community level strategies of intervention that aim to develop and mobilize the strengths of out-group individuals through organizations, and to create changes in the society that are more suited to the needs of these individuals. The two major classes of strategies are the parallel institutions model and the community organization-social advocacy model.
The Parallel Institutions Model

The parallel institutions model draws its basic conceptions from human ecological theories and stresses dealing with social problems by creating alternative settings controlled by disenfranchised groups. Strategies and tactics emphasize the factors of power, autonomy, and control by these out-groups in newly created organizations. One example of the parallel institutions model is described by Sarason (1976). The intervention strategy involves creating new settings and is based on a concept of networks. Creating new settings is a process of "helping unrelated networks come into relationship with each other in light of their mutual needs" (Sarason, 1976, p. 576). One critical factor is to supply out-groups with information which aids them in using existing networks and tapping into new networks to find alternate sources of getting their needs met. Although this point is not emphasized by Sarason, it is implicit in this strategy that through access to alternate sources of resources, out-group members become more independent of traditional sources, and thus acquire power through a more favorable bargaining position. Some other examples of the parallel institutions model are communes, temporary task-oriented groups, neighborhood groups in control of schools, sub-units and new units created on assumptions different from their parent organizations, and data-based autonomous alternative settings, an approach described by Fairweather (1972, 1967). "All the methods of research [data-based strategies] are possible in combination with any other change technique" (Rappaport, 1977, p. 202).
The Community Organization-Social Advocacy Model

The community organization-social advocacy model draws its basic conceptions from political and economic theories, and stresses dealing with social problems by gaining representation within existing settings for disenfranchised groups. Strategies and tactics emphasize the factors of power, autonomy, and control by these "out-groups" within existing organizations. A prominent example of the community organization-social advocacy model is described by Alinsky (1969). The intervention strategy involves creating mass organizations and is based on a concept of conflict. "Conflict is the essential core of a free and open society" (Alinsky, 1972, p. 62). Masses of organized out-group individuals are set in conflict with established groups to seize a share of power and resources from the established group. It is implicit in this strategy that established power sources are dependent on the masses and they are comfortable with the status quo. The masses are valuable objects of exploitation, and they are expected to follow a prescribed set of rules to preserve order. Through the utilization of mass organization and the creation of conflict, out-groups gain a power-bargaining position due to the threat they pose to the well-being of established groups. Some other examples of the community organization-social advocacy model are presented under the headings of locality development, social planning and social action by Cox et al. (1974).

Developing a Psychological Approach to Community Organization

The primary community intervention strategy of the psychological approach to community organization developed in this study, involves out-group individuals in both creating new settings and gaining
representation in existing organizations, and it is based on a concept of "process." A modified individual therapy model developed by the present author (Powell, 1978) is used in combination with a process approach described by Siegel (1973). The process approach as it is applied in the present study is discussed in the next section, followed by a description of the modified individual therapy model.

A Process Approach. In describing "a process approach," Siegel (1973) writes:

Explicitly, it assumes that everyone is capable of thinking for himself, of devising new ways to approach old problems, of defining problems to make them more solvable.... (italics in the original, p. 28)

This approach discourages the elitist view that only trained professionals should be enlisted in the activity of problem solving.

Siegel's assumption about peoples' ability to deal with their problems is shared with Fanon (1968) who writes:

...we must above all rid ourselves of the... contemptuous attitude that the masses are incapable of governing themselves. In fact, experience proves that the masses understand perfectly the most complicated problems. (p. 188)

The main thrust of a process approach is that it shifts the emphasis of problem solving activity from solution-centered to problem-centered. Instead of bringing traditional solutions to a new problem, all persons who are in any way related to the problem are encouraged to engage in the process of defining it and contributing to a creative solution. Through active participation in this process, the persons involved develop a sense of ownership for both their problems and the process of finding solutions. Of ownership, Siegel (1973) writes:
It is defined as the extent to which an individual feels that an idea [process or procedure] belongs to him, that he owns it, that it is his idea [process or procedure] to work with, it is recognized as initiated by him, available to commit himself to. (p. 31)

This approach which involves everyone concerned in the process of problem solving has implications for the leadership function. The leader is no longer a commanding authority who is responsible for developing new ideas and directing their implementation. As Siegel (1973) states:

Leadership becomes a supportive role.... It is not the leader's responsibility to determine what shall be done (i.e., what new idea should be put to work) but rather to support all members of the system in their own development as innovators in that system. (p. 30)

The leader's role becomes one primarily of facilitation.

Although the process approach permits that no solutions are brought from one setting to another, it does suggest that the process itself is generalizable. Siegel writes, "What could be generalized however, would be the process by which solutions could be developed" (1973, p. 41).

Colarelli and Siegel (1966) used a process approach in an extensive study in which aides assumed the primary responsibility for working with chronic patients on a state hospital ward, while the professional staff's primary responsibility became that of providing support for the aides. In the present study, this author uses a process approach as a community intervention strategy in which residents are primarily responsible for identifying the problems which are explored, while the community consultant provides them with support in
dealing with the problems. Thus, the consultant follows leads from the residents, as suggested in the following statement by Fanon: "If the leader drives me on, I want him to realize that at the same time I show him the way" (1968, p. 184).

In a community setting, a process approach may be used in combination with any of a number of techniques designed to stimulate resident interest, such as a community self-survey. In addition to stimulating resident interest, the technique which a process approach accompanies must serve the purpose of rendering residents accessible to the consultant. In the case of the self-survey technique, the consultant emphasizes the process while producing the survey as an information-gathering device, and uses a process approach to provide individuals and small groups with skills that are transferrable to other community situations.

The application of a Modified Individual Therapy Model. In the psychological approach to community organization a modification of the psychoanalytic intensive individual therapy model is applied at those critical points of contact between the community consultant and individuals and small groups in the community. This procedure retains certain individual therapy techniques and theory, but applies these in a different way from their conventional use in one-to-one therapy relationships. In the traditional therapy model, the therapist is in the role of assessing intrapsychic and interpersonal conflicts and defenses posited within the patient, and establishing a kind of relationship from which the patient increasingly gains awareness of his own functioning. The goal is that this process will result in
desirable shifts in the patient's feelings and behavior, and, with increased awareness, the patient is rendered more personally productive. In the modified individual therapy procedure, the community consultant assumes a similar role of assessing conflicts and defenses posited in residents, but the residents are not identified as patients and no ongoing individual therapy type relationships are established. Instead, the knowledge gained through this kind of assessment is used to assist residents in successfully achieving their goals in the external environment, and in a variety of other ways toward the achievement of community goals. As an example, the consultant may observe that a key resident seems immobilized by conflicting feelings. The resident may display a strong drive toward achievement and an almost equally strong fear of failure. Using this knowledge, the consultant actively works to isolate some of the dimensions of this problem and to determine just what form of support may minimize conflicts and fears, and assist the resident toward successfully performing a task. During this process, the consultant takes no steps to encourage the resident toward intrapsychic awareness of conflicts. In another example, the consultant may seek to determine and keep abreast of who he may be with a given resident "in the transference." A resident may act toward the consultant as if the consultant is "the good father," "the big brother," or "the good son." With certain key residents, the consultant may choose to temporarily "enter the transference", i.e., the consultant may, within reasonable limits, assume the role projected onto him and intermesh psychologically with the resident, and from this position offer stronger support toward the
resident's successfully attaining certain community goals. In this process, the consultant commits himself to restricting his range of behavior to that which is prescribed by the resident, in exchange for a favorable position from which to desirably influence the resident's behavior in the real world.

Other restrictions to the consultant's range of behavior with residents derive from establishing the posture of the psychotherapist, even though the consultant has considerably more freedom and flexibility with community residents than the psychotherapist has with patients. For example, the model of the psychotherapist prescribes the professional's behavior, such as in suggesting guidelines for limiting self-disclosure, and stresses selective focus on asking the "right" questions in the interest of rendering the distortions and misperceptions of the other more transparent. In adopting this model, the community consultant acquires a basis for correcting for distortions and misperceptions of the residents and can better assess the "reality" of events and issues that occur in the community. Another advantage in establishing the posture of the psychotherapist is that this posture has built-in mechanisms for one correcting for one's own distortions. Some knowledge on the part of the consultant about the nature and the operation of his own irrationality provides a vehicle for resolving his own conflicts short of acting them out, overtly or covertly, on the residents. In general, the posture of the individual psychotherapist adopted as a model for the community consultant gives the consultant more objectivity, control, and stability in the community situation. It enables the consultant to avoid traps and
distractions, to better focus on the task, and to behave more consistently.

The psychological approach to community organization is a functional conceptual model that contains a value position which sees the core of black community problems as related to oppression. The primary strategy is a psychoanalytically derived therapy model used in the context of a social process framework with the aim of restoring a psychological sense of community.

The Needs-Functioning conceptualization, a process approach, and the modified individual therapy model were applied in the target community of this study, prior to a fuller development of the psychological approach to community organization. A summary of that application of these conceptions and strategies is the subject of Chapter 2. The development and application of the more comprehensive psychological approach to community organization, which is the main focus of this dissertation, is discussed in the succeeding chapters.
A Description of the Target Community

The city of Kingston, where the black community involved in this study is located, is a small, politically-conservative, college town. The most recent U.S. Census data (1970) listed the city’s total population as 16,828 and the black population as 800, although some black community leaders estimated the black population to be as large as 1200 at the time of this study. More than ninety percent of the city’s black population is concentrated in the southwest area of the city which is locally referred to as "Libertyville." Of the black community at Kingston, Despres (1960) writes:

...psychologically, [Libertyville] is that area of the community in which the Negroes and most of the "hilligans" live. It is ecologically noticeable as a slum district.... Railroad tracks run east to west through the middle of the area. In the north it is bounded by fraternity houses.... In the south it is bounded by a cemetery and in the west by most of the factories in the community. (p. 261)

Educational, occupational, and financial status indicators all suggest that Libertyville is a working class community. Currently

---

1Names have been changed to protect the identity of the community.
blacks share the community with whites who are described as "hill folk who come from the South to spend a session or two in the factories" (Despres, 1960, p. 258). Although whites moved into this area recently, psychologically and historically it is considered the city's black community because ancestors of the current black population began settling there prior to the Civil War. The present study is concerned with the black population of this community.

Invitation into the Community

The invitation to initiate a psychology-based project in Libertyville came from a young minister in his early twenties, Rev. A.J. Marlow, who introduced himself to this consultant at a meeting held at the Kingston County Community Mental Health Center where the consultant was employed. The consultant began the first of four exploratory meetings with A.J. and a small group of community residents on October 4, 1974. During these initial contacts, it was learned that A.J. was the Director of the Steadman Community Center, a focal point of activity in the black community. The Steadman Community Center, a Confederated Charities sponsored agency, was traditionally a recreational center, but under A.J.'s directorship it had shown a strong leaning toward social action. A.J. had also organized and was the coordinator of a local chapter of Project Bootstraps, a national organization that voiced concern for the needs of oppressed people. A.J. said the biggest problem in the community was the apathy of the residents, and he indicated that he expected the consultant to offer individual therapy to community residents and to become an advisor to Project
Bootstraps. The consultant responded by saying that a community self-survey project was likely more appropriate than individual therapy for dealing with the problem of apathy of a large number of community residents. Furthermore, if the consultant were to offer technical assistance to a community self-survey project, then he needed to avoid being associated with Project Bootstraps, because the majority of the community residents regarded the organization as too radical, and for that reason they could withdraw from participation in the community project. With some reluctance, A.J. agreed that the Steadman Community Center would sponsor a community self-survey project to be coordinated by the consultant.

The Community Self-Survey Technique

A technique for identifying community problems while involving a large number of residents in the process of defining and seeking solutions to problems, is the community self-survey technique. In discussing self-study approaches, Perlman and Gurin (1972) write:

Those responsible for the action are also the ones who determine what study is to be undertaken and, in the process of conducting such a study, have an opportunity to think through the questions they are trying to answer and the use they will make of the data obtained. ...self-study approaches...are useful in educating people concerning problems and in motivating them to become involved actively.... (p. 214)

Any community, regardless of its Needs-Functioning level, can make use of this technique, because it is the people in a given community who become more aware of their problems, define their problems, and work toward creative solutions. What one community experiences and
comes to articulate as problems may be different from those of other communities, and a community may have more or less available resources to employ toward solutions. The community self-survey technique provides a starting point for assessing needs, stimulating residents' interest in their community, and generating community problem solving.

The community self-survey technique, as it was used in the project reported here, was divided into four phases. The phases were: (1) the entry phase, (2) the survey instrument development phase, (3) the survey interviewing phase, and (4) the action programs phase. The entry phase consisted mainly of the consultant making contact with the community residents through interviews about what they saw as their community's most pressing needs. The survey instrument development phase consisted of selecting a small number of community residents who produced the community survey instrument. The survey interviewing phase consisted of interviewer training and the administration of the survey by resident interviewers to other members of the community. The action programs phase consisted of coordinating activities and developing resident leadership to continue acting to meet the needs of their community. The first three phases are briefly summarized in this chapter. (See Powell, 1978, for a more detailed description.) The fourth phase constitutes the focus of succeeding chapters.
The Entry Phase

The primary goal of the entry phase of the community self-survey project was for the consultant to gain entry into the community. From his initial contact with A.J. Marlow, the consultant collected a list of names of community leaders for initiating a self-survey project. Interviews began with residents whose names appeared on the list, and each interviewee was asked to suggest names of still other residents who were knowledgeable about the community and who may have been interested in participating in a community project. This process was continued until no new names were suggested by resident interviewees. Through these interviews the consultant was led to visiting community churches and interviewing their ministers, visiting public schools and interviewing principals, teachers, and students, attending community meetings and programs, accepting speaking engagements, interviewing the community's businessmen, and other similar activities. These activities led to many important contacts as the project began developing.

Two observations made during the early stages of the interviewing were helpful toward further entry into the community. The first was: all early interviewees confirmed that Libertyville had three prominent families who were the Taylors, the Evans, and the Freelands. They were prominent because of status due to tradition, financial holdings and influence on the community. They had been an important part of the community since the late 1800's. It was often said that, through intermarriage, everyone in the community was related to one or the
other of these families.

The second observation was: the Libertyville residents seemed to perceive themselves in terms of "insiders" and outsiders. Some of those residents who considered themselves outsiders had migrated from other communities, while others were born and reared in Libertyville. Outsiders were not restricted to any one social class, but whether working class or middle class, they all shared the perception in common that they were not fully accepted by the core of persons who were unquestionably residents. In this study, the term "insiders" describes certain core residents of the community, but it is not a term people in the community used to describe themselves. There was also a lot of variation in the group labeled "insiders," but it was the more conservative members that gave this group its predominant character. During interviews with these residents, they were quick to say that all the trouble in the community came from the presence of "outsiders who came up here from the South."

These two observations influenced interviewer selection and the order in which residents were contacted. The consultant attempted to interview outsiders before approaching the reportedly more difficult "insiders."

The total number of formal interviews completed by the consultant over the course of the entry phase was seventy-five, and the number of informal and shorter interviews numbered well into the hundreds. The average interviewing time was approximately two and a half hours, with some interviews lasting as long as four hours.
All formal interviewing of residents began in the same way with the consultant asking, "What are the most pressing needs of this community?" and "What persons or agencies could best meet these needs?" Once these questions were asked, the consultant followed up responses with more questions to obtain an in-depth view of how the residents perceived their community.

Interviewee responses about community needs were recorded on separate 3 x 5 cards and given to a committee of two psychologists and one librarian, who were instructed to group the cards according to problem-content areas. Each decision was made by group consensus. (After the survey group was formed, its members interviewed some of their neighbors and provided additional items which were included in the problem categories list.) The twenty-one problem categories and the number of responses given under each category appear in Table 1 on the following page.

The question "What persons or agencies could best meet these needs?" yielded information on some sources of network linkages, the community's political impact potential, and two community power bases.

Possible linkages with the community self-survey project were the community's six churches, the Parents Teachers Association, other organizations and clubs, and a city councilman, who lived in the community.

In spite of the success of voter registration efforts initiated by A.J. Marlow, the black community was not a potent political force affecting the politics of the larger city. One reason was that the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Problem Category</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apathy of Residents (and climate of community)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of Recreation</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Condition of Neighborhood</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family/Children</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jobs/Job Preparation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Law/Courts/Police</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Education/Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Senior Citizens/Transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
black population was only a small percentage of the city's total population. Perhaps a more important reason was that political parties did not provide an effective base for opposition and dissent in the city's power structure.

Other than the kind of power held by organizations, such as churches, and individuals, because of financial advantages and property holdings, the community had two points of focus that could be viewed as power bases. One was the power base of A.J. Marlow, an outsider, whose programs were coordinated through the Steadman Community Center. Rev. Marlow was a charismatic religious leader who captured the imagination of the residents. He had extensive connections with the church community and had won the trust and affection of the black community as a whole. All segments of the community responded positively to A.J.'s traditional programs, but tended to withdraw from those programs which confronted the power structure in the white community. The most active support for his more radical programs came from his following of out-group young adults. In general, A.J. had strong popular support, but he made few inroads into the core of power held by conservatives in the black community or the larger white community.

The other power base was held by Mr. Ralph Evans, an "insider," who was known in the black community as the "Senator." The "Senator" was a man in his late sixties, who was one of the city of Kingston's most successful businessmen. Every community resident interviewed mentioned the prominence of the "Senator" in regard to who made the important decisions about the black community. The residents also
mentioned his influence and contacts in the white community. Every year he made substantial financial contributions to the dominant, local conservative political party, of which he was a member, and participated actively in many of the party's affairs. He was acquainted with a number of city and state officials, as well as several members of the influential elite power groups in the area. Residents said that factory operators and other employers often contacted the "Senator" when they were considering hiring a black community resident, and his recommendations were always followed.

The "Senator's" power was derived from the functional role he played for both the black community and the white community. The present author labeled this role "black community junctioner" and defined it as: "The black community person(s) who functions in the linkage position between a black community and its larger white host community." Most decisions that concerned the black community were negotiated by the white community through the "Senator," and, in return, the "Senator" was privileged to token favors from the white establishment. Since the black community had no council, or similar body, to which the "Senator" was accountable, and since the white community had no other relationships with the black community that were binding, there was no way of cross-checking how the "Senator" represented one community to the other. The "Senator" exploited his role as community junctioner for personal gain and power. His alignment was with power, and he had learned to relate to the lesser powerful blacks in the way that whites have related to blacks historically. The white community established no relationships with the black
community that were binding and had a deaf ear turned to needs and
concerns expressed directly by black community residents. However,
from an administrative standpoint, the white community had to have
some contact with the black community in order to maintain control of
it, and one of the principle instruments through which that purpose
was achieved was the community junctioner. The "Senator" was the main
core of power in the black community, and he had limited and condi-
tional power in the local white establishment.

Some Community Events that Occurred During the Course of the Self-
Survey Project

As the community self-survey project began, the white community
was growing angry with A.J. Marlow, because, through Project Boot-
straps, he was quite vocal on behalf of several issues that were
unpopular in the area. He spoke out for changing social conditions
that would improve opportunities for black community residents, and he
organized and held rallies in the black community for candidates of
the less dominant political party. As a result of these kinds of activi-
ties, A.J. began to receive harassing phone calls and to find
threatening notes attached to his car. One evening, following a
meeting, he returned to his car to find the tires slashed.

Later, pressure was brought to bear on A.J. from Confederated
Charities, the organization which sponsored the Steadman Community
Center where he was the director. Confederated Charities claimed
their organization was losing donations from the public who thought
that Confederated Charities was sponsoring Project Bootstraps, since
A.J. was also the local coordinator of Bootstraps. Confederated Charities encouraged the Steadman Community Center Board of Directors to force A.J. to resign one of his two positions, preferably the Steadman Community Center directorship. However, the Steadman Community Center Board of Directors came to A.J.'s rescue and did not insist that he resign. They said community leaders often hold more than one position simultaneously, and they saw no reason why A.J. should be denied this privilege, especially since Bootstraps was a national organization with a good reputation.

Shortly following this controversy, the Steadman Community Center was broken into one evening and ransacked. Its few pieces of recreational equipment were damaged or destroyed, windows were smashed, and tables were overturned. A.J. reported later that he had found a note at the scene, from the Ku Klux Klan, ordering him to get out of town.

This terrorist incident was followed by a collusion between elements of the white community and the black community junctioner to lessen A.J.'s influence in the community. Through a behind-the-scenes political maneuver, Lamar Foxworth, a young man who was a proponent of the junctioner, became the Steadman Community Center Board of Directors president. When Lamar took office, he and the junctioner began to publicly discredit and slander A.J. While this was occurring, Confederated Charities threatened to cut off all Steadman Community Center funds if A.J. were not fired from the position of director.
By the time the survey work was completed in May, A.J. had managed to retain his position as Steadman Community Center Director, but the coalition of factions directed against him had effectively curtailed the impact of his programs.

The Survey Group Phase

The primary goal of the survey group phase was for a small group of residents to produce a survey instrument about their community to be administered to their neighbors. Early in this survey group phase, the consultant invited some prospective participants, who were screened and selected during the entry phase, to form the survey group. Two criteria were used as a basis for the selection of survey group members. One criterion was choosing members who tended to represent the whole community, and another was the ratings of prospective group members obtained through an adapted use of a rating system devised by Taylor and Randolph (1975). (See Table 2, "Prospective Survey Group Members," on the following page.) Of the twelve prospective members, the survey group formed with seven members.

The membership, organizational structure, and meeting format, and the consultant's group support structures were established during the survey group's first three meetings. Mr. Ira Strong, the member who became chairman, set up a two-level organizational structure, dividing the group into chairman and members. He arranged a system in which each group member was to choose a problem category and individually prepare 30 questions from that category to be presented to the group. The meeting format, with the chairman presiding, was for survey group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Approx. Age</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva Dunlap</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>High School student</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Evans</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Factory work</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Force</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Holden</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Elem. School</td>
<td>Beautician/(Pres. of PTO)</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia (Freeland)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Profess. Schl.</td>
<td>Executive Sec. (U.S. Gov't).</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Jackson</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Supervisor Am. Can/(City Councilman)</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lambert</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3-4 yrs. college</td>
<td>Counselor/Minister</td>
<td>Grad. Student</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Richards</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B.A. Degree</td>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Strong</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2 years college</td>
<td>Dept. Head of Warehouse--Phone Co.</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Taylor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>B.A. Degree</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oria Taylor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Business woman</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillie Watson</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>B.A. Degree</td>
<td>Elem. School teacher</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members to jointly evaluate thirty questions presented by a member, and by group consensus choose the best fifteen for the survey. Consistent with a process approach, the consultant followed leads from the chairman and members and provided support to the group "task and maintenance functions" (Thibaut & Kelly, 1967, p. 274), which increased the group members' knowledge, efficiency, and ability to work together effectively. This support was delivered to the group by the consultant during the five minutes of meeting time he was allotted, and during weekly home visits with survey group members between their regular meetings. The consultant also provided "rescue functions" at those times when the group was "stalled."

The survey group, which named itself the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee, met one hour weekly for twelve work sessions before completing the survey, and for a total of sixteen sessions extending through the interviewing phase (see "Attendance Record of Survey Group Members," Table 3, on the following page).

After the questions had been prepared, the survey group members were organized into subcommittees to complete the work of producing the final survey, and to train interviewers who would administer it. The pilot study was conducted at the homes of twenty-five prospective interviewers, who had been selected by the survey group members earlier. Of the 129 items that appeared on the pilot study, 114 were chosen for the survey, and organized into 16 problem categories. To decrease the total interviewing time, most of the questions from the pilot were made into closed-ended, "yes-no" questions for the final survey. One item from the pilot study was selected as a pre-post
Table 3
Attendance Record of Survey Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans, M.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden, M.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, W.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert, M.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>out of town 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, E.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, I.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, M.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interviewing Phase

The primary goal of the interviewing phase of this project was for local resident interviewers to administer the survey to other residents of the community, using a consistent and uniform set of procedures. During the interviewing phase, the consultant shifted the locus of his support from the survey group members to the local interviewers in the interest of their performing the tasks of administering the survey. The interviewers were provided with structured interviewer training sessions conducted by the consultant and a subcommittee of the survey group. The format of the interviewer training sessions was as follows:

1. Orientation and overview of the survey project.
2. Reading through the Manual for Interviewers.
3. Role play from Respondent Selection section of Manual for Interviewers.
4. Role play administering the survey, with pairs of local interviewers administering the survey to each other and exchanging feedback.
5. Assignment of households to local interviewers (from map of the community).
6. Group question and answer period.
7. Formal dismissal of session.

The interviewer training sessions lasted for approximately two and one-half hours, and three different training sessions were held.
The geographical area within which the local interviewers were to administer the community survey was bounded on the west by Shawnee Street, on the east by Adams Street, on the south by Sterling Place, and on the north by Flint Avenue. (See Figure 2, "Map of the Community," on the following page.) Within these boundaries, 171 black family households were identified. Six of those were homes of survey group members. Twenty-five homes were those of the residents who had been selected by survey group members as prospective interviewers. Eliminating the homes of the survey group members who constructed the survey, and the homes of the prospective interviewers who were the pilot study sample, from the survey population, left 140 households where the survey was expected to be administered.

Over the five week period of interviewing, 21 local resident interviewers completed 133 of the 140 households, which constituted 96.5% of the sample. (See Table 4 for rate of completion of interviews, on page 37.) Households not included in the survey were two, where residents refused to be administered the survey, three, where residents could not be caught at home because of odd working hours, and two, where black residents no longer lived.

**Dissemination of Survey Results**

Copies of the survey results containing percentages of the residents' responses to each survey item, were disseminated to any person or agency who could help to find solutions to some of the community problems the survey addressed. (See a copy of the survey in Appendix A.) As a result of a meeting held at the City Hall regarding a
Figure 2: Map of the Community
Table 4

Interview Completion Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer No.</th>
<th>No. of Interviews Assigned</th>
<th>Number of Interviews Completed</th>
<th>1st Week</th>
<th>2nd Week</th>
<th>3rd Week</th>
<th>4th Week</th>
<th>5th Week</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>*9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>*9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>*9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Week interviewer began

Week interviewer discontinued
community matter, newspaper and radio publicity of the survey began before the interviewing phase was completed. Some of the results of the survey were broadcast over the radio, and an article appeared in the local newspaper, which included a picture of the survey group members, and told the story of the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee.

Community Action Programs Phase

The primary purpose of the action programs phase of this project was for community residents to channel their energies through action groups toward initiating changes to improve their community. With regard to community action programs, the consultant's role may vary as the community self-survey project progresses through its different phases. Three different consultant roles that were identified as associated with community action programs were: (1) stimulating community action programs, (2) providing support for community action groups, and (3) participating in community action groups' activities as part of a given community action group-consultant "mix." (The concept of the "mix" is described later in this chapter.)

Stimulating Community Action Programs

In stimulating community action programs, this consultant used three different procedures, which were: (a) investing in community residents' individual potentials, (b) structuring activities within the survey group, and (c) focusing residents' attention toward issues that were potential catalysts around which community action groups
could form.

The procedure of investing in community residents' individual potentials toward developing community action programs was used during the earliest phases of the community self-survey project. Every contact with a community resident was regarded by the consultant as a short-term therapeutic encounter. During or following some of these contacts, the consultant provided useful information, individual training, or linked residents with resources. The consultant made his skills available to all community residents who displayed potential of some kind, and had sufficient motivation and time to develop their potential. In this way, the consultant used the strategy of investing in the development of a large number of the community residents' individual potentials with the expectation that a few of these individuals would develop community action programs.

The procedure of structuring activities within the survey group toward developing community action programs was used during the survey group phase of the community self-survey project. Survey group members were encouraged to seek out, establish contacts with, secure appointments with and hold conferences with resource persons who could assist them in finding solutions to some of the problems their survey was addressing. Their notes from such conferences were filed into an information bank. The contacts with resource persons, and the information bank, plus the experience they gained while working together in the survey group, were expected to aid the survey group members with coordinating community action programs that might have developed from their survey.
The procedure of focusing community residents' attention toward issues that were potential catalysts around which community action groups could form, was used during all phases of the community self-survey project. The catalytic potential of an issue was viewed as the magnitude of emotion that a given issue was capable of arousing in the community residents. Anger is a state in advance of apathy (Grier & Cobb, 1968; Clark, 1965; May, 1953); therefore, if apathy is a problem experienced by residents in a community, then an appropriate catalytic issue is one that arouses the community residents' anger. During the entire course of the community self-survey project, the consultant scrutinized issues in an attempt to determine which issues aroused the residents' emotions, and he gave particular attention to those which aroused the residents' anger. Those issues were identified as catalytic issues, and residents' attention was focused toward those issues by addressing them on the survey. The expectation was that some of the residents would form action groups around those catalytic issues, and through action groups, the residents would contribute to constructively resolving some of those issues on behalf of their community.

**Providing Support for Community Action Groups**

In providing support for community action groups, the consultant functioned in the same manner described above in the Survey Group Phase. (For a fuller description, see Powell, 1978.) Consistent with a process approach, the consultant followed action group members' leads as to what kinds of activities constituted maximal support to
The consultant was not necessarily involved in the formation and operation of all action groups that developed in the community during the time of the community self-survey project. Some action groups were formed spontaneously by residents, and the size and the scope of the issues addressed by different action groups varied a great deal. When the consultant did contribute to the formation of an action group, the strategy was to use a catalytic issue to provide incentive to form the action group, then use the newly formed action group to begin administering properly to resolving the catalytic issue. After the group was formed, that strategy aided the consultant in keeping his attention attuned to differentiating two important aspects of the action group's activities, which were planning within the group to deal effectively toward resolving the external issues, and strengthening the group's internal organization.

**Participating in Community Action Groups (The "Mix")**

During the latter phases of working with the survey group, a philosophical dilemma with regard to the process approach arose. A process approach required that the community residents make their own decisions in completing the survey. On the other hand, the task of completing the survey required organizational skills beyond the peoples' level, and necessitated the consultant's entering the group as an active decision maker. This author synthesized these two ideas in a concept he entitled the "mix," and defined as "the combined resources of the community action group members and the consultant in
a given community situation." The "mix" includes the ideas of a Needs-Functioning conceptualization, a process approach, and the modified individual therapy model, and also permits the consultant to become more directly active in working with community groups.

The magnitude of the consultant's participation in a given action group depends on the level of functioning that can be sustained by that action group's members. One factor which affects the level of functioning of a group is the group members' means, or access to resources. A community action group-consultant "mix" at the lower order end of a Needs-Functioning spectrum has a greater lack of means to functioning effectively than does a similar group at the higher order end of the spectrum. One way of compensating for this lack of means is for the consultant to make all of his personal resources, in addition to group process skills, available for utilization in the "mix." He fills in for the lack of means with any talents the residents do not possess, until such time as they acquire them. The consultant may have to supply his discipline, energy, academic skills, planning and organizational abilities, clerical skills, creative abilities and other qualities toward elevating the total level of functioning of the "mix."

The arrangement within a "mix" is one in which there is constant interaction and constant interchange of ideas and knowledge between the consultant and the residents. The "mix" is a single unit which contains the pooled resources of the residents and the consultant, and it is capable of producing more creative solutions to problems than either the residents or the consultant functioning independently.
of each other.

The "mix" produces a situation which is replete with duplicity for the community consultant. His increased active participation in the group leads to closeness with the residents, while group process and group training functions require maintaining appropriate distance from the residents. Keeping group process and group training functions in focus, while increasing his direct participation in the group, is one of the important contributions the consultant makes to the "mix."

A Brief Report of a Community Action Group: An Example of the "Mix"

During the time when the survey group was beginning the interviewing phase, a catalytic issue arose around which a community action group-consultant "mix" formed. A white suburban community, known as Shady Village, circulated a petition protesting a Board of Education decision to make a few routine additions, such as building a music room and increasing the library space, at Garfield School, the elementary school in the black community. Shady Village and Highland Cliffs were two white communities which had been developed south of the black community, but the children in these communities were bussed around Garfield School to white elementary schools located further north in the city of Kingston. Apparently the residents of these two communities felt this arrangement was threatened by the simple addition plans to Garfield, and in response, they protested these plans and strongly supported another proposal that was highly favored by the Board of Education, which was to build a new middle
school in Kingston. The black community, through a newly formed group called the Concerned Residents of Libertyville, became involved in the school issue, and this group's strategy was to escalate conflict over the issue, and make creative proposals for resolution.

The Concerned Residents were led by Mr. Morris Evans, a survey group member, who had received group process training and leadership development training from the consultant during the course of producing the survey. The consultant functioned actively with the Concerned Residents as part of the community action group-consultant "mix." He met frequently with Mr. Evans and other members of the group. In the course of these meetings he suggested procedures for informing the black community and mobilizing its active support. He suggested themes they might emphasize with the Board of Education, provided training for leaders, and assisted in organizing community support meetings. This process led to the Concerned Residents' calling a public meeting to which they invited the Superintendent of the Board of Education to talk with black community residents concerning the school issue. As a result of that meeting, the Concerned Residents made two new proposals, which were: (1) to increase the Garfield addition plans to include six classrooms and a variety of other improvements, and (2) to redistrict the school district, to include Shady Village and Highland Cliffs in the Garfield School area. These proposals were placed on the formal agenda for the next Board of Education meeting, and Mr. Evans was invited to that meeting to defend the proposals. Meanwhile, the Concerned Residents organized the people in the black community, who had been aroused by some of the survey
questions, and 25% of the black population were present at the Board of Education meeting in support of Mr. Evans' position on the school issue.

The Board of Education members voted favorably for both proposals. Redistricting was effected and nearly a half million dollars was spent in additions to Garfield School. The middle school proposal later failed, as a bond issue was defeated. Apparently Garfield was seen as appropriate to serve some of the functions which had been expected from a new middle school, and later another half million dollars was spent in additions to Garfield. In total, the additions included twelve new regular classrooms and a variety of other new educational and recreational facilities. Through timely action, creative proposals, and a show of strength and support, the Concerned Residents were instrumental in getting approximately 1 million dollars in additions to the school in the black community, and they had acquired white middle class neighbors in their school area whom they expected to more effectively demand that their school offer better quality education. The school additions had an impact on other aspects of the black community, and met several needs residents had listed as concerns on the survey, such as providing improved recreational and playground facilities for the black community's children.

The main thrust of the Concerned Residents' involvement with the school issue occurred during and immediately following the survey interviewing phase. After the survey results had been summarized and disseminated, the consultant left the community and spent the summer out of state. Although his original agreement with Rev. A.J.
Marlow had been to work in the community for only one year, he accepted an invitation from the Concerned Residents to return in the Fall to continue the community project. Chapter 3 is an account of the consultant's second year of work in the target community, when the more fully developed psychological approach to community organization was applied.
CHAPTER 3

Community Action Programs—Phase II

Within the framework of the primary purpose of the community action programs phase, as presented in Chapter 2, a more specific purpose may emerge and assume the form of a major goal to be accomplished on behalf of the community. In the community of this study, during the period beginning in August 1975, a major goal became that of establishing an ongoing community action group that represented black community concerns to governmental authorities of the larger city and county power structures.

The emergence of this major goal introduced another important dimension in the functioning of a community action group toward which the consultant's attention had to be focused. In addition to directing attention toward improving the functioning of individual group members within the context of the community action group, the consultant's attention had also to be directed toward improving the functioning of the community action group itself, as a unit, within the context of the city and county setting. In the way that the idea of task and maintenance functions provided a useful conceptualization for dealing with the individual as a unit in the group, it was then required that the consultant become familiar with ideas which would provide a useful conceptualization for dealing with the group as a unit in the
community setting.

An important difference between individuals working within the context of a group setting, and groups working in the context of the larger community setting is assumed in this study. Usually, within the context of a group setting—especially a small group setting—the individual group members have shared goals, and an individual member's participation is rewarded through the achievements of the group. Therefore, the effectiveness of the group as a whole is based on cooperation among the individual group members toward achieving shared goals. However, within the context of a composite community setting, various groups may not have shared goals, and a given group's activity on behalf of its goals is often not rewarded in quite the same way through an achievement of the composite community. "...the local [composite] community can be seen as the field in which units interact with each other..." (Warren, 1972, p. 278). The composite community can be viewed as the background against which various groups act out their purposes. Therefore, a group's effectiveness in the larger community setting is often based on its power to influence decisions in that setting, because it is often in competition with other groups which do not share the same goals.

The consultant was required to attend to an emphasis on competition when viewing the community action group as a unit functioning within the context of the larger composite community, and to attend to an emphasis on cooperation when viewing the community action group in terms of its members functioning within the context of the group itself. These dual emphases were fashioned into two fundamental
sub-goals that would aid the community action group in attaining the
major goal which emerged during the stages of the project's action
programs phase discussed here. The two fundamental sub-goals were:

(1) To strengthen the community action group's relative
position among other groups in the larger community
setting and thereby increase its power to influence
decisions in that setting.

(2) To strengthen the community action group's internal
functioning so that without the consultant, its
members could maintain the group's ability to
influence decisions in the larger community setting.

"To strengthen the community action group's relative position
among other groups..." required the use of some conceptualization of
relations among groups as units in a larger community setting. One
such conceptualization of groups, in terms of "vertical and horizontal
patterns" was presented by Warren (1972). Warren writes:

We shall define a community's vertical pattern
as the structural and functional relation of
its various social units and subsystems to
extracommunity systems (p. 161). ...We shall
define a community's horizontal pattern as the
structural and functional relations of its
various social units and subsystems to each
other. (p. 162)

In this conceptualization, local units in any given community have two
types of relationships or ties with other units. Those ties of a
local unit with other units which are located in the larger society,
outside of the community's boundaries, constitute the local unit's
vertical ties. Those ties that are shared with other local units
within the community's boundaries, constitute the local unit's
horizontal ties.
The emphasis of this study stresses the relationship between vertical and horizontal patterns, with special interest directed to ways in which ties to a vertical system may strengthen a local unit within its horizontal pattern. On that issue, Warren (1972) writes:

"...the individual unit finds at its disposal various means through which it can influence the local community.... In many instances, the unit has the backing of a state or national organization in pursuing its goals and developing its operations in the community. This backing...lends support to the local unit in following policies which may not be satisfactory to other community units. The unit is not alone but is recognized as an established part of an extracommunity system which may have great prestige and power.... [Some examples of such are] the local army post which represents a powerful force from the national scene; ...the local plant which bears the seal of a powerful, nationally known corporation. (p. 291)"

In this study, one of the ways of strengthening the relative power of the community action group vis-a-vis other groups in its larger community setting was to firmly establish it with influential extra-community ties.

"To strengthen the community action group's internal functioning. ..." required continued use of the conceptualization of task and maintenance functions. During the advanced stages of the community action programs phase, attention to task and maintenance functions is intensified because of the consultant's impending termination from the group. This is an even more critical issue when a project is conducted in a community located near the lower order end of a Needs-Functioning spectrum. Due to the consultant's active participation in compensation for a lack of means, the residents of such a community are likely to be
more dependent on the consultant to provide support to both the
task and maintenance functioning of the group. Thus, such a com-
munity action group could lose considerable operating efficiency
when the consultant eventually left the group.

To lessen the loss of operating efficiency in this situation,
the consultant, during the course of his actually providing sup-
port to the group must, at the same time, offer intensive training
to group members toward their becoming skilled at providing task
and maintenance functions for themselves. The training is rein-
forced if the consultant builds structures and means within the
group—as well as in the community—through which support to task
and maintenance functioning is delivered by the group members them-
selves. One such reinforcing structure provided by this consultant
which served as a guideline for the group's continued functioning
in the consultant's absence, was a written constitution. The con-
tent of the constitution had been developed jointly by the group
members and the consultant during the course of the group's actual
functioning, and, upon the consultant's termination from the
group, the written constitution, in which the group members shared
ownership, was presented.
Community Reentry and Stimulating New Community Action Programs

The consultant's return to the community in late August, 1975, was met with resistance from many of the community residents. He was returning for a second year of work following his summer vacation, and his experiences were similar to those of the initial entry phase as described in Powell (1978). Although the consultant had been openly accepted by the residents as an active participant in some of their local activities before his departure, many of them were cool toward him upon his return. Even some of those residents with whom he had established contacts earlier tended to ignore his presence and to communicate unwelcoming feelings. It was assumed that one factor which contributed to the way the residents were reacting, was the impact the self-survey project had begun exerting on the community. The project had begun stimulating changes, and even though some of the changes seemed highly favorable, the accompanying disruption to the community's status quo caused the residents to feel uncomfortable. The consultant became the target of the residents' feelings of discomfort, and they directed these feelings toward him in the form of resentment and denial of his presence. The residents appeared to be even less approachable than they had been during the initial entry phase, so it was much to the consultant's advantage that he had established good working relationships with some community members during the
self-survey project activities of the previous year. The second year reentry process began by reestablishing contact with the survey group members. One important immediate goal during reentry was to discover what changes had occurred during the consultant's absence from the community, so that he could get back in touch with the community residents and assure that the project's activities continued to follow their leads.

The reentry process began with the consultant visiting the survey group members in their homes. He presented each member with a small souvenir, which marked his return from summer vacation, before discussions about community events began. Most of the members talked openly and freely about the success of their survey and about their impressions of what was happening in the community, but two of them carefully guarded their responses in the same way many of the other community residents were reacting in the consultant's presence. During the conversations with the survey group members, the consultant asked if they were interested in formally reinstating their group. All of the members, except one who was leaving the community to begin a new job in another city, responded positively and said they wanted to start their group again. Regarding the tenor of the community and the status of the community self-survey project, the most immediately useful information came from the survey group chairman, Mr. Ira Strong, and the survey group member who had organized his own community action group, Mr. Morris Evans.

When he visited with Mr. Strong at his home, the consultant found that he had become very excited about the survey project. He asked
the consultant for one or two items of survey instructional materials that he had misplaced, and said he needed those items to show to some of his friends who were interested in how the survey was produced. He mentioned also that he had taken copies of the survey results to several Steadman Community Center Board of Directors' meetings and pointed out to the board members how important such needs as better recreational and day care facilities were to the local residents. He said he had had to defend the survey on several occasions in those meetings because the Board of Directors' president, Lamar Foxworth, had begun a campaign of criticizing the community self-survey project. Mr. Strong said that because he had participated on the survey committee, he knew the survey was done right, so he did not have any trouble defending it. He also said that he had begun to speak out in meetings on other community issues as well.

Mr. Strong's report of his new-found assertiveness and increased involvement in community issues was confirmed by other residents who later reported that since he had been chairman of the survey group, he had become much more active in community affairs. He had been appointed also to the auxiliary Board of Directors of a group that was based in the white community and provided training and contacts with employers for some of the local women who were seeking jobs. Mr. Strong played an instrumental role in securing the consultant as a speaker before the staff and participants at one of that group's training sessions. The self-survey project and some of the survey results were appropriately discussed as an aspect of the consultant's presentation to the group, and Mr. Strong actively participated in
that part of the evening's program.

When he visited with Mr. Morris Evans at his home, the consultant found him planning a Concerned Residents activity with a community resident who was a member of that group. He and the group member seemed pressured and acted as if they had a deadline to meet. Mr. Evans was quite agitated, and except for shaking hands and offering a brief greeting, he bypassed other social formalities, and immediately involved the consultant in the planning activity. When the activity was completed and the other group member had left, Mr. Evans then turned to discussing the Concerned Residents group.

He reported that he had experienced a lot of frustration in his role as the Concerned Residents leader over the summer, but he had managed somehow to hold the group together and keep it focused on the school issues. Support for the group had lessened considerably among the community residents, and vacations and other summer activities had resulted in the core membership of the group turning over almost completely.1 These factors, Mr. Evans said, had made it difficult for him to get any kind of sustained cooperation from the residents, and to keep the core members working in a consistent way to achieve the group's goals. In spite of these difficulties, however, Concerned Residents had participated jointly with Board of Education personnel in all meetings and planning sessions regarding the Garfield

1Although there were disruptions due to the turnover of membership, Concerned Residents did acquire an important new member in Mrs. Minnie Holden. She and Mr. Evans had worked together as members of the survey group and she was the Garfield School PTA president.
School additions. Also, the group members were continuing to hold weekly meetings among themselves to discuss their problems and to formulate strategy. Mr. Evans concluded that although he thought the Concerned Residents had done a good job during the summer, he was glad to see the consultant back to give them some help.

After assuring Mr. Evans that he would resume work with the Concerned Residents group, the consultant asked about A.J. Marlow, and wanted to know what kind of new projects he had initiated. Appearing shocked that the consultant did not know, Mr. Evans said, "A.J. was run out of town." He said it was a pity and a shame how A.J. had suffered from threats and harassment during the summer. "Everybody was after him," Mr. Evans said. The Ku Klux Klan terrorism activities had started up again, and they were worse than before. Too, the Confederated Charities and the Steadman Community Center Board threatened to label the left-over expense from the field trips he had taken community children on as "misappropriation of funds," if he did not resign his position as the Steadman Community Center director. A.J. was getting pressure from every direction. Mr. Evans said, "They must have done something awfully bad to A.J., because I have never seen him quite so shaken as before he left. He didn't even stop over and say goodbye."

The unsettling news that A.J. had been forced out of the community raised questions as to what was currently happening at the Steadman Community Center. Mr. Evans said the Steadman Community Center Board had responded to a strong suggestion from the Confederated Charities to rent out the Steadman Community Center building to an
organization which was based in the white community. He thought that
gesture was a further "stab" at A.J. since most of A.J.'s projects
had originated from the Steadman Community Center. It was also seen
as a move to nullify the thrust of the community self-survey project,
since it blocked the residents from access to a convenient place to
hold meetings. Mr. Evans said that the weekly Concerned Residents
meetings had to be held in the basement of the church where he and
Mrs. Holden were members of the congregation.

As their conversation continued, Mr. Evans made reference to
certain changes in his own personal life. In the spring, before the
consultant had left the community, Mr. Evans had gotten married, and
during the summer he had begun a part-time job as a bartender at the
Uptown Inn, a bar located near his home. He mentioned that his newly
acquired responsibilities to his marriage and his job meant that he
would not have as much time available to devote to community work.

Through his visits with Mr. Evans and Mr. Strong, the consultant
had gathered information indicating that the self-survey project was
no longer anchored to the Steadman Community Center. A.J. Marlow,
who had invited the consultant into the community, had, himself, been
forced out, and the new Steadman Community Center leader, Lamar
Foxworth, was evidently hostile toward the self-survey project. He
had begun discrediting the project and criticizing the consultant
in the same way he had done earlier with A.J. Also, the Steadman
Community Center building was rented out and unavailable as a place
from which black community programs could be coordinated.
The self-survey project no longer had a sponsoring agency, and, except for Concerned Residents, the consultant had been set adrift in the community. In this situation, the consultant began to support the only existing community action program, by participating in the weekly Concerned Residents meetings, and, toward stimulating new action programs, he began visiting the community on a regular basis in search of leads that might come from the residents.

During one of his visits to the community, the consultant had a chance meeting in a downtown restaurant with Mrs. Carla Stattemiller, who was the executive director of the Confederated Charities. Mrs. Stattemiller said she had seen a copy of the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee’s survey results, and she referred to the successful completion of the survey as one of the most impressive projects she had seen done in the area in quite some time. She said that a county-wide survey project had been in the making for nearly eight years, but the personnel involved just couldn’t manage to "get it off the ground." She went on to say that they were interested in many of the questions that were on the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee’s survey, and that funding for some of the programs those questions suggested, would be no problem if they were tied in with a county-wide project. Although she was not specific about terms, Mrs. Stattemiller invited the consultant, and the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee to participate in the county-wide survey project. The consultant responded by saying that he would meet again with her to discuss this possibility further, after speaking with the survey group chairman, and members, about her offer.
This information was relayed to the survey group chairman, and he was told that this was one option the group could investigate further, if they were interested. The chairman was encouraged to call a meeting of the group because, in addition to the invitation from Mrs. Stattemiller, several of the members had asked the consultant when the survey group would begin functioning again. However, the chairman’s response was noncommittal. He said only that he would give some thought to calling a meeting of the survey group members.

The survey group chairman seemed interested, but at the same time he seemed unwilling to take the decisive initial step to formally reinstate the survey group. It was critical that he and the members take that step, because at that phase of the community self-survey project, the consultant was to function only in the capacity of advisor to them. This meant that if the group were reinstated, then the chairman and members were expected to function autonomously in performing tasks and providing their own support. If they reinstated their group themselves, they would be likely to develop a stronger sense of ownership, which could contribute to their functioning successfully, with relative independence from the consultant. It was therefore conditional that the chairman and members take that decisive initial step before the consultant would commit himself to become involved with them in another project.

Several weeks passed without the chairman formally reinstating the survey group, and during that time, the consultant explored other alternatives in an attempt to stimulate community action programs. The possibility of establishing a comprehensive daycare/recreational
facility was discussed with the Steadman Community Center Board of Directors' president, Mr. Lamar Foxworth. An appointment was scheduled with Mr. Foxworth, and during the ensuing conference between him and the consultant, it was evident that he had already given a lot of thought to the idea. Mr. Foxworth was well-informed about the issues and problems involved in establishing such a facility in the black community. He was interested in exploring ways of securing federal government funding. He said the black community had several assets that could attract support for such a facility. Among the assets, he mentioned that the Steadman Community Center had already acquired a land site for such purposes, and also successfully operated the only licensed nursery school in the area, which had a good reputation with both black and white parents. These, he felt, were favorable features on which to build in the writing of a daycare/recreational facility proposal to the federal government. The consultant volunteered to assist with the proposal writing, and suggested that the community self-survey results dealing with that area be included. He suggested also that he would coordinate other research projects which could aid further in supporting the facility proposal.

Mr. Foxworth responded enthusiastically, and set another appointment to continue talks toward making the proposal idea more concrete. However, on two successive occasions he did not keep his scheduled appointments with the consultant, and discussions on the comprehensive daycare/recreational facility stalled.

After it was apparent that contacts with established groups and individuals, such as described above, were not resulting in new
community action programs, the consultant decided to concentrate his
efforts on strengthening the Concerned Residents group, with the ex­
pectation that its members would develop programs from the survey
results. When it had the full support of the residents, the Concerned
Residents group had rendered an important service to the community
with its timely and effective performance in connection with the
Garfield School additions and redistricting issues. However, once
Concerned Residents had achieved its goals in this area, resident
interest drifted away from the group. If this group were to be
effective in developing some of the programs suggested by the survey
results, then its members had to regain support from the residents.
Support was especially needed from some of the community "insiders,"
who had more access to resources, and more connections with organi­
zations, such as churches, civic, business, and professional groups,
and social service agencies. In addition, the Concerned Residents
group had certain unfavorable aspects of the community action group­
consultant "mix" to overcome. It was a local community group (1) that
was recent in origin, (2) that had few horizontal ties, (3) that had
few core members, (4) that had no catalytic issue in ascendency, and
(5) that had a group leader, who was relatively new to the role, who
was from the working class, and who was regarded as a community out­
sider. To rebuild Concerned Residents to a position of prominence
in the community from which it might acquire the capability to co­
ordinate programs, was expected to be a difficult task, not unlike
working with the survey group the year before. It was undertaken,
however, because it was the only thrust seen coming from the residents
for community action programs, and it was the only tie in the community where the consultant had a modest degree of leverage. All other doors appeared closed.

Rebuilding the Concerned Residents was a task that depended on the residents' participation, but the residents were not responding to the consultant's efforts to get them actively involved in new community projects. At this point, the Concerned Residents group was in need of support, and the consultant himself was in need of support, perhaps in the form of ideas to help him get "untracked." A logical next step was to go to some place for help where there were experts who were trained and paid a salary to support and assist groups and individuals. Such a place was the local community mental health center, and, in fact, visiting the community mental health center was the next action step taken.

The consultant and Mr. Morris Evans secured an appointment and met with the community mental health center's staff. They told the staff about Concerned Residents' participation and gains in connection with the school issues, and described what they perceived as the group's current status. In addition, they raised the possibility of the group eventually initiating community action programs, some of which could be of a preventive, mental health nature. Copies of the survey results were presented to the staff, and most of the staff members read their copies thoroughly with focused attention. The community self-survey project was presented as an initial step the community residents had taken on their own. The staff was then asked for any support, any ideas, or any suggestions they could offer toward strengthening the Concerned Residents group, and extending its
functioning. The conference lasted for more than an hour, and, at
its end, the community mental health center's director said they would
provide some kind of support for Concerned Residents, and that he, or
a staff member, would attend the next Concerned Residents meeting.

The next three meetings of Concerned Residents were held with
no one from the community mental health center attending. Finally,
the consultant and Mr. Evans went back to the community mental health
center and again met with the director, only to find that his position
on providing some kind of support for Concerned Residents had shifted.
He no longer favored assisting the group. Shortly following that con­
ference, however, a token gesture was offered to Concerned Residents
by the director, through placing Mr. Evans on a children's service
committee. This was a combined staff and citizens discussion group
which dealt with issues related to expanding children's services at
the community mental health center itself. That group met twice over
an extended period of time, and it served somewhat as a morale boost,
and as experience in that kind of setting, for Mr. Evans, but it did
not culminate in any form of support for Concerned Residents.

By this time, the consultant had been back in the community for
nearly two and a half months, and every alternative he pursued toward
stimulating community action programs was met with frustration. The
residents were providing no leads, and he had not found a community
action group-consultant "mix" that was suitable to this phase of the
self-survey project. Another condition was making its effects felt
also, and that was the unavailability of the Steadman Community
Center building for the consultant's routine use. During the times
he was present in the community, toiletry had to be planned around visits to public places such as restaurants, or the bus station, and all telephone calls were made from public phone booths, or, on occasion, from the homes of a few empathic residents. He had no place in the community to leave his work materials, and for his office he had to use his car, or a little corner of the counter at the bar where Mr. Evans worked.

On 11/12/75, the consultant made a routine stop at the Uptown Inn for a brief chat with Mr. Evans. The moment he saw the consultant, Mr. Evans reached under the bar counter and pulled out a copy of the local newspaper from the day before, and pointed to an article which he instructed the consultant to read. The article reported that the county of Kingston was under investigation by the State Civil Rights Commission as a result of a minority hiring discrimination suit filed by the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps, on January 16, 1975. (See copy of article on the following page, entitled "SCRC investigates County hiring.") The article further reported that a State Civil Rights Commission investigator, Mr. Newton Ives, had asked county representatives to provide an affirmative action statement, and other information regarding the county's hiring practices. The county had employed a lawyer in connection with this suit, and in the article he stresses, "...that by law the Civil Rights Commission has only one year's jurisdiction in the matter from the time the charge is filed... and only about two months jurisdiction remains."

When the consultant finished reading the news article, Mr. Evans said he had gone to Centralton with A.J. Marlow when the charge was
SCRC investigates County hiring

Minority hiring practices of the Kingston County Commissioners are currently under investigation by the State Civil Rights Commission. The investigation stems from a charge filed on January 16, 1973 by the Kingston Chapter of the State Commission on Human Relations.

The commissioners said they were unaware of the charge until last week, when [name removed] of the Civil Rights Commission called to make an appointment. The commissioners took immediate action to employ [name removed] of the [name removed] firm of [name removed], to represent the county in the matter. [name removed] accompanied [name removed] on his personal investigation of the Courthouse complex Monday.

Both men then met with the commissioners about 3:30 p.m. when [name removed] asked the commissioners to provide him with an affirmative action statement and additional information on the board's jurisdiction over hiring practices in other departments of the county government.

[name removed] said he will complete his findings for consideration by the Civil Rights Commission which then determines the merit of the charge. If cause is found the commission will proceed with appropriate legal action. If the charge is determined to be unfounded the charge will be dropped. [name removed] said the commission could act within two weeks to one month. [name removed] pointed out that by law the Civil Rights Commission has only one year's jurisdiction in the matter from the time the charge is filed. Because of the apparent delay in beginning the investigation, only about two months jurisdiction remains.
originally filed back in January. He said he remembered distinctly that the same charge that was filed against the county was filed against the city of Kingston also, and he wondered why that was not mentioned in the newspaper. He went on to inform the consultant that there was no chapter of Project Bootstraps in Kingston since A.J. had been run out of town, and technically, the Kingston Chapter of Bootstraps had been only an auxiliary wing of the Centralton Chapter. Therefore, he planned to inform the Centralton Chapter about the suit and let them "handle it from that end." He told the consultant that Fred (Stag) Taylor was going to drive him to Centralton for such purposes on the following day, and they would stop by the consultant's home at 8:00 A.M. He said, they wanted the consultant to go along and assist them in talking about the suit with the president of the Centralton Chapter of Project Bootstraps. The consultant agreed to this arrangement, and the last words he heard Mr. Evans say that day were, "It must be something mighty important, buddy, because the county went out and hired themselves a bigshot lawyer from River City."

The consultant left the Uptown Inn reflecting that Mr. Evans just may have provided the kind of resident lead he had been listening for, and maybe this lawsuit involving Project Bootstraps had the makings of a strong community action group-consultant "mix."

Establishing the Groundwork For a Community Action Group-Consultant "Mix"

On the morning of 11/13/75, Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor arrived at the consultant's home a little before 8:00 A.M., and the consultant
greeted them at the door with shaving cream still on his face. Even before they were inside the house and seated, an energetic discussion began with the consultant asking the two men to state exactly what they had planned to do that day. Mr. Evans responded by repeating the essence of what he had said the day before. He stressed the necessity of their seeing the president of the Centralton Chapter of Project Bootstraps, to let him know that the Centralton Chapter would have to handle the minority hiring discrimination suit. He said, "A.J. Marlow was our coordinator when the suit was filed, but since he was run out of town, we have no Project Bootstraps Chapter in Kingston. That is why we hope the Centralton Chapter will take over the case for us and help us out." After Mr. Evans had made these remarks, the consultant asked, "Instead of asking the Centralton Chapter to do it, why don't we handle this suit ourselves, with Mr. Evans serving as coordinator of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps?" Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor looked at each other in obvious surprise as the consultant went on to explain more about what his suggestion had meant. He said, "The fact that there have been no meetings, etc., since A.J. left Kingston, does not mean there is no Chapter of Project Bootstraps there. Most of the residents who were members or supporters of the organization when A.J. was here, still live in the community. This includes people such as you, who were an officer, and Mr. Taylor, who contributed financially and otherwise gave the group his backing. So all we have to do is call the members together and begin functioning as Project Bootstraps again."
After dealing with this idea, Mr. Evans wanted to know more about how and why he should become the coordinator. The consultant said, "Project Bootstraps in Kingston already had its elected officers, such as president, vice-president, etc., which could easily remain intact, but the group is without its coordinator, the non-elected position in which A.J. served. This position is needed because the Kingston Chapter is an auxiliary group of the Project Bootstraps Chapter in Centralton, and therefore it is necessary to have an officer who coordinates activities between the two chapters. Further, the position of coordinator took on its current status of importance because A.J. held it, and because it is the office of Project Bootstraps that was named in the suit, but the person to hold this position now could be appointed." Mr. Evans was told that he was a good choice for the position because the citizenry in the city and county were sensitized to him as the leader of the Concerned Residents group, which had just won important achievements for his community in connection with the school issues. There was a good chance that his success as the leader of Concerned Residents would transfer over to his leadership of Project Bootstraps and provide a lot of momentum toward dealing successfully with the minority hiring discrimination issue.

Mr. Evans seemed very attentive, and his next question was, "Exactly how would I become the coordinator?" The consultant responded by saying, "No arrangements were made in regard to this office before A.J. left the community, so technically he is still the coordinator. However, since it is a non-elected office, why don't we
arrange for the present coordinator, A.J., to appoint you to the position. We could try calling right now to see if we can locate A.J., and since it is early morning there is a good chance that wherever he lives we will reach him at home. If so, he could appoint you as coordinator. Then you could still see the president of the Centralton Chapter today, if you wish, but only to brief him about your own activities as members of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps. The consultant went on to say, "However, the critical importance of your becoming the coordinator today is so that you and Mr. Taylor can visit the State Civil Rights Commission Office and 'stake your claim' to the suit. With A.J. gone, a big vacuum has been created in the community leadership, and the situation is such that any residents in the community can claim that they represent Project Bootstraps. Even the 'Senator' could make that claim, if he chose to do so. Control of the group could easily fall into the wrong hands. Regardless of whether a group of residents speak truthfully or not, whoever makes the first substantial claim, following A.J., will come to symbolize Project Bootstraps in the eyes of the public. It may as well be you and Mr. Taylor, and all the rest of the people who worked and struggled right from the start with A.J. to elevate the organization to a position of respectability in the community."

After this, Mr. Evans was interested, but he remained apprehensive about what he considered the vulnerability of the position of coordinator. He felt there was a lot of danger involved in accepting the position, and he pointed to all the serious problems A.J. had encountered. The consultant assured Mr. Evans that one big difference
between him (Mr. Evans) and A.J. was that he lived in the community and had strong support from some of the residents such as Mr. Taylor. These factors made it much harder for him to be discredited and dislodged as the group leader. In addition, the consultant pledged to work with the group, and support the group in such a way that it minimized the danger to Mr. Evans as the coordinator, and to other residents as officers and members.

After a few minutes more of discussion, when Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor decided that they would handle the suit from Kingston, the consultant began making telephone calls to trace the whereabouts of A.J. Marlow. His first call was to the ministerial school which A.J. had attended. A series of other telephone calls from there led to locating him in his hometown in Florida. Upon answering the phone, A.J.'s voice revealed that initially he was a little shocked to be hearing from someone associated with this community where he had labored for the last few years. Preliminary talk and greetings, though warm, were kept short. However, A.J. did get a chance to report that in spite of having fallen on hard times during and immediately following his termination period from Kingston, he was beginning to feel better, and to work again. He mentioned that he was in the process of organizing a group similar to Project Bootstraps there in his own hometown. The consultant explained the details of the situation involving the minority hiring discrimination suit, and A.J. was glad to know that another of the projects he had started before he was forced out of Kingston could possibly "bear fruit" after he had left. He was in agreement with the main purpose of the call, so Mr. Evans
was given the telephone, and, via long distance, the Rev. A.J. Marlow conducted the ceremony in which all rights, privileges, and powers of the office of coordinator of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps were transferred from himself to Mr. Morris K. Evans.

Mr. Taylor had been invited to stand close by to listen in, and to talk with A.J. also, so that he committed himself to becoming an active member of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps, and, at the same time, he served as a witness to the transfer-of-office ceremony.

Following the ceremony, A.J. wished the new coordinator good luck in restoring Project Bootstraps to functional status in Kingston, and in managing the minority hiring discrimination suit against the county. Meanwhile, the consultant finished shaving; then he and the two members of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps left his home intent on visiting with the president of the Centralton Chapter and meeting with the State Civil Rights Commission representative who was investigating their suit against the county.

It was decided that the Centralton Bootstraps president would be contacted later, when the two Kingston Bootstraps members and the consultant did not find him at the church where he was pastor, and could not reach him at his home by telephone. After that decision, they went to the regional office of the State Civil Rights Commission and requested to speak with the staff person who was investigating the charges of their legal suit. A few minutes passed, and the investigator, Mr. Newton Ives, invited them into his office. His first words were, "I am very surprised to see you, because I was told by Kingston county and city officials that there was no longer a Chapter
of Project Bootstraps in their area." "I wonder where they got their information," Mr. Taylor quickly said, "because here we are."

Mr. Taylor then introduced Mr. Evans as the coordinator of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps, himself as a member, and the consultant as their psychological consultant. Mr. Ives, although remaining objective in fairness to all parties concerned, was most cooperative in answering questions from the trio of Kingston Bootstraps representatives. Their questions were designed to gain relevant information about the legal suit, to determine what further responsibilities Project Bootstraps at Kingston had as the suing party, and to learn what members of Bootstraps could do to aid in winning the case.

Through discussions that resulted from questions about these, and similar issues, a lot of useful information was gathered concerning the nature of the legal suit. One important parcel of information, which confirmed Mr. Evans' memory, was that the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps had filed the same charges of minority hiring discrimination against the city. Mr. Ives said he was managing both cases, and he had begun investigating the city of Kingston also.

Another important goal that was to be accomplished by the trio was to firmly establish a connection between the State Civil Rights Commission and themselves, as the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps. Mr. Ives was given addresses and telephone numbers and asked that all communication concerning the suits be channeled to the coordinator, Mr. Evans, who represented the suing party. Mr. Ives agreed to do this, and, at the meeting's end, he gave the Kingston Bootstraps members all the pamphlets and booklets, and other general affirmative
action literature he could immediately obtain. Several copies of each item of literature were requested so that they could be made available to other Project Bootstraps members who were home in Kingston.

Following that meeting with Mr. Ives, the two Project Bootstraps members and the consultant returned to the consultant's home for a brief planning session. By this time Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor had acquired a sense of ownership in their group, and they eagerly presented a number of ideas about where to go from there. It was decided that the next step would be to call a meeting of all Project Bootstraps members in Kingston. The meeting was to be held on Friday night, the evening of the next day, and the announcement for that meeting was to be placed in the local newspaper in a section reserved for such purposes. This was short notice, but it was assumed that Project Bootstraps members would have seen the 11/11/75 newspaper article, and would be partially ready to attend an emergency meeting. By placing the announcement in the newspaper, it was also assumed that the Bootstraps members were being invited to the meeting, and, at the same time, the community and the parties sued were being told that Project Bootstraps had begun functioning again. Before meeting on the next evening, Mr. Evans was responsible for getting the announcement into the newspaper, and the consultant was responsible for contacting the Centralton Chapter Bootstraps president to brief him about the legal suit, and other activities of the Kingston Chapter of Project Bootstraps. The planning session ended with Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor preparing to rush back to Kingston in order to get there in time to post the announcement.
An Assessment of Project Bootstraps as a Community Action Group—Consultant "Mix"

Circumscribing the Assessment

At the time when the Project Bootstraps group began developing into a community action group-consultant "mix," the consultant had already worked closely with the residents and studied their community for more than a year. From this vantage point, he was in a position to informally assess the resource potential of that "mix," and make certain calculated predictions as to how effectively that "mix" could function in the immediate future. What follows, then, is the consultant's assessment of the community action group-consultant "mix," in terms of what he judged as some of the important factors of the community situation that would influence the Project Bootstraps group's actual ability to function successfully. This assessment served as the basis for the planning of activities with the Project Bootstraps community action group.

2This informal assessment of the "mix" by the consultant does not constitute a complete assessment. The "mix" is an entity that is difficult to assess completely because it is composed of three primary components (the residents, the consultant, and the given community situation), each of which is in flux within itself, and all of which are in flux in relation to each other. (See definition of the community action group-consultant "mix," in Chapter 2.) Even if the flow of the process could be "frozen" at a given point in time and suitable criteria were devised to assess the resource potential of each component, this still would not give a complete assessment of the "mix," because such would not capture the chemistry of the "mix," i.e., such would not capture that organic aspect of the combined whole which renders it different from the sum of its parts.
An Assessment of the "Mix"

With the minority hiring discrimination suits, Project Bootstraps had a catalytic issue, in ascendency, which provided the incentive around which an effective community action group could form. By the time the discrimination issue surfaced in the newspaper article on 11/11/75, the community residents' support of such an issue was well documented. On the community self-survey results, 78.2% of the community residents said that discrimination was a problem in the community, and 24.0% stated that the problem of discrimination was greatest in the area of employment. When, on the survey, the residents were asked, "What would you suggest be done in the way of resolving the problem?" 21.2% said, "Invite in outside agencies and/or initiate legal action." To the same question, an additional 13.2% of the residents said, "Organize black people in the community to act as a group." Since Project Bootstraps was a black group that was confronting the problem of discrimination in employment, and had invited in an outside agency (the State Civil Rights Commission) to assist in dealing with this problem, the survey results' figures indicated that there would be considerable support among the community residents for the Project Bootstraps group's activities.

Through the work of A.J. Marlow, Project Bootstraps had a history in the composite community of Kingston, as an activist organization. The black community associated Project Bootstraps with voter registration drives, and other of A.J.'s programs that were aimed at establishing equality for blacks. The white community's association to Project Bootstraps was best described in a local newspaper
article, "[Steadman] Center to submit report to [Confederated Charities] as [Bootstraps] issue is raised," (Powell, 1978, p. 46). In that article, the following is written:

[Bootstraps] nationally is action oriented and concerned with political and social changes which are often in conflict with and challenge the status quo in local communities.

From prior work that had been done, and the attitudes of the local community people toward Bootstraps, the Project Bootstraps group held a strong potential for establishing horizontal ties. It also held a strong potential for acquiring the power to influence decisions in the local composite community, through firming up its extracommunity ties. It could strengthen its ties with the Bootstraps Chapter at Centralton, the State Civil Rights Commission, and the national Project Bootstraps organization; and perhaps it could establish extracommunity ties with other civil rights oriented groups.

Following A.J. Marlow, who had been a leader from outside the community, Project Bootstraps had prospective local leadership in Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor, two men who could each contribute important dimensions to the group. As reported above, Mr. Evans was already in the public eye from having been the leader of Concerned Residents, and having initiated action that successfully resulted in substantial additions to Garfield School. Furthermore, Mr. Evans had personally filed an affirmative action lawsuit on behalf of himself and other blacks in the community, against a private industrial company from which he felt he had been illegally dismissed. He had the opportunity to contribute his prior knowledge about lawsuits, and learn more about legal matters, through his affiliation with Project Bootstraps.
Mr. Taylor had a similar opportunity, in that he was also interested in legal matters. He had the reputation of being the community's champion in regard to legal action, because during the late 1940's he had won a legal suit against the city, in which, according to law, the city was not to bar black children from city swimming pools.

Mr. Taylor brought another important dimension to the Project Bootstraps group, and that was respectability, by virtue of his unquestionable status as a community "insider." He was in his middle sixties, and he was the patriarch of the Taylor family, perhaps the most esteemed of the community's three prominent families. He had connections with the community self-survey project, through his son, Med Taylor, who had been a member of the Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee, and who, incidentally, had been the primary author of the survey's discrimination category.

Local leadership was a critical factor because many of the previous leaders had been persons from outside the community, and when they left, the community groups they were associated with ceased functioning. Eighty-one and one tenth percent of the community residents indicated on the survey that they believed, "...Kingston lacks black leaders really interested in improving the community," and 60.0% indicated that they had "...lost interest because so many groups had organized and died in a short time." Verbally, community residents reported that groups in their community always "just petered out." This happened because the residents of the community were provided with no training toward developing their own leadership capabilities, so they remained dependent on leaders from outside the
community to keep their groups functioning. This created a situation
in which not only did their groups "just peter out" when the leaders
from the outside left, but also, any enemy of a given group in the
black community could destroy that group by rendering its leader in-
effective or running the leader out of town, as was observed in the
case of A.J. Marlow. The implication for the Project Bootstraps
community action group was that it would be an advantage to establish
it with local leadership. Local leaders could not as easily be run
out of town, especially if the group had protective support through
affiliation with influential extracommunity organizations. It was
important for the local leaders to be trained to execute leadership
functions, so that they could continue their activities after outside
sources of leadership had left their community.

What had happened to A.J. Marlow, when he began working for social
and political changes in the community, tended to characterize how
the larger white community dealt with opposition in general. Making
a statement about the particular community of this study, Despres
(1960) writes:

...the exercise of power in situations that
involve decisions important to the community's
social order is usually lacking in some form
of public consensus; as a result, power is
often exercised coercively. The techniques
of coercion (e.g., intimidation, force, and
manipulation) are particularly observable in
those situations where some form of feeble
opposition emerges. (p. 382)

The Project Bootstraps community action group had to be calculating in
the way it embarked on social and political issues in the handling of
its minority hiring discrimination legal suits, in order not to
invite violence onto itself. The details of what had happened to A.J. Marlow, in this regard, were instructive to Project Bootstraps, in that they pointed out some of the sources from which various coercive tactics could come. The group members, and the black community in general, could expect terrorism from the Ku Klux Klan, criticism and slander from the black community junctioner, harassment from among the white citizenry, and intimidation from the white establishment, through such acts as firings or threats of firings from jobs, reduced welfare benefits, and cutbacks from social agencies. Knowing these sources in advance and identifying the various tactics associated with each, could provide an opportunity to devise ways to avoid them, or to minimize their effects.

Within the black community, some of the ways the residents often behaved were labeled as forms of apathy (Powell, 1978). One form of apathy was described as the residents' tendencies to retain "veto power" without taking active responsibility. A second form of apathy was described as the residents' tendencies to exercise critical judgment after the fact. The first type of apathy emphasized the importance of carefully establishing who was in and who was out of the Project Bootstraps community action group. Those residents who were not committed to actively participating in the group would be prevented from slowing down the group's decision making process. The second type of apathy emphasized the importance of supplying the residents with relevant information in advance of important events, and devising ways for their critical judgments to contribute to anticipating and planning.
Both the black community and the white community often behaved as if they made use of a defensive mechanism of denial. They often acted as if certain community problems simply were not there, and if they ignored the reality in these situations long enough, the problems would go away. The tendency of the black community to act as if it utilized a defensive mechanism of denial stressed the importance of Project Bootstraps not depending on open and active support from the majority of the black community residents. They had expressed their true feelings about discrimination on the survey, but they feared the white community's retaliation to any form of opposition they displayed. In addition, the community junctioner exacerbated the black residents' fears, in order to control them to the ends of the white establishment. Therefore, their expressions on the survey indicated a silent inclination to support Project Bootstraps, but openly the residents would likely deny that there was a hiring discrimination problem, or that anything important was happening. They would join in with Project Bootstraps gradually, unless something happened to inflame their feelings, as was the case during the school issue. Only if this occurred would they become more demonstrative in their support. The tendency of the white community to act as if it utilized a defensive mechanism of denial suggested a strategy that could be used by the Project Bootstraps group in handling the minority hiring discrimination legal suits. That strategy would be to present the reality of certain community problems in a way that the white community was placed in a bind, i.e., to present a problem in a way that the white community was either forced to recognize and deal with the problem,
or its lack of recognition and attempts to ignore the issue would tend to render the problem more visible. The city's lack of recognition that it too was involved in the minority hiring discrimination suit, was a likely example of a defensive denial mechanism at work.

The larger white community of Kingston was dominated by powerful interest groups to which the black community had no access. In reference to how interest groups can dominate a local community through informal access to each other, Warren (1972) writes:

...numerous studies indicate that a large share of decision-making takes place informally among leadership groups who then implement their decisions through the community's formal organizational structure... (p. 291)

In reference to how interest groups dominated the local community of this study, Despres (1960) writes:

...the power structure...divides individuals into different and relatively independent interest groups. These interest groups, because they are primarily upper class interest groups, seldom compete with one another in such a way as to alter their position in the power structure. Furthermore, these interest groups are relatively inaccessible to members of the middle and lower classes.... (p. 381)

These powerful interest groups in Kingston included representatives of the community's primary employers, and the ethos of their attitudes toward the hiring of blacks pervaded the entire community. Industrial corporations in the community, some of which had extra-community ties with their national parent companies, were a part of, or were influenced by, the local network of interest groups. The attitude of these interest groups toward the employment of blacks
was reported by Despres (1960) who writes:

...a high official in the Chamber of Commerce, stated quite emphatically that [Kingston] did not welcome any industry which employed or would employ negroes. (p. 124)

This attitude against the employment of blacks filtered down from the controlling interest groups into every facet of the community. Throughout the entire city and county of Kingston, it was conspicuous to an observer that few blacks were employed in any kind of jobs. Not only was it the case that no blacks were observed working in managerial or white collar positions, such as at executive or secretarial levels, but blacks were also not observed working as clerks in stores, or as waiters and waitresses in restaurants. Neither were there any blacks seen on the crews of federally sponsored building and construction projects. Except for the presence of black consumers, a walk through the downtown area could easily give a mistaken impression that no blacks lived anywhere in the composite community. Many of the blacks who lived in Kingston were employed in other communities, such as Centralton, where they found employment open to them that was more appropriate to their skills. Because of discrimination, Kingston had few jobs that were open to blacks, and most of those were minimal skill level jobs, such as that of janitor. To the survey question, "Are you working at present?" 45.1% of the black community residents answered "No." Of those residents who were not working 41.7% were actively seeking jobs, through filing applications and other means. Of those residents who were employed, and were dissatisfied with their jobs, 55.0% felt they were qualified for better
positions. Of the total number of black community residents, 32.3% worked in unskilled, semi-skilled or skilled blue collar positions; 14.3% worked in white collar clerical or sales positions; and 3.8% worked in professional or managerial positions.

Although the Project Bootstraps group had neither informal nor formal access to the larger white community's powerful interest groups, it could possibly influence some of the decisions of these interest groups through its minority hiring discrimination suits against the city and county. The city and county governmental structures were visible organs of the interest groups and their policies about hiring blacks reflected the attitudes of these interest groups and the rest of the community. If Project Bootstraps were effective in getting the city and county governmental units to conform to the law with regard to black hiring, then, perhaps indirectly, they could influence the decisions of the interest groups in a way that more jobs and new job opportunities opened up for blacks in Kingston. That is to say, if Project Bootstraps won the minority hiring discrimination suits against the city and county, then more jobs could become available to blacks from local industries, businesses, utility companies, and similar sources other than just the city and county. Through the suits, Project Bootstraps could seek to become a group from the black community that represented black community concerns to the city and county governmental structures, with the expectation of also influencing the network of interest groups, in which the power of the larger white community was concentrated.
Project Bootstraps had a limited amount of time in which to make an impact on the community, because, as announced in the 11/11/75 newspaper article, the State Civil Rights Commission, by law, had only two more months jurisdiction over the legal suits, and that jurisdiction ended on 1/16/76. This problem of limited time was compounded by another problem that was of equal concern, and that was the season of the year. The two months during which Project Bootstraps had to make a substantial impact included both the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. In reference to problems encountered by politicians during this season, Apple (1975) writes:

A difficult month, this [December], for capturing the attention of the electorate; the most elaborate campaign stratagems are puny competition for holiday conviviality. (p. E2)

Unless the members worked rapidly and timed their projects well, the activities of Project Bootstraps would likewise be "puny competition for holiday conviviality." However, Project Bootstraps did have the active participation of the consultant, who had had the experience of working with community residents under a quickened pace during the last week or two of completing the survey, and perhaps the season of the year could be used to some advantage.

At this phase of the community self-survey project, the consultant was free to actively participate with Project Bootstraps as part of a community action group-consultant "mix." During his initial entry into the community, he rejected association with Project Bootstraps or any other group that the majority of the community residents regarded as too radical. That was done to minimize the residents'
fears, and encourage their participation in the community self-survey project. During the preparation and administration of the survey, and the ensuing action steps, the consultant followed residents' leads in the choice of activities to pursue, and also in the planning of these activities. At this latter phase of the project, leads emerged from former members of Project Bootstraps, which embodied an important concern of the majority of the residents, as they indicated on their community self-survey. The consultant's initial set against association with Project Bootstraps was to be broken, leaving him free to work actively with this group in the interest of an important concern of the whole community.

Considering the above factors, the assessment of Project Bootstraps as a community action group-consultant "mix" was favorable. A written report of further activities of this "mix" is organized and presented in four stages. Stage one begins in the next section of this chapter.

STAGE ONE

Reorganizing the Project Bootstraps Group and
Establishing it with Vertical (Extracommunity) Ties

At the 11/14/75 emergency meeting of Project Bootstraps only Mr. Evans and his wife, Mrs. Yvonne Evans, Mr. Taylor, and the consultant showed up. Before the meeting, Mr. Evans had gotten the announcement into the newspaper, and the consultant had phoned the Centralton Chapter Project Bootstraps president's home to brief him about the Kingston group's activities, but learned that he was out of
the city for a few days. After waiting for nearly an hour for more members to come to the 11/14/75 meeting, Mr. Evans, Mr. Taylor, and the consultant laughed at themselves for assuming that the community residents would not initially respond apathetically to this issue, and would come out to the meeting in large numbers. The laughter did not last long though, as, with an expression of urgency in his voice, Mr. Evans said, "We've put ourselves out there on the line now, buddy, so we've got to do something. We can't turn back now." Mr. Evans' statement brought on a long period of silence as it became apparent that a lot more work had to be done if the Project Bootstraps group were to become functional again in Kingston. The consultant responded to Mr. Evans' expressed concern by saying that he would conduct a brief membership survey of all former Kingston Bootstraps members, and, in the process, make personal contact with each of them in an attempt to stimulate interest in restoring the group. That idea was met with approval, so the rest of the meeting was a "brain storming" session, in which the three members present gave the consultant as much information, and as many names, as they could recall, of community residents who had been members of Project Bootstraps under A.J. Marlow's leadership.

Beginning with the list of names the three members had given him, the consultant proceeded to interview former Project Bootstraps members in the same way he had interviewed community residents during the entry phase of the project. Other names, and sources of names, such as old programs, etc., were collected from each interviewee, until all former members were identified and interviewed. The purpose
of the membership survey and interview with the former Project Bootstraps members was to collect some important information from them, to present some important information to them, and to encourage them to actively participate in the Project Bootstraps group. The information collected attempted to determine definitely who was in, and who was out of the group, in order to combat against the first form of apathy, i.e., so that only those who were definitely in the group would be considered in the group's decision-making process, or would in any way represent the group to the public. It was also convenient to determine, right from the start, the level at which members wished, or had the time, to function, how they preferred to receive information, what they considered a good time to meet, and where they wished to meet, since the Steadman Community Center had been made unavailable for Project Bootstraps activities. (The results of the membership survey appear on the following page.) The information presented to the former Project Bootstraps members was about the minority hiring discrimination legal suits, and about Mr. Evans having been appointed coordinator.

Toward encouraging the former members to actively participate in the Project Bootstraps group, A.J. Marlow's influence was used. At that time, the consultant did not personally know all of the former Project Bootstraps members, and, in general, the community residency had been cool toward him, but their feelings about A.J. Marlow were very much alive. In addition to genuinely liking A.J. Marlow, the residents seemed to feel guilty about his having been forced out of their community. They felt he had worked hard to help them improve
Project Bootsrap Membership Survey

1. Are you interested in continuing to work with Bootsrap this year, 1975-76?
   Yes 15
   No 2
   Undecided 1

2. (If yes to 1) you would like to be
   An Executive Committee Member 4
   A Regular Member 4
   An Auxiliary Member 7
   Other 0

3. You would prefer to receive information (more than one choice permitted)
   By attending meetings 3
   By phone 4
   By letter 1
   By word of mouth 6
   By newspaper 4
   Other 0

4. Where do you think is a good place for the group to meet?
   Private homes 8
   Garfield Elementary School 1
   Steadman Center 1
   St. John's Church 1
   Churches 1
   Kingston City College 1
   Office space on Vermont Rd. 1
   Don't know 1

5. What days (evenings) are best for you to meet?
   M, T, W, TH, F, S, S 5
   M, T, W, TH 1
   M, T, TH, F 1
   M, W, TH 1
   M, W 1
   M, TH, SUN 1
   No good time 1

*(Nine members of Kingston Bootsrap have moved to other cities and were not surveyed.)*

**Guidelines for Levels of Membership**

1) The Executive Committee Members are expected to attend all meetings and make emergency decisions that reflect thoughts and feelings of the entire membership.

2) The Regular Members are expected to attend all meetings and participate actively in all major decisions.

3) The Auxiliary Members are not expected to attend all meetings, but are expected to stand in advisement to the Executive Committee and Regular Members and participate actively in major decisions to the extent that time and circumstances permit.
their community, but at the very time when he needed their support the most, they had turned their backs on him. (Even the community junctioner displayed a twinge of guilt once, when, during that time, the consultant visited his grocery store. Apparently with genuine remorse, he said, "I wish that boy, Marlow, had done right and stayed around here a little longer," but he couldn't continue with his expressions of these feelings for wanting to get a message over to the consultant, so he quickly followed that statement by saying, "but he wanted to run the community, Doc.... Anybody who comes here has to realize that I run this community.") During the interviews with the former Project Bootstraps members, the consultant endeavored to facilitate a transfer of their feelings for A.J. Marlow over to the activity of restoring the Project Bootstraps group, and to working for the equal employment cause A.J. had initiated. Before the interviews, the consultant made another long distance telephone call to A.J., in which he brought him up to date on what was happening, and requested that he block off some time when interested residents from the community could phone him. During the interviews, the issues regarding the legal suits, and restoring Project Bootstraps under Mr. Evans' leadership as coordinator, were introduced as having A.J.'s full approval, and the consultant offered to pay the charge for any former members who wished to phone A.J., either to discuss these issues, or just to chat. Everyone contacted was quite happy to hear news of A.J. The interviews were completed on 11/17/75, with only one former member of Project Bootstraps, Mr. Lawrence Carlisle, raising any serious objections.
Mr. Carlisle was 28 years old, and he was characterized by his intelligence, his curiosity, and his social grace. He was one of the local community residents A.J. Marlow had invited to sit in with himself and the consultant as the entry phase of the community self-survey project began. Mr. Carlisle had been highly recommended to become a survey group member, but his commuting several miles daily to his place of work and his supporting his wife and three children adversely affected his available time and his schedule. One factor involved in his not becoming a survey group member was his missing the appointment when his membership was to be discussed. Nevertheless, he remained in touch with the project, and was of assistance to the consultant and the survey group on several different occasions. When the consultant visited Mr. Carlisle to discuss matters concerning Project Bootstraps, he was visiting one of the local community residents with whom he was most familiar.

Unlike most of the other former members of Project Bootstraps who had been interviewed, Mr. Carlisle wanted to know all the details about decisions regarding the group, and he was particularly interested in knowing how Mr. Evans had become coordinator. The consultant was straightforward in his responses to Mr. Carlisle, and did not avoid accepting full responsibility for the extent of his involvement in the group. He said Mr. Evans and Mr. Taylor had invited him to participate in the group in connection with the legal suits, and he had made suggestions he thought were in the best interest of quickly restoring Project Bootstraps, and managing the suits effectively. The consultant went on to reiterate why he thought Mr. Evans was a
good choice as coordinator, and pointed out that neither he (Mr. Carlisle) nor any other former members of Project Bootstraps had responded to the 11/11/75 newspaper article about the suits, or to the 11/14/75 emergency meeting announcement. At the least, Mr. Evans, Mr. Taylor and the consultant had "started the ball rolling."

Mr. Carlisle agreed that it was in the best interest of all concerned that constructive work on the matter had already begun, but then he inquired about future plans, and pointed out that he had been the chairman of Project Bootstraps when A.J. was in the community. The consultant responded by saying that future plans would be made up as they go along, with everyone involved contributing to the plans, and he would remain in his position as chairman of Project Bootstraps. This pleased Mr. Carlisle, because he wanted to be involved, but he seemed hesitant, as if something were still bothering him. Intuitively, the consultant asked, "Is there some kind of personal friction between you and Mr. Evans?" and Mr. Carlisle's reply was "Yes." The consultant then said that since he and Mr. Evans would be co-leaders of Project Bootstraps, it might be a good idea for them to get together and talk out their differences, with the consultant present as a neutral observer. Mr. Carlisle agreed to such a meeting, and later that day, the consultant approached Mr. Evans with the idea. Mr. Evans also agreed, so the meeting was set for the evening of 11/19/75. In general, Mr. Carlisle's behavior had not been disconcerting to the consultant. To the contrary, his reactions were viewed as a display of ownership in Project Bootstraps, and his scheduled meeting with Mr. Evans held the potential
for deepening his level of participation in the group.

The atmosphere of the first part of the meeting between Mr. Evans and Mr. Carlisle was tense, as initially both men approached each other cautiously. While they avoided dealing directly with the source of their personal conflict, they were able to open up and talk freely about the common bond they shared through past association with Project Bootstraps. The current status of the group and the nature of the legal suits were thoroughly discussed. At one point during their meeting, Mr. Evans presented some affirmative action literature that he had collected over a long period of time, and from it he read passages showing that Project Bootstraps was legally in a good position to win the suits.

Mr. Carlisle was impressed with Mr. Evans' display, and he began expressing some ideas as to what he thought Project Bootstraps could do, but his statements always seemed to reflect a concern for not making further plans until the rest of the membership could contribute to them. (Mr. Carlisle mentioned also that Project Bootstraps had other important functions it was supposed to perform in the community, and the purpose of the organization was not just to manage the legal suits.) Based on these and similar observations, the consultant suggested to the co-leaders that they could divide the leadership responsibilities in such a way that each leader functioned in his area of interest or concern. That is to say, that Mr. Evans could be primarily responsible for handling functions related to the legal suits, and Mr. Carlisle could be primarily responsible for handling functions related to the membership. Both leaders liked that
suggestion and they shook hands to seal an agreement to cooperate in providing local leadership for Project Bootstraps.

Their meeting had lasted for nearly two hours, and, at its end, the consultant requested that they both sign letters to be mailed out to the rest of the members. The letters were a followup to the membership survey and interviews, and invited the members to attend the next meeting of Project Bootstraps, which was scheduled for 11/21/75. (The two leaders were also requested to sign letters to the State Civil Rights Commission investigator, and the Centralton Chapter Project Bootstraps president, which contained information from the membership survey about the composition of the Kingston Chapter Project Bootstraps group.)

Although the two leaders were in agreement at the end of their meeting, and they were excited about the prospects of Project Bootstraps, the consultant would continue to closely observe their interactions with each other. In discussing new settings which grow out of existing ones, Sarason (1972) writes:

...the before-the-beginning period contains organizational dynamics which tend to work against rather than for the new setting in the sense that its heritage is marked by conflict, real or potential. (p. 30)

The meeting between Mr. Evans and Mr. Carlisle had facilitated their agreeing to work together as co-leaders in a new setting, but it was important that their personal conflict, "before-the-beginning," was monitored, so that it did not reemerge and work against their cooperating in achieving the goals of the group.
The membership survey results indicated that 15 former members of Project Bootstraps were interested in becoming active members again, and 8 of those 15 (3 women and 5 men) were present at the 11/21/75 meeting. (See Table 5, Appendix B, on page 197 for more information about Project Bootstraps membership.) Before the meeting formally opened, those members present chatted amiably among themselves, as some had not seen others in several months. When the meeting was formally opened, the consultant gave each of the members a folder which was to serve for orientation purposes, and to initiate a procedure through which active members would be kept informed. The folder contained the following:

(1) the membership survey results
(2) a list of names, addresses and phone numbers of all local active members of Project Bootstraps
(3) general affirmative action literature
(4) a copy of the 11/11/75 newspaper article about the Project Bootstraps legal suit
(5) numerical summaries comparing black and white employment figures in the city and county
(6) the community self-survey results
(7) information about the national Bootstraps organization
(8) information sheets with names, addresses, and phone numbers of resource persons
(9) copies of letters written to the State Civil Rights Commission Investigator, and the Centralton Bootstraps president by the coordinator and the chairman

The members leafed through their folders, and most of their meeting time that evening was spent raising questions about the legal suits, and attending to the organization of their group. Mr. Evans
and Mr. Taylor gave a report on their conference with the State Civil Rights Commission investigator, but some of the members felt they wanted still more information, so they asked the consultant to contact the SCRC investigator, and see if he would come to Kingston and talk with the entire Project Bootstraps membership. As to officers, in addition to coordinator and chairman, the members decided to select only two--secretary and treasurer. The general organization of the group was patterned after the levels of membership delineated on the membership survey. Those levels divided membership into three categories: executive committee members, regular members, and auxiliary members (see page 88). The resignation of one member from the executive committee left only Mr. Evans, Mr. Carlisle, and Mr. Taylor functioning at the executive level.

Before formally closing their meeting, the group members decided to follow a suggestion from the consultant to place an article in the local newspaper. That item was to be discussed specifically during their next meeting, which would be held following the Thanksgiving holidays. Also, the group's chairman, Mr. Carlisle, and the consultant were to check on the local members' status with the national Project Bootstraps organization. The members' status was a concern of the consultant's about which no one present seemed to have any clarity.

Following the 11/21/75 meeting, the consultant secured an appointment with the State Civil Rights Commission investigator. The purpose of this conference was to discuss the members' request for him to visit one of their meetings, and to use him as a resource
person in connection with the tentative plans to place an article in the local newspaper. The SCRC investigator said he was not at liberty to make an official visit in which he represented the agency, but that he would gladly come to talk with the group informally on his own time. Then the consultant asked if it would damage the Project Bootstraps group's case to place an article in the local newspaper, and, if not, were there any guidelines they should follow in order to be consistent with policies of the State Civil Rights Commission. The investigator thought there would be nothing wrong with Project Bootstraps placing an article in the local newspaper, and the State Civil Rights Commission had no official guidelines for such, but he would personally suggest that the article stick close to the facts, and that it not be slanderous. The investigator was thanked for that information, and after the consultant checked back and forth with the members, he was scheduled to visit with the group on the evening of 12/3/75.

The consultant then phoned the Centralton Bootstraps Chapter president. He had returned from his out of town trip, and he had already received the correspondence from Mr. Evans and Mr. Carlisle. Before the consultant got very far into discussing the situation, the Centralton Bootstraps president insisted that he would visit with the Project Bootstraps group in Kingston. This was a surprise because he had never visited, nor displayed any particular interest in, the Kingston group before. It appeared that he was suspicious of the Kingston group's activities involving the legal suits, and that he was visiting to exercise his authority, and level controls on
the group. Regardless of his motivation, however, his actual visit to Kingston could be used to elevate the self-esteem of the Kingston Bootstraps members. The consultant told him he was sure the members would be delighted with his visit, and that he would contact the members about the choice of times he had proposed, then phone him back with specific information.

Meanwhile, Mr. Carlisle and the consultant found the former treasurer's records, and learned that an associate member of the group, who commuted from Centralton, had not submitted the membership fees for the current year. They found two or three personal checks bearing the signatures of former members which were earmarked for membership purposes, but they were dated for nearly a year earlier. None of the local members were currently active with the national Project Bootstraps organization. After discovering this information, it was decided that one use of the Centralton Bootstraps president's visit certainly would be to firm up the local group's membership status with the national Project Bootstraps organization. After contacting all members and asking them to bring their membership dues, the Centralton Bootstraps president was called back and asked to bring membership applications and his receipt book with him when he visited Kingston. His visit with the group was set for 12/1/75.

When the Centralton Bootstraps president visited the Kingston Bootstraps group, his presentation was woven into the meeting agenda, but placed near the beginning of the meeting, since he had said in advance that he would have to leave early to keep another appointment. He had an opportunity to observe the organized way in which the group
was conducting its business, and none of the suspiciousness he seemed to display over the telephone surfaced in the meeting. He was given money, for which he gave back receipts for eight fully paid memberships to the national Project Bootstraps organization, and he was responded to as a resource person. He clarified the nature of the Kingston Bootstraps group's auxiliary status with the Centralton Bootstraps Chapter, and gave the group some useful information about the national Bootstraps organization. Concerning the legal suits, he recommended a lawyer in Centralton with whom the Kingston group could consult. He said this lawyer had worked closely with the Centralton Bootstraps Chapter on a similar legal project. After spending an hour, the Centralton Bootstraps president politely left the meeting. That was the last personal contact any of the Kingston Bootstraps members had with the Centralton Bootstraps president, but his visit had been extremely helpful in terms of the members' enhanced self-esteem, in terms of the useful information he had given the group, and because of his prompt submission of the membership applications. The Kingston Bootstraps members received their membership cards from the national Project Bootstraps organization two weeks after the Centralton Chapter president's visit.

On the evening of 12/3/75, the State Civil Rights Commission investigator, Mr. Newton Ives, met with the group as scheduled. The group briefly conducted its business, in order for the members to have more time to talk with their guest about the legal suits. They asked Mr. Ives several questions, and he seemed to enjoy his interactions with the members, as he talked about affirmative action
issues. He shared a great deal of useful information with the group. He told them that when such suits as theirs were filed with the State Civil Rights Commission, usually the suing party filed charges also with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which is a federal organization. He reminded the members that this had not been done in their case, and he suggested that they could file their suits with EEOC if they chose.

All except the first of the four emergency meetings of Project Bootstraps had been held at Mr. Taylor's home. During the business portion of this last meeting, before the discussion with Mr. Ives began, it was decided that regular meetings in the future would rotate to the homes of different members, and would be held on the first Monday evening of each month. Previously, letters had been sent to all Project Bootstraps members stating what had been done between meetings and announcing the next meeting. It was decided that henceforth an announcement would be mailed to members as usual, but it would state only the place, date, and time of the next meeting.

The Kingston Project Bootstraps group members were obviously impressed with the visits they had from distinguished persons, but more importantly, their group had been restored and reorganized, and it had been firmly established with influential extracommunity ties. The Kingston Bootstraps members were residents who were no longer acting alone in the community. They had acquired additional power to influence decisions through their affiliation with the power of a state, and a national, organization. By association, they shared in
the actual power of those organizations to influence local decisions (such as in requiring conformity to the law), and they acquired a psychological kind of power which came from the way those organizations were perceived by the community. The way those organizations were perceived could act to deter the larger community from using coercive tactics against Project Bootstraps members for raising opposition to the status quo.

The next section of this paper deals with the Project Bootstraps group establishing horizontal ties in the community.

STAGE TWO

Establishing the Project Bootstraps Group with Horizontal (Intracommunity) Ties

After the Centralton Bootstraps Chapter president left the 12/1/75 meeting, the Kingston Bootstraps members were briefed concerning getting an article printed in the local newspaper. All members of the group were invited to sit in and contribute, but only the executive committee members, who would actually talk with a newspaper reporter, stayed for the session.

The newspaper article was to serve several purposes. The main message of the article was to inform the community that Project Bootstraps filed the same charge of minority hiring discrimination against the city of Kingston, as had earlier been reported as filed against the county. This message was a newsworthy item that the newspaper establishment would likely print, and it was intended to catch city officials off-guard, by publicizing the legal suit at a
time when they were unprepared to deal with it. City officials were vulnerable to the minority hiring discrimination suit because the city employed few minorities, because they thought the opposition—Project Bootstraps—had been crushed, and because they had not hired a lawyer. When faced with the charges, they were likely to respond in the way that they usually dealt with such issues, and that was by denying the problem existed. In general, denial of certain problems worked effectively, because it was a "mechanism" operating in that system in which everyone was interlocked. The black community was intermeshed with the white community in a way that the denial mechanism effectively obscured their perception of certain problems and resigned them to accepting the status quo. It is similar to the situation of a young adult who cannot consciously identify certain oedipal problems because he is immersed in his family system. If the city officials were to use this characteristic denial style when confronted with an agency from outside their system, and in dealing with a technical legal matter, then, without the services of a lawyer, they could commit some serious tactical errors.

In addition to the message about the suit against the city, the newspaper article itself was to inform the black community, and the white community (especially the parties sued) that the local chapter of Project Bootstraps was restored to functional status, and to identify its new leaders. These local leaders were filling the leadership vacuum that was created when A.J. Marlow was forced out of the community, by establishing their claim as the suing party. If the newspaper article were printed, then the black community would
know to whom they were to direct any information they had that was relevant to the legal suits, and the white community, especially the parties sued, would know with whom they were to negotiate.

The timing of the newspaper article had to be balanced between two major holidays. The State Civil Rights Commission had to make a judgment on the suits by mid-January. Therefore, the article had to appear in the newspaper close after Thanksgiving, so that it had an impact on the important targets of its message before the Christmas rush began, and carried over into January. But there was a good chance that the newspaper article would result in the use of coercive tactics against Project Bootstraps members. Therefore, it had to be printed in the newspaper close enough to Christmas so that the hostilities of relatively unorganized groups and individuals, who would be inclined to coerce the Project Bootstraps members, would be dissipated in "holiday conviviality."

The purpose of the briefing session was to work against the second form of apathy (judgment after the fact), and assist in bringing the group members to pool their good judgments in planning, at a point in time before they negotiated getting the article into the newspaper. Before the briefing session, the consultant held discussions with the executive committee members, and it was determined that all of them would contribute to the article's content by each making one relevant statement. During the briefing, they were given guidelines for answering the news reporter's questions, and drilled on keeping their answers within the area of minority hiring discrimination, rather than using this opportunity as a platform from
which to air various other grievances about the community. (A copy of the item used in the briefing session appears on page 111.) Also, during the briefing, it was decided that the consultant would not accompany the Bootstraps executive committee members when they negotiated getting the article into the newspaper. This was part of their training, and it was an important step in their establishing themselves, rather than the consultant, as the local leaders of the group. Too, it was decided that they would contact the same reporter who had written the 11/11/75 article. That particular reporter had done a creditable job, and also had some history of the situation to draw upon in rounding out a newspaper report on the subject from the Project Bootstraps point of view. They were to contact the news reporter on the following day, 12/2/75.

Just following the briefing session, Mr. Carlisle asked the consultant to stop by his home for a few minutes that evening. He did so, and during the conversation on that occasion, Mr. Carlisle told the consultant he was an ex-felon. It was assumed that he offered this information at that time because he was to represent Project Bootstraps at the news conference on the following day, and he was concerned as to whether or not his status as an ex-felon was a factor to be considered. The consultant assured Mr. Carlisle that his participation in the news conference was of critical importance, and this information was not a factor which should in any way alter his role in the group.

(By this time in the project, the consultant was familiar enough with certain residents to be able to address them by their nicknames.
These were the names these residents were referred to as a matter of course by their peers in the community. Mr. Evans was known as "Rhino," Mr. Carlisle was known as "Monk," and Mr. Taylor was known as "Stag."

At 1:30 A.M., early in the morning of the day following 12/2/75, when Mr. Evans got off from work, the consultant dropped by his home to see how the news conference had gone. The consultant was quite expectant, because this was one of the first projects the new Project Bootstraps leaders had done without him. His enthusiasm, however, was met with a disturbing silence. The consultant finally asked, "How did everything go, Rhino?" and Mr. Evans said, "Okay." Then he gave a few encouraging statements about the content of the conference. Following those statements, the consultant asked, "Was Monk there?" and Mr. Evans said, "Yes," but volunteered no further information. Waiting just a few seconds, but feeling quite assured, the consultant then asked, "Was Stag Taylor there?" and Mr. Evans said, "No." "Stag Taylor wasn't there! Well, did you and Monk tell the news reporter that Stag was one of the leaders, and did you give her Stag's statement?" and Mr. Evans' reply was "No." This information, the fact that Mr. Taylor had not participated in the news conference, precipitated one of the deepest felt crises of the entire community project. The next two and a half hours found Mr. Evans, his wife, and the consultant engaged in an intense discussion about how to respond to this event.

A lot of the tension was produced because Mr. Evans and the consultant differed on how they thought the situation should be
handled, and that was further compounded because it was late at night and some resolution between them had to be reached by morning. The consultant asked whether or not it would be appropriate if they visited or phoned Mr. Taylor to discuss the situation with him, since it was an emergency. Mr. Evans thought that would be inappropriate, since it was late at night, and especially since Mr. Taylor wasn't feeling well. The consultant then suggested that they contact Mr. Taylor early the next morning, and ask him to go down to the newspaper office and give his statement to the reporter who was writing their article. At that time he could indicate that he had not appeared the day before because he was sick. Mr. Evans thought this was a poor solution, because it was handling the matter in a shoddy way, and the group was certain to lose face over it. He thought it reflected a lack of organization and would damage the good image the group had worked so hard to build. Mr. Evans then adamantly stated that the situation should be left just as it was, with Stag Taylor's name not included in this news article, but included in some future article. The consultant said that the first news article about the new leaders of Project Bootstraps would likely be the one which made the most sustained impression on the community. If Stag Taylor's name were not included in this article, then there would be no convenient opportunity later to let the public know that he was one of the leaders. The dialogue was charged, but it kept going back and forth, and during that process, the consultant was able to make his concerns clear. Primarily they were that the Project Bootstraps group would lose a great deal of its potential, and it was
considerably more vulnerable, if Stag Taylor were not identified as one of the group's leaders.

Stag was the leader of the Taylor family, which had lived in the community since 1883. In his family's history there were several members who had distinguished themselves, and won the respect of both the black community, and the white community, for their display of civic interest and financial acumen. Stag Taylor and many of his current relatives kept the tradition of his family predecessors alive, and he was known throughout the larger community for his active involvement as a prime mover in church, business, civic and social organizations, and other community affairs. The Taylor family was a very large, and a very cohesive family, and through intermarriage with other families, they had ties with most of the black community residents.

To identify Stag Taylor as one of the leaders of Project Bootstraps was to acquire tacit support for the group from a large number of black community residents. This included those residents who were in or connected with his family, as well as others who identified with his civic work. He provided a link between Project Bootstraps and other important community organizations, and his affiliation with Project Bootstraps broadened the group so that its activities represented concerns of the black well-to-do, and the black middle class, as well as the black working class. Not to identify Stag Taylor as one of the leaders of Project Bootstraps was to lose a lot of the group's potential for attracting a broad base of support, and it was to render the group susceptible to criticism and slander from the
community junctioner, and to increase the likelihood of coercion from the white community.

This group, as when A.J. was its leader, threatened both the white establishment and the community junctioner's status in the black community, so it was not unreasonable to anticipate that another black-white collusion could form to discredit and intimidate the new leaders. The community junctioner would certainly assert to the black community, and the white community as well, that Project Bootstraps was led by "known troublemakers," i.e., one of their leaders had had trouble with the police and the other was an ex-felon. He would say that no one was to listen to them and their claims were to be dismissed. Mr. Evans and Mr. Carlisle were quite capable of actually providing good leadership for the group, but the junctioner's slander would be effective against them, as it was against A.J. Marlow, if Stag Taylor were not identified as one of the Project Bootstraps leaders. If Stag Taylor were identified as one of the leaders, then the junctioner would be placed in a bind when he attempted to criticize and slander the Project Bootstraps leadership. Stag Taylor was the junctioner's peer and personal friend. In slandering the other two leaders, he would be tending also to slander a peer, and a friend, and a man who was as powerful and as respected in the community as himself. Including Stag Taylor's name in the newspaper article as one of the leaders would at least delay the junctioner's effectiveness. As with the junctioner, the white establishment also was placed in a bind; likewise, it was probably less inclined to use coercive tactics against the group when one of the Project Bootstraps
leaders was a financially autonomous and respected citizen, who met all the criteria for upper-middle class membership.

These issues were discussed back and forth between Mr. Evans and his wife and the consultant until a solution was arrived at which was satisfactory to all. The solution was for the consultant to write out the statement Stag Taylor would have made at the news conference had he been there, but attribute the statement to the entire Project Bootstraps executive committee of Morris Evans, Lawrence Carlisle, and Fred (Stag) Taylor. Then Mr. Evans would submit this to the newspaper reporter as an additional statement about the issue on behalf of the entire executive committee. This Mr. Evans was willing to do, because Mr. Taylor had already agreed earlier to make that statement, and it did not require contacting him again. Further, it assured that Mr. Taylor would be identified in the newspaper article as one of the Project Bootstraps leaders. The consultant was to return from Centralton to Kingston with the statement already prepared, and drive Mr. Evans to the newspaper office by the time it opened at 8:00 A.M. on 12/3/75. After Mr. Evans had conducted his business with the reporter, the consultant was to drive him back to begin his job that morning at 8:30 A.M.

The newspaper reporter was in the office when Mr. Evans got there, so the schedule and the plan went smoothly. Later that day the article appeared in the newspaper on the front page, and it identified each of the Project Bootstraps executive committee members equally as co-leaders. Also, the newspaper reporter had done some investigative work, and broadened the article with additional
relevant information. (See "Hiring practices hit: City also faces Bootstraps discrimination charges," on page 110 below.)

The description above, of how a creative solution was arrived at through dialogue between residents and the consultant, is one example of the way both contribute to the community action group-consultant "mix." Another such example may be seen in a comparison between the briefing item (page 111) and the newspaper article (page 110). The briefing item is primarily the work of the consultant, and the newspaper article is primarily the work of the residents. It may be observed that the newspaper article, while reflecting the consultant's contribution, goes further in introducing important new information. The article introduced the idea of meeting stringent job qualifications with "on the job training." This information, which the residents brought to the situation spontaneously, tended to counteract one of the specious arguments used most by establishment employers against minorities. The argument is, "We can find no qualified minority applicants." A solution to the "problem" of "no qualified minority applicants" is offered by "on the job training." This comparison is an example of how the combined functioning of the "mix" exceeds the separate functioning of its several parts.

The Project Bootstraps leaders and members were quite excited about their article in the newspaper and the black community's reaction to it, but their celebration was short-lived because of a terrorist incident that occurred during the early morning of the next day. Mr. Evans reported that on 12/4/75 around 2:30 A.M., a car load of white citizens stopped in the street in front of his house, and
City also faces Bootstraps discrimination charges

Representatives of the Kingston, Chapter of Bootstraps revealed today that the same allegations of hiring discrimination, which were filed against Kingston County, were also filed against the City of Kingston.

In a statement to The Tribune, Lawrence Catlett, chairman of the Executive Committee of Bootstraps, said, "Our charges are that the hiring practices of the city and county of Kingston discriminate against blacks. Both charges were filed Jan. 14, 1973."

The charges against the county came to light in early November when an investigator for the New York Civil Rights Commission, Newton J. Zene, began his personal investigation of the county.

It was learned today that Zene contacted city offices and met with City Manager Douglas Arley regarding the charges on Oct. 10. The contact was made by Arley.

Zene contacted the City Manager on Oct. 10.

"We were unable to reach the City Manager, but we did talk to some of the employees," Arley said.

The charges against the city were filed in October, but the investigation did not begin until November.

Zene said he has found "probable cause of discrimination" in city government and will recommend to the Civil Rights Commission that action be taken to reach a "voluntary agreement to bring the city into compliance with the law."

Zene said he has discussed with Arley the problems uncovered in his investigation. He indicated action by the commission could be expected during the Dec. 9 meeting.

Responding to Zene's statements, Arley said he was amazed at the information. Throughout the investigation, Zene has led me to believe what we said in our charges of hiring discrimination to be true, and we are going to let the New York Civil Rights Commission and the courts decide the issue.

According to regulations governing civil rights actions, legal suit can be initiated if efforts for conciliatory agreement cannot be reached. However, the commission must act on charges within one year of filing.
I. OBJECTIVES TO BE ACCOMPLISHED:

1. To make a statement within reasonable time following the
   (11/11/75) Kingston Tribune article that announced the
   Bootstraps hiring discrimination charges against the city
   and county, and to beat the Christmas rush.

2. To let the city and county know that Bootstraps currently
   exists.

3. To apply some pressure on the city and county to produce,
   and lay claim to representing Bootstraps in any future nego-
   tiations on Affirmative Action, etc.

4. To avoid antagonizing the city or county into a fight with
   Bootstraps, so that all of their business, and all of Boot-
   straps' business is with a third party, namely the State
   Civil Rights Commission.

5. To attract the support of black people (and white people)
   in the community.

II. STATEMENTS THAT WILL ACCOMPLISH THE OBJECTIVES:

1. (I am Morris K. Evans, coordinator of Bootstraps, Kingston)
   "I am referring to this article that appeared in the Kingston
   Tribune on November 11, 1975. The same charges of hiring
   discrimination filed with SCRC against the county of
   Kingston, were also filed against the city of Kingston."

2. (I am Lawrence Carlisle, Chairman of the Executive Committee
   of Bootstraps, Kingston)
   "Our charges are that the hiring practices of the city and
   county of Kingston discriminate against blacks."

3. (I am Fred Stag Taylor, an officer on the Executive
   Committee of Bootstraps, Kingston)
   "We would like to see more of our local people, black and
   white, hired by the city and county.... We believe our
   charges to be true and we are going to let the SCRC and
   the courts decide the issue."

III. GUIDELINES TO SAFEGUARD ACCOMPLISHING OBJECTIVES WHEN TALKING
     WITH THE NEWS REPORTER:

In order to meet our objectives and not damage our legal cases,
it would be better not to risk using words that are highly
charged and tend to be slanderous. As an example, the word
"racism" is more inflammatory, and has less legal implications
associated with it, than the word "discrimination." Rather
than to say, "The hiring practices of the city and county are
racist," it would be better to say, "The hiring practices of
the city and county discriminate against blacks."

Two general guidelines to assure that we are meeting our objec-
tives when answering questions that are asked to us by news
reporters are: (to ask ourselves first):

1. Is it relevant?

2. Is it current?
loudly shouted insults at him that were generously laced with the word, "nigger." They hurled stones onto the front of his house, some of which smashed through his living room window. Then they fled, with the sound of their car tires screeching in the night. This incident was of great concern to the two younger leaders of Project Bootstraps as they predicted anxiously that this was the beginning of a long line of acts of terrorism that would be directed against them. They had frightening recollections of all the things that had happened to A.J. Marlow when he had been the leader of Project Bootstraps. The consultant told them that such acts were not likely to escalate and continue against them, as they had against A.J., because of the plans to handle the group differently from the way A.J. had handled it. (Those plans are discussed in the next section of this paper.) He told them they had timed the newspaper article so that such acts would be minimized as the community residents were pulled into the Christmas rush, and he reminded them that the local newspaper had already begun the countdown of the number of shopping days before Christmas. In addition, he followed up his reassuring words to the two younger leaders by applying a psychophysiological technique which was aimed at decreasing the high level of anxiety produced by their stressful situation. (Mr. Taylor was not included in the application of this technique because he did not display the same reactions to the terrorist incident as did the two younger leaders.)

The choice to apply the use of a psychophysiological techniques against anxiety was broadly based on the "reciprocal inhibition principle," as presented by Wolpe and Lazarus (1967), who write
If a response inhibitory to anxiety can be made to occur in the presence of anxiety-evoking stimuli it will weaken the bond between these stimuli and the anxiety. (p. 13)

The specific psychophysiologic technique used was the one described by Benson et al. (1974) in eliciting what he and his colleagues refer to as the "relaxation response."

Benson et al. (1974) describes this technique for eliciting the relaxation response as follows:

Four basic elements are usually necessary to elicit the relaxation response in man:

(1) Mental Device--There should be a constant stimulus--e.g., a sound, word, or phrase repeated silently or audibly, or fixed gazing at an object. The purpose of these procedures is to shift from logical, externally-oriented thought.

(2) Passive Attitude--If distracting thoughts do occur during the repetition or gazing, they should be disregarded and one's attention should be redirected to the technique. One should not worry about how well he is performing the technique.

(3) Decreased Muscle Tonus--The subject should be in a comfortable posture so that minimal muscular work is required.

(4) Quiet Environment--A quiet environment with decreased environmental stimuli should be chosen. Most techniques instruct the practitioner to close his eyes. A place of worship is often suitable, as is a quiet room. (p. 38)

In commenting on the safety of this technique, Benson et al. (1974) writes

When the relaxation response is elicited for two limited daily periods of 20 to 30 minutes, no adverse side effects have been observed. (p. 44)
This psychophysiologic technique was chosen for use with the two younger Project Bootstraps leaders because it was observed to be particularly effective in situations which continually evoked the flight or fight response (Benson et al., 1974; Beary & Benson, 1974; Glueck & Stroebel, 1975). Also, its application procedure was economical, and, once they learned this procedure, they could apply it themselves. The Project Bootstraps leaders had to deal with objective sources of fear in the environment and they also had to deal with irrational fears they, themselves, generated. It was assumed that if they were to eliminate their irrational fears, then they would be in a better position to deal effectively with the objective sources of fear in the environment.

The consultant obtained consent from Mr. Evans and Mr. Carlisle to apply the psychophysiologic technique and their initial instruction in the procedure was conducted separately. Over the next several weeks, the consultant stayed in close touch with the two leaders, and held extensive discussions with them about the technique's application and effects. They became able to detect more subtle differentiations in their feelings, and to discuss their perceived fears, as well as to discuss concepts, such as that of anxiety. In addition to their reports that they were aided in alleviating their fears, the use of the psychophysiologic technique was an experience which the two leaders shared, and a source of conversation between them. The consultant encouraged them to interact around this common experience, because he was still concerned that they had been in personal conflict before reentering Project Bootstraps as co-leaders.
Through such a shared experience it was expected that they could become more comfortable with each other's personal differences as they worked together in the group. The application of the psycho-physiologic technique began the weekend after the terrorist incident which followed their article in the newspaper on 12/3/75.

Through the newspaper article, the Project Bootstraps group had established intracommunity ties by letting the black community and the white community know that its members were in charge of the legal suits. The group had placed itself in a position to form alliances with other community groups and individuals who supported its goals and to enter into negotiations with the parties sued. Also, the newspaper article sensitized the larger community to the discrimination issue, and to the group. Several newspaper reports followed the 12/3/75 Project Bootstraps story (see Appendix C, pp. 201-213), and other articles began to appear in the local newspaper about the national Project Bootstraps organization.

The next section, Stage Three, deals with the Project Bootstraps group managing the legal suits.

STAGE THREE

Managing the Legal Suits While Training the Members in Attending to the Project Bootstraps Group's Task and Maintenance Functions

Following the 12/3/75 newspaper article, which served as a basis for establishing Project Bootstraps with intracommunity ties, the group was to alter the way it functioned in order to more effectively
manage the legal suits. After the new local leaders had established themselves as the suing party, the group was to pull back and assume a low profile to weaken the community's perception that the situation constituted a fight between the city and county on one side, and Project Bootstraps on the other. The seeds of this altered way of functioning were contained in the newspaper article itself. There, Project Bootstraps endeavored to meet its purpose of establishing intracommunity ties, without slandering or antagonizing the city and county. One statement made in the article by the new leaders was, "We believe our charges of hiring discrimination to be true, and we are going to let the State Civil Rights Commission and the courts decide the issue." Pulling back and assuming a low profile was a part of the group's strategy in managing the legal suits. That strategy was to shift the locus of the legal struggle from the city and county vs. Project Bootstraps, to the city and county vs. the State Civil Rights Commission. The idea of the city and county vs. the local chapter of Project Bootstraps contained a gross imbalance of power; however, the city and county vs. the State Civil Rights Commission was implicit of a fight between more equally powerful establishments. Project Bootstraps, instead of itself, was to place its "advocate," the State Civil Rights Commission, out into the "brunt of battle." In a sense, the group members would publicly claim neutrality with statements like "...we are going to let the State Civil Rights Commission and the courts decide the issue," but they would privately provide the State Civil Rights Commission with all the relevant information obtainable, to assist in getting a ruling in
favor of Project Bootstraps.

This strategy in managing the legal suits favored the local chapter of Project Bootstraps in several ways. It was suited to the strengths and resources of the community action group-consultant "mix"; it avoided contact with the city and county, except through a third party, and thus decreased the possibility of Project Bootstraps committing errors that could damage the suits; and, it removed the Project Bootstraps members from the center of attention, and thus made it less likely that they would draw terrorist attacks, or give the community junctioner ammunition from which to generate effective slander against them.

The members of Project Bootstraps were disciplined to recognize the limits of their power, and to utilize fully the strengths and resources that were available to them. They had no power with which to mount an offensive in this situation. Their power was contained in their affiliation with the State Civil Rights Commission, and the position they occupied as the suing party. The real strength in this position was in understanding the situation as thoroughly as possible, and reacting intelligently and quickly to events. From this position, the group members were to tilt the balance of power in the legal struggle between the city and county and the State Civil Rights Commission in the favor of Project Bootstraps. This would constitute making good use of the organization with which they were affiliated. Rather than for the group members to go on the offensive in an un-disciplined way, the strategy for managing the legal suits required that they draw on resources found in qualities such as patience,
accurate perception, good judgment, quick reactions, and good timing.

By avoiding contact with the city and county, the Project Bootstraps group reduced the chance of giving them any cause with which they could divert the central issue of the legal suit. This lack of contact made it less likely that an issue such as racism, for example, could enter the case and cloud the central issue of minority hiring discrimination. Racism is a relatively undifferentiated and highly inflammatory issue, and a charge of racism is relatively more difficult to prove or disprove, because there are less concrete indicators of its existence. By comparison, a charge of minority hiring discrimination is more easily proved or disproved, because a concrete indicator of its existence is available in a comparison of the number of minorities employed with the total number of individuals employed in a given setting.

Removing the Project Bootstraps members from the center of attention was to decrease coercive tactics against the group by "removing the object" of those attacks. It was assumed that the terrorists and the community junctioner could not successfully attack or effectively slander a group that was hidden from their view. Another change was made in this regard, and that was to close the membership. Under A.J. Marlow, the Project Bootstraps membership had been completely open, because he brought a paradigm of the open church congregation over to the group from the ministry. This had certain advantages in building the membership, etc., but it had the distinct disadvantage of publicly revealing the group's plans. Some of the group's plans were undermined long before they got to the point of execution.
Under the new local leaders, by consensus decision, Project Bootstraps closed its membership with eight regular members and seven auxiliary members (see Project Bootstraps membership survey, p. 88). This was to protect the group from infiltration by informers who might have revealed the group's plans to hostile community sources. Also, the size and composition, and other such information, were not privileged to the public. Thus, in removing its members from the center of attention, in closing its membership, and in not revealing its strengths and weaknesses, Project Bootstraps became a shadowy and elusive target for those who would use coercive tactics against it. Members of this community action group-consultant "mix" also began conducting a lot of their business at night.

On 11/10/75, an article appeared in the local newspaper indicating that the State Civil Rights Commission had failed to act on the minority hiring discrimination charges. (See "Bootstraps charges not considered by rights unit," on page 202 in Appendix C.) This was contrary to what the Project Bootstraps members expected, because in the 12/3/75 newspaper article, Mr. Ives, the State Civil Rights Commission investigator, was quoted as saying, "he had found 'probable cause of discrimination' in city government and will recommend to the State Civil Rights Commission that action be taken...to bring the city into compliance with the law." As it was, his findings were to be reviewed by the commission, which was the decision-making body of the State Civil Rights Commission. The commission met once each month to review and make judgments on their field investigators' findings, but the Kingston Project cases did not appear on the agenda.
for the month of December. Bootstraps was concerned, because if the Kingston cases were not considered the following month, the State Civil Rights Commission's one year jurisdiction over the cases would have passed. There was a danger that the Project Bootstraps suits would not be acted on within the legally prescribed time limit, and thus would be dismissed. Project Bootstraps had to somehow deal with its concern that the legal suits against the city and county not be dismissed, and also contribute to obtaining a legal judgment from the State Civil Rights Commission that validated their charges.

Along with the actual activities involved in managing the legal suits, simultaneously, the leaders were being trained by the consultant to provide the Project Bootstraps group's task and maintenance functions. The group's coordinator, Mr. Evans, was in training in providing primarily the group's task functions. With the consultant's guidance and support, Mr. Evans established and maintained communications with extracommunity and intracommunity organizations, provided information in meetings on events that were relevant to the functioning of the group, and stimulated planning among the group members for proceeding with the legal suits. His training in performing task functions, in relation to the legal suits, involved him and the consultant in acquiring legal information through contacts with resource persons. They placed long distance and local telephone calls to organizations, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and they conferred with lawyers.

Shortly following the 12/10/75 newspaper article, Mr. Evans and the consultant acquired an appointment with Attorney Phyllis McGee
who was the lawyer recommended to the group earlier by the Centralton Chapter Project Bootstraps president. In that conference with her, Mr. Evans and the consultant were concerned with the following questions: How could Project Bootstraps assure that action was taken on the legal suits before the State Civil Rights Commission's jurisdiction over the cases was exceeded? What kind of gains would be valuable to accomplish from the legal suits and how could Project Bootstraps become a part of the final negotiations between the city and county, and the State Civil Rights Commission? In her explanations, Attorney McGee pointed out that the Project Bootstraps charges of minority hiring discrimination were of a general nature which fell within the category of "a continuing violation," and therefore they were not legally restricted to only one year's jurisdiction. She said that to acquire an affirmative action plan from the city and county constituted a substantial gain, in and of itself, but Project Bootstraps could try also to legally disqualify the stringent job application tests which were usually used to the disadvantage of minority applicants. With regard to Project Bootstraps becoming a part of the final negotiations between the city and county and the State Civil Rights Commission, she said simply to ask the State Civil Rights Commission if Project Bootstraps could do so as the suing party. Near the end of the conference, Attorney McGee gave Mr. Evans and the consultant the names of other lawyers they could contact to gain more clarity on the suits, or to take further legal action on them, and subsequently, those lawyers she recommended were visited.
Mr. Evans was encouraged to keep notes, and to write up a final report on all these activities in which he and the consultant participated. He was then to make that report to the entire membership during the next group meeting.

The group's chairman, Mr. Carlisle, was in training in providing primarily the group's maintenance functions. With the consultant's guidance and support, Mr. Carlisle presided over all group meetings, facilitated the flow of group process in meetings, coordinated within-group activities, and arbitrated in disputes between members. His training in providing maintenance functions involved periodic discussions with the consultant. Initially, comparisons were drawn between some of the activities of an athletic event which Mr. Carlisle knew very well, and some of the ways he was to function in the group.

Mr. Carlisle was very fond of basketball, and for several years he played on one of the teams in a locally organized city league. On a few occasions each year he was called on to referee. He was asked by the consultant to reflect on how his experiences as a player in the game differed from his experiences as a referee in the game. Then it was pointed out to him that his functioning as chairman of the Project Bootstraps group compared more with his experiences as a basketball referee, than as a basketball player. In the group meetings, he was to maintain distance from the group members' interactions around issues, in order to observe how the members were "playing the game." Each meeting had a format in which certain goals were to be accomplished. He was to keep in touch with that format, and, through his observations, assist the members in accomplishing
the goals. Sometimes it may have meant encouraging certain members
to speak up more, or other times it may have meant discreetly "blowing
the whistle" on certain members, if in "not abiding by the rules"
y they were taking the group too far afield. Primarily, he was to
develop ways to keep the members interacting constructively toward
accomplishing the group's goals.

The consultant held many informal discussions with Mr. Evans
and Mr. Carlisle before meetings, and he held scheduled supervisory
sessions with them after each meeting. The group meeting format was
as follows:

(a) Open meeting
(b) Reading of minutes from the last meeting
(c) The coordinator's report
(d) Discussion and analysis of relevant issues
(e) Summary and recommendations
(f) Close meeting

This format had been included in the group members' folders, and the
leaders began assuming their responsibilities in the second Project
Bootstraps meeting. The supervisory session with Mr. Evans was to
assess the coordinator's report, and to incorporate any new ideas
that may have been suggested by the members into plans for action on
the legal suits. The supervisory session with Mr. Carlisle was to
recall specific situations in the flow of the process in the meeting,
and to explore different ways he as chairman could approach some of
those situations in future meetings.
The actual activity in attending to the legal suits was used in training the leaders and members to provide the essential functions for their group. In meetings, the coordinator's report was to communicate information and act as a stimulus to which the chairman could assist the members in responding with constructive ideas. The leaders were then to filter out the best of these ideas and fashion them into action steps. That way, the members would be a valuable source of ideas to the leaders, and the action steps taken by the leaders would reflect the entire membership. Each leader and the members were being trained to perform a specific aspect of the total role assumed by the consultant in providing essential functions for the group. They were being prepared to continue functioning after the consultant left their group, and to transfer this way of functioning to other areas of community concern after the issue of the legal suits was resolved.

Following up on the concern that the legal suits not be dismissed, the Project Bootstraps coordinator visited the regional office of the State Civil Rights Commission, about a week before the commission's scheduled meeting in January, 1976. On that visit, it was learned that the Kingston cases had been removed from the hands of the field investigator, Mr. Ives, and were being handled by the State Civil Rights Commission's chief investigator. The Project Bootstraps coordinator's main purpose was to communicate to the State Civil Rights Commission that the suing party knew certain technical aspects of the law involving these cases, and fully expected the law to be executed. During his contact with the chief investigator, he
used the information he and the consultant had obtained from Attorney McGee to inquire about the cases' status as continuing violations.

The Project Bootstraps coordinator's visit apparently had some effect, because in a local newspaper article printed on January 13, 1976, the State Civil Rights Commission's chief investigator was quoted as saying:

...in situations where a clear-cut violation occurred on a specific date. ...the commission has one year, less one day, from the date of the violation in which to take action. ...the charges against the [Kingston] governmental units were 'of a general nature and constitute a continuing violation not affected by the deadline.'

The same article also reported that the commission had not made a disposition on the Project Bootstraps charges in their January meeting, but now the charges were in less danger of being dismissed, because the State Civil Rights Commission's jurisdiction over the Kingston cases had been extended indefinitely. (See "[Bootstraps] charges remain active for [SCRC] action" on page 203 in Appendix C.)

In the months that followed, it appeared that the State Civil Rights Commission was reluctant to make a judgment against the city and county on the Project Bootstraps charges. Over the next two months, articles appeared in the local newspaper entitled, "[Bootstraps] charges not before [State] rights unit today," and "No action taken on charges by [Bootstraps]" (see Appendix C, pp. 205-206). During that time Project Bootstraps kept in close touch with the State Civil Rights Commission in an attempt to communicate that they, as the suing party, and a large segment of the community, which they
represented, held the commission accountable for issuing a legal
decision on the charges. In addition, Project Bootstraps contacted
community residents who were involved in concrete examples of minority
hiring discrimination by the city or county, and took these residents
to the regional office of the State Civil Rights Commission to for­
mally file complaints. This gave the State Civil Rights Commission
more concrete incidents with which to strengthen their evidence
against the city and county. Project Bootstraps also sent the State
Civil Rights Commission copies of local newspaper articles and called
its attention to the way in which city and county officials seemed
to "dare the commission to act." The 1/13/76 newspaper article is an
example. In that article it seemed the State Civil Rights Commission's
strategy was to encourage the city and county to act on their own so
that they did not have to make a decision on the charges. Such a
strategy was inferred from the chief investigator's statement that
"...unless a substantial black hiring effort is instituted the charge
affidavit remains open." This seemed to imply that the charges
would be dismissed if the city and county made a substantial black
hiring gesture on their own. Project Bootstraps sent a copy of this
article to the State Civil Rights Commission and pointed out that the
city had no intentions of acting on its own. In the same article,
just a few lines below the statement made by the chief investigator,
the city manager was quoted as saying, "...any substantial black
hiring effort is out of the question." Project Bootstraps pointed
out the contradiction between the State Civil Rights Commission's
tacit directive, as expressed in the statement by the chief
investigator, and the position taken by the city, as expressed in
the statement by the city manager. Through activities such as these,
Project Bootstraps sought to place the State Civil Rights Commission
in a position where it would have to act on the charges to save face.

The local Project Bootstraps group was performing effectively
in keeping attention focused on the minority hiring discrimination
charges, but the members felt disappointed because they were getting
no direct support from either the Centralton Chapter, or the national
Project Bootstraps organization. The local group had tried on several
occasions to contact the Centralton Bootstraps president to find out
more about his group's meeting times, and when they could join in
with the Centralton Chapter's activities, but all such attempts were
unsuccessful. They were concerned, too, because the coordinator and
the consultant had learned from Attorney Phyllis McGee that the
Centralton Bootstraps Chapter had not been an integral part of her
legal project in Centralton, as the Centralton Bootstraps president
had led them to believe when he visited Kingston. The Kingston
members felt isolated from the Centralton Chapter, and they sought to
solve this problem by establishing a direct flow of communications
between themselves and the national organization.

After writing to the Centralton Chapter president about the
Kingston Chapter's concerns, the coordinator, through phone calls
and letters, contacted the national Project Bootstraps organization
and requested to have more direct contact with them. He told them
what the Kingston Chapter was doing at the local level in connection
with the legal suits, and specifically requested, (l) legal information
regarding the suits, (2) literature specifying the national organization's guidelines for the local community groups, (3) criteria outlining what the Kingston group would have to do to become an independent chapter of Project Bootstraps.

The Kingston members expected to receive words of encouragement from the national organization, but instead they received words of caution which implied that the national organization did not want to be drawn into the local Kingston legal suits. The national organization's personnel sent no legal information, and, essentially, they placed the local group back where it had started, because they referred it to the Centralton Chapter for literature and guidelines.

To the request for criteria for independent chapter membership, the national organization's response was less straightforward. It was drawn out over a long period of time, and it involved several phone calls and letters. The final implication was that the national organization did not want to lose its Kingston members, but it wanted the group to remain a subsidiary of the Centralton Bootstraps Chapter.

With this response from the national Project Bootstraps organization, the Kingston group members "threw up their hands" in frustration. They said they were not going to continue working on the legal suits without help. They said if the national organization didn't care about what they were doing with the legal suits, they didn't care either, and further, they were going to disassociate completely from Project Bootstraps.

The consultant understood the members' feelings, but sought to bring more perspective to the situation. He reminded the local
members that if the State Civil Rights Commission judged favorably on their charges, it would constitute a big gain for them and their particular community. Therefore, they were not to expect the national organization to do the actual work that had to be done locally toward acquiring that gain. They knew their community, and probably knew better how to proceed in it than anyone from the national organization. It was pointed out to them that they were full-fledged members of Project Bootstraps because they had current membership cards, and they could continue to negotiate with the national organization about becoming an independent chapter. The consultant suggested that they remain affiliated with the national Project Bootstraps organization, and continue to use that affiliation to their advantage in doing what they, themselves, had to do locally to help get a favorable judgment on their charges. That way, he said, they would be leaving open the option of making a stronger appeal to the national organization (even if it meant sending a delegate to the national headquarters) if they got into some kind of trouble they could not handle at the local level.

The consultant was concerned that the local chapter of Project Bootstraps be provided with some structure through affiliation with other organizations, as he anticipated leaving the group. He had suggested repeatedly that the group establish another extracommunity tie, but they responded reluctantly. The suggestion was that they file their charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission also, as Mr. Ives had said it was customary to do in their situation. The consultant was of the opinion that the Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission was more powerful than the State Civil Rights Commission and could assure more substantial legal gains from the minority hiring discrimination charges. It could also become another source of stimulation for local Project Bootstraps group activities. The group members did not openly disagree with the consultant and say that they would not file their charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, but they shied away from the suggestion whenever he brought it up. The members did openly disagree with the consultant over the issue of reopening the local group to new members. This issue is discussed in the next section.

Through assuming a low profile while managing the legal suits, the Project Bootstraps members minimized drawing attention to themselves. There were no repetitions of the terrorist attacks which occurred prior to the Christmas holidays. However, the leaders did have to endure verbal confrontations at the personal level with various white residents who told them they "didn't like seeing blacks messing around in local politics." Initially the white community, in general, was hostile toward Project Bootstraps, but became more restrained in acting out its hostility as the legal suits progressed and attention was focused toward the State Civil Rights Commission. On occasion there was even some feeble support for Project Bootstraps from the white community. For instance, a few local employers told the Project Bootstraps leaders that they were glad to see the legal suits initiated because the suits enabled them to hire blacks in spite of local prejudices.
The majority of the black community residents were not overt in showing their support for Project Bootstraps, but there were exceptions. A few of the black residents told the Bootstraps leaders that they had posted newspaper articles about the legal suits on bulletin boards where they worked, and that these articles had sparked heated discussions between them and their white co-workers. Other black residents came forth with information about incidents of job discrimination they had encountered with the city and county, and other local employers.

The "Senator" was unusually hesitant about publicly discrediting Project Bootstraps, especially since the group posed a serious threat to his role as the community junctioner. Although holding back from acting out against Project Bootstraps, he spent much of his time trying to get informers into the group in order to gain such information as: how many members the group had, who the members were, what the group's plans were, and who was running the group. His hesitancy to discredit the group was likely due to his lack of information about these kinds of details and to the continued presence of Stag Taylor as a member.

Although Mr. Taylor had missed the news interview, he was pleased that his name appeared in the 12/3/75 newspaper article as one of the Project Bootstraps leaders. He continued as an active participant in the group, and he brought a stabilizing influence to bear on all group decisions. He shared his vast experience with the younger co-leaders, and his home was readily available for Bootstraps meetings whenever needed.
The next section, Stage Four, deals with the consultant's termination from the group and the group's continued functioning.

STAGE FOUR

The Consultant's Termination from the Group and the Group's Continued Functioning

As the 4/5/76 meeting of the local chapter of Project Bootstraps approached, the State Civil Rights Commission still had not acted on the minority hiring discrimination charges, but the consultant had already entered the process of terminating from the group. The consultant was to leave for summer vacation, two months later, in early June, and he would not be returning to function in quite the same way again with either the Project Bootstraps group or the community.

The minority hiring discrimination probable cause finding by the State Civil Rights Commission's field investigator was reported publicly on 12/3/75, so it had been expected that the commission would have acted before the 4/5/76 Project Bootstraps meeting. By that time, however, the Project Bootstraps members were thoroughly familiar with a projected course of action they were to follow, if and when the commission made a judgment on their charges. Information from both newspaper articles and conferences with lawyers indicated that if the commission judged probable cause of hiring discrimination against the city and county, then, within a definite time limit, the city and county would be required to produce affirmative action plans. The projected course of action to follow this occurrence involved three steps that were designed to maneuver Project Bootstraps
into a position where it would become a more influential and ongoing community action group.

In the first step, Project Bootstraps members were to seek to work jointly with city and county personnel in the actual drafting of the affirmative action plans. Project Bootstraps was to request that the State Civil Rights Commission negotiate the inclusion of some Bootstraps members, as representatives of the suing party, in the activity of drafting the affirmative action plans, with city and county representatives. In the second step, Project Bootstraps members were to seek to become the "checkers" of the affirmative action plans. That is, Project Bootstraps was to establish itself as an agency in the community which would assure that the affirmative action plans were properly observed. An arrangement could be made in which any irregularities in observance would be reported to the State Civil Rights Commission. Thus, the affirmative action plans would be public documents around which Project Bootstraps initially established direct contact with city and county government. In the third step, Project Bootstraps members were to seek to become an ongoing community action group that represented black community concerns directly to officials of the city and county governmental units. If Project Bootstraps did initially establish direct contact with city and county government through the affirmative action plans, then that contact was to be extended into channels of communication through which Project Bootstraps could introduce other concerns of the black community. Project Bootstraps would then be providing the black community with an alternative to the community junctioner,
and with an interest group that represented a wide range of black community concerns.

The projected course of action implied that the Project Bootstraps group's strategy would change if the commission issued a favorable judgment on the minority hiring discrimination charges. Toward obtaining a favorable judgment, the group had adopted a strategy which involved, "pulling back and assuming a low profile," as described in stage three, above. If a favorable judgment were obtained, then the group was to use that newly acquired legal determination as leverage, and institute the projected course of action steps in gradually becoming more openly active in community affairs. This projected course of action was necessarily tentative, however, and the three steps could not be placed on a definite timetable, because Project Bootstraps controlled very few of the variables that were essential to its advancing through the steps. It was more a master plan in which goals were set toward which the group would strive, and it served as a basis for the group members to make decisions in the future that were consistent with their goals, if certain anticipated events did actually occur in the community situation.

The intermediate, or second step, in the projected course of action was anticipated as an optimal point for the consultant to terminate from the group. He would be leaving the group when its members became the checkers of the affirmative action plans, and thus had a relevant task which their level of acquired organization would enable them to manage successfully without him. In this second step, their task would be primarily a "watching function."
would be required to carefully observe and determine if the city and county's actual hiring practices matched the affirmative action plans as written. In connection with this task, any negotiations with the city and county, or the State Civil Rights Commission, would provide experience toward their advancement to the third step. As it was, time considerations did not permit the consultant's termination to occur within the framework of the projected course of action. The commission's delay in issuing a decision on the charges, delayed execution on the projected course of action, and therefore, the timing of the consultant's leaving the group could not be woven around a position the group arrived at in the external community situation. Instead, his termination from the group was woven around issues that developed within the group itself.

In general, preparation for the consultant's termination from the Project Bootstraps group began as early as 12/2/75, when the group leaders were held responsible for getting their article into the local newspaper. From that time, the consultant engaged in training the leaders, and gradually transferred all responsibilities of the group over to the leaders and members. Also, he began conducting more group business over the telephone, and through letters, rather than through face to face discussions with the leaders and members. More specifically, the actual process of termination was initiated in the group's 3/1/76 meeting.

In the 3/1/76 meeting, the leaders and members of Project Bootstraps were unified in communicating that they wanted to reopen their local chapter to new members. They said several black community
residents had complimented them on the way they were handling the legal suits, and they mentioned the names of nine residents who specifically expressed interest in joining their group. (See Table 6, "Prospective New Project Bootstraps Members," in Appendix B, page 198). The consultant told the members that their having favorably impressed some of the other black community residents was a good sign of their effectiveness, but he asked if they could wait until a judgment had been issued on their charges before they admitted new members. He justified his position by saying the timing was poor for taking in new members, because new members would have to be oriented, and that task could prove to be disruptive to the disciplined way they were proceeding with the legal suits.

The leaders and members were not convinced by the consultant's argument, however. After he finished speaking, they firmly stated their opposition to his point of view and persisted in saying they needed more members immediately. As they expressed themselves, the emotion they generated seemed out of proportion to the issue of reopening the membership. Somehow, in stating their position, they communicated an underlying feeling of desperation. The consultant regarded the manner of the group members' stance on this issue as a clue to other feelings they were experiencing.

The underlying feeling of desperation was generated by the pressures that accompanied their mission, and the long periods of uncertainty they had to tolerate. No black community residents had challenged the unfair practices of the local establishment in quite the way they were, and they felt anxious in setting this precedent.
They felt anxious, also, from disciplining their actions and waiting month after month to see if the commission had acted on their charges, without having any certainty that the commission would ever act. Too, they were uncertain about the national Project Bootstraps organization as a source of support. Through taking in more members, they were seeking to gain relief from anxieties caused by the pressures and uncertainties inherent in their situation. Getting more members into the group was a way of acquiring immediate active support that was highly visible and safe. Their reactions in connection with this issue of reopening the membership alerted the consultant to other occurrences which indicated that the group members had begun withdrawing from taking any risk they perceived as bringing more pressures and uncertainties, and they had begun withdrawing from the consultant himself.

One indication of the group members' withdrawing was their not following the consultant's repeated suggestion that they file their charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Another indication was the coordinator's having missed the last conference he and the consultant had scheduled with a lawyer. That occurred about a week before the meeting. He called the consultant a half hour in advance of the appointment to say he wasn't able to attend, but when the consultant later made a report to the group on the conference, the coordinator showed signs that he was afraid that particular conference, and that particular lawyer, would have led the group into some new binding commitment. The solidarity with which he and the other leaders and members pursued the issue of reopening
the membership indicated that the coordinator's missing the con-
ference was a prior decision the group made without including the
consultant. The group members had come to associate the consultant
with risk taking that brought them unwelcomed anxieties. They were
angry with him, and they were distancing themselves from him.

The group members' having begun making decisions independently
of the consultant, and their distancing themselves from the consul-
tant, were qualities to be encouraged, because they were important
to their functioning effectively without him. It was an optimal time
for the consultant to initiate the process of his termination from the
group, and thereby facilitate the group members' developing autonomy.
In the procedure for his termination, the consultant would cease
functioning in the role of active group participant, and commence
functioning in the role of group advisor for the remaining 3½ months
before he was to leave the community. That way, the group leaders
and members had an opportunity to function autonomously, but with
the advice and support of the consultant for a limited period of time
before they were completely on their own.

In terminating, the consultant would attempt to use the activity
of reopening the membership, to encourage the members' tendencies
toward independence, and, in the interest of their group to abort
their tendencies to withdraw from risk taking. Termination would be
built around the core members' taking on the primary responsibility
for orienting the new members. In that arrangement, the core members
would be required to "sell" their group, and this responsibility
would likely deepen their sense of ownership and involvement.
Orienting the new members would require that the core members assume a role with the new members that was similar to the role the consultant had initially assumed with them. As they entered this role, and formed attachments with the new members, they would tend to detach themselves further from the consultant, who will have "slipped away" from the group as an active participant.

Reminding the members that they would soon be in complete control of their group would tend to shock them out of their withdrawal from risk taking, and their responsibility in reopening the membership would have a more sustained effect in that regard. The core members were not considering that their history in the group was an experience the new members did not share, and that situation would present them with new problems to solve. They were more focused on gaining a feeling of security by taking in new members, and they were not viewing reopening the membership as an act of risk taking which would bring its own pressures and uncertainties. As they made this discovery through orienting the new members, the consultant, from the role of advisor, would present them with a broader perspective on their anxieties and withdrawal tendencies. That perspective would be that felt anxieties come with most new activities, even those which are welcomed (such as taking in new members), and felt anxieties do not necessarily reflect the true nature of conditions in the external world. Therefore, they were expected to recognize the pitfalls involved in allowing their anxiety to be the only factor to cause them to withdraw from taking risks. Instead they were to examine as many factors as possible in the external situation, and oftentimes,
in spite of felt anxieties, they were to make decisions and take
risks in favor of functioning effectively as a group.

In the 3/1/76 meeting, after he had come to better understand
the members' motivations, the consultant agreed to assist with taking
in new members in the next regularly scheduled meeting. His agree­
ment was part of a negotiation in which the core group members agreed
that they would (1) assist the consultant in drafting a procedure for
admitting new members, (2) hold an emergency session, before the next
regularly scheduled meeting, to properly observe the procedure, and
(3) be primarily responsible for orienting the new members.

Presenting it as a part of why they, the core members, were to be
primarily responsible for orienting the new members, the consultant
announced his plan for terminating from the group. Everyone concerned
had known the exact time when he would be leaving, but no one seemed
quite prepared to deal with the feelings that accompanied the formal
announcement. For a while, no one spoke, and no one looked at anyone
else as a stillness came over the room. The effect of the announce­
ment had been shocking, as the members and the consultant began to
realize how much they would miss each other.

While faced with these reactions to the termination announcement,
it was important that the members did not feel that the consultant
was deserting them. If they felt deserted, then they could tend to
withdraw even further from risk taking. For this reason, the con­
sultant quickly reminded the group members that he would be with them
as their advisor for another 34 months, and he told them he had no
doubts that when he left they would be able to continue with their
group. Some of the members responded by saying they will be sorry to see the consultant go. Others wished him good luck in his future endeavors, and expressed confidence that they would carry on their group. The somber mood created by the announcement did not lift, however, and it carried over into the activity which consumed the rest of the meeting. That was specifying the elements in a procedure for the admission of new members. The procedure was later included in a written constitution that was to be presented to the members as the consultant was leaving.

Producing a written constitution was another preparation for the consultant's termination from the group. In the 12/3/75 meeting, the consultant had requested and was awarded approximately 10 minutes of each meeting in which he and the members jointly contributed to the content of a group constitution. The constitution listed guidelines to assist the members with such issues as meetings, membership, duties of officers, election of officers, induction of officers, and amendments. The writing of the constitution paralleled the development of the group, and its content was abstractions of functions, roles, and responsibilities as they had actually been assumed by the members. For instance, it outlined the responsibilities that became attached to each of the three levels of membership which were introduced in the membership survey, and it specified the functions of each officer, as officer roles had developed from the leaders' diverse interests. The constitution was to serve as a guidepost for the group's stability, but it permitted for flexibility as to the direction in which the group could choose to go. It allowed for the
group's option to become an independent chapter of the national Project Bootstraps organization, or to acquire its own charter and function as a local community group.

The main steps in the procedure for the admission of new members had been observed in an emergency session, and in their regularly scheduled meeting on 4/5/76, the Project Bootstraps core members admitted eight more community residents into their group. (See Table 7, "Attendance Record of Prospective Bootstraps Members," in Appendix B, page 199, for a listing of new members.) During the week leading up to that occasion, the consultant did not hold the usual "before meetings" sessions with the leaders, so that they sustained the full impact of preparing to receive the new members. In the meeting, the core members became quite excited as they took over their orientation task. The consultant remained in the background of this activity, and noted events that he would discuss with the leaders later, as the "after meetings" supervisory sessions with them were continued. Two observations of interest, which were events that had been anticipated, were: the core members did tend to detach themselves further from the consultant as they immersed themselves in the task of orienting the new members, and there was a distinct difference in the level of discipline between the core members and the new members.

When the core members told the new members about their group, they did not make a single reference to the consultant. With no mention whatsoever of the consultant's participation, they began with their group's origin in the community with A.J. Marlow, and filled in its history consistently, from that time to the time of the meeting.
They vividly described the details of certain events in the history of the group, in a way the consultant had not heard them do before. Although they made no reference to the consultant, they did make constant reference to some of the ideas he was able to share with the group. The core members had incorporated some of these ideas into their way of thinking, and in orienting the new members they reflected that these ideas had become their own. They revealed that they had knowledge of sophisticated aspects of how their group functioned; they were familiar with the subtleties of their strategy for winning a determination on their legal charges; and they could generalize from the main ideas contained in their projected course of action.

The new members became uncomfortable when they heard the core members speak with pride about how the work had proceeded on the legal charges. From outside the group, the new members had experienced the forceful impact the group made on the public, but from within the group, they were introduced to the tactful way that impact was created, and, to them, this was a discrepancy. The new members reacted with dislike for the lack of a more directly forceful expression, which they thought would have gotten immediate results. To them, the group's style of operating was too calculating, and its pace was too slow. The new members were disturbed by the rhythm and flow of the group, because, unlike the core members, they had had no previous orientation, in this context, to the idea of delayed gratification in dealing with "slow" legal matters. The new members were disturbed also
by what they considered the tentative nature of the local group's relationship with the national Bootstraps organization, and the State Civil Rights Commission. They expected these organizations to make firm commitments to the local group, and to actually perform deeds for the local group. By contrast, the core members were learning to make use of their affiliations with these organizations as an aid to what they, themselves, were doing in the local community. These and similar differences between the core members and the new members had to be resolved through some kind of creative solution if the group were to become unified again in its approach to solving problems.

The meeting went over its allotted time limit, as the core members and the new members had begun exchanging ideas about their differences, and the consultant did not get his usual time to deal with the constitution. He had brought copies of the constitution's completed rough draft, so he asked all members who could do so to remain after the meeting and contribute to the document's final revision. Six core members and four new members were able to stay for the task. The new members were especially welcomed, because through this task it was expected that they would be drawn further into the group. The consultant read through the rough draft completely, and the members held discussions about certain parts, and recommended corrections, additions, and deletions. After all suggested changes had been considered, every member present signed the constitution, and final copies were made available to the entire
membership within the next two days. (Several extra copies were
given to the leaders for future members who joined the group.)
During the next two regularly scheduled meetings of the group, that
followed, the consultant listened very carefully for differences
that developed between members over policy issues, and pointed out
how reference to the constitution could resolve some of these dif­
ferences as they arose. (A copy of the constitution is included in
Appendix D, beginning on page 214.)

The next few days following the 4/5/76 meeting found the core
members struggling to incorporate the new members' ideas into the
framework of the group, without severely disrupting the group's
cohesiveness. The new members initiated doing such things as writing
to national Project Bootstraps and visiting the State Civil Rights
Commission's office to reaffirm the local group's ties with these
organizations, and they discussed fund raising projects and social
events to bolster the local group's treasury and morale. They also
demanded more active participation from the Advisory Board Members,
(see Bootstraps Constitution, on p. 214 in Appendix D) and requested
the forming of new committees which they thought would aid the group.

In the midst of this activity, efforts to incorporate the new
members into the group were assisted by an important total group
victory. On 4/9/76, four days after taking in new members, the local
newspaper's front page headline article reported that the Project
Bootstraps charges of minority hiring discrimination against the city
of Kingston had been legally validated by the State Civil Rights
Commission. The newspaper article was timely, because the core
members planned to become more openly active in community affairs if they won a favorable decision on their charges, and that was more suited to the new members' push in that direction. (See copy of the article, "[SCRC] asks city conciliate on hiring," on the following page.)

The 4/9/76 newspaper article reported that the State Civil Rights Commission determined probable cause that:

...unlawful discriminatory practices have or are being engaged in by the city. ...the city's current hiring and employment policies have resulted in 'a complete absence of minority employees in the skilled and professional job classifications' [and]...the city 'currently employs a smaller percentage of minority employees than are present within the total county or city population.'

Along with a copy of the State Civil Rights Commission's determination, the city manager received a letter which contained:

... a proposed conciliation agreement which would require the city to develop an affirmative action program for minority hiring.... The proposed conciliation agreement would require the city to implement the affirmative action program to insure minority employment levels equal to the percentage of minority persons within the general [Kingston] County population.

The newspaper article mentioned also, that, although Project Bootstraps filed the same charges simultaneously against the county of Kingston, the investigations on those charges were handled separately. No determination was made on the county suit, but the commission's chief investigator was quoted as saying, the Compliance Department of the State Civil Rights Commission "has requested further investigation into the charges against the county."
On 'probable' discrimination
SCRC asks city conciliate on hiring

The Shené Civil Rights Commission has found probable cause after its preliminary investigation that the City of Kingston has engaged in unlawful discrimination practices.

City Manager Frank Hessler received a copy of the commission's determination today. The letter to Hessler contained a proposed conciliation agreement which would require the city to develop an Affirmative Action Program for minority hiring.

The local chapter of the NAACP filed charges Jan. 16, 1972 against the City and County of Kingston.

Although the suits were filed simultaneously, a Civil Rights Commission spokesman has explained that the investigations have been handled separately.

Local officials had understood that commission action was necessary before a finding could be made. The suits have not been before the Civil Rights Commission during a regularly monthly meeting and are not on the agenda for consideration this month.

However, [Hugh Hopkis] chief investigator for the southeast region of the SCRC, explained today the commissioners have delegated the authority for an initial finding to the Central Office Compliance Dept. "After an internal review of the investigation," Hopkis said, "the Compliance Dept. did find probable cause. It is presumed the finding will be confirmed by the commissioners at some future date."

[Hopkis] said the Compliance Dept. has requested further investigation to the charges against the county.

The county retained [Aubrey Shipp] of the law firm of Benton, Brevi and [Rendall] to represent the commissioners and other county officials in the suit.

For the city's part, Hessler plans to meet with commission officials at the Southeast Regional office in Central Park at 11 a.m. April 23 to obtain further information concerning the proposed conciliation agreement.

The SCRC determination dated March 25 states that the commission has found that it is probable that unlawful discriminatory practices have or are being engaged in by the city.

The SCRC finds probable cause that the city's current hiring and employment policies have resulted in a "complete absence of minority employees in the skilled and professional job classifications."

The commission also finds probable cause that the city "currently employs a smaller percentage of minority employees than are present within the total county or city population."

Hessler noted that the finding is based solely on a preliminary investigation.

"There was never any full-fledged investigation of any kind," Hessler said. "They do not say we are acting in an unlawful way, only that there is probable cause."

Hessler agrees that "based on numbers" the city does not have enough minority employees in comparison with the total city population, but cited two other factors. The lack of turnover and employment openings means the city is not hiring that many persons and there is also a scarcity of minority applicants.

"This (the SCRC determination) does not in any way find the city guilty of any unlawful practice," Hessler said. "We have been working on an affirmative action program for the past year and, in fact, submitted a preliminary draft of that program to the SCRC over a month ago."

The proposed conciliation agreement would require the city to implement the affirmative action program to insure minority employment levels equal to the percentage of minority persons within the general Kingston County population.

The SCRC determination received by the city today contradicts earlier indications that official action would be taken at a regular SCRC meeting. Local officials had been led to believe that the matter would be placed on a regular agenda for consideration. The next regular meeting of the SCRC is set for Tuesday.
The Project Bootstraps members were elated with the State Civil Rights Commission's determination on their charges against the city, and they wrote an open letter to the newspaper editor in response to the event. Through the letter, the Project Bootstraps members wanted to express their feelings, reinforce the determination, and stimulate the process toward the city signing a conciliation agreement. (See a copy of the letter, "[Bootstraps] pleased with rights unit," p. 149.) The letter also marked the group's reemergence as a more open and visible community action group. The members became more vigorous in contacting the State Civil Rights Commission about becoming active participants with the city in producing the affirmative action plan, which was the first step in their projected course of action.

One example of the impact Project Bootstraps was exerting on the larger community was an event that occurred on the day following the 4/9/76 newspaper article. On that day, the mayor of the city of Kingston visited the black community and held an extended private conference with the junctioner, in the junctioner's grocery store. This meeting had all the earmarks of urgency, because it was held under those unusual circumstances. No one knew for sure what this meeting was about, but the Project Bootstraps members assumed that the mayor was talking with the junctioner to find out if he could neutralize the thrust toward fair employment practices that came from the black community through Project Bootstraps, and prevent the city from having to sign the conciliation agreement. If this is what they discussed, then they had waited too long to hold such a meeting, because discrediting the consultant at that time could not neutralize
Our Readers Say

[Bootstraps] pleased with rights unit

The [Kingston] Chapter of [Bootstraps] is pleased with the State Civil Rights Commission's recent statements in response to our charges that the City of [Kingston's] hiring practices discriminate against blacks.

We see this as a positive step toward our goal to have black people working at all levels of employment in the city and county of [Kingston].

Members of the executive committee of the local chapter of [Bootstraps] are [Lawrence Carlisle, Morris K. Evans, and Fred (Stag) Taylor]

[Project Bootstraps...]

[Coordinator]

[Kingston]
the effects of the Project Bootstraps group, and too much momentum had built up toward the city signing the conciliation agreement.

Immediately following this meeting with the mayor, the community junctioner became openly hostile toward the consultant. In face to face meetings, he was no longer sociable, and most of his statements were innuendos that contained subtle threats. Too, he began to spread slanderous rumors among the black community residents, and some of the residents began to appear frightened in the consultant's presence. However, this tactic against the consultant did not have the effect of destroying the Project Bootstraps group, as it, along with other tactics, had earlier in the case of A.J. Marlow. This time the activities of the group could not be so easily disrupted, because the group's functioning did not depend on the consultant. Project Bootstraps was now under the control of local leadership, and it was a community action group that belonged to the people.

From the time of the determination on the minority hiring discrimination charges, the State Civil Rights Commission kept pressure on the city to sign the conciliation agreement. (See "Council to study conciliation pact," and "[SCRC] urges city action on conciliation," in Appendix C, pp. 208.) On 5/10/76, the Kingston city council formally approved the conciliation agreement, and authorized its signing. (See "Conciliation pact approved" on p. 151.)

Through the State Civil Rights Commission, Project Bootstraps had obtained a legal determination that the city's hiring practices discriminate against its minority citizens. This legal determination rendered knowledge of the city's discriminatory hiring practices open
Conciliation pact approved

In another matter, council unanimously adopted as an emergency measure an ordinance authorizing [Hessler] to sign a conciliation agreement and consent order with [State] Civil Rights Commission.

The agreement requires development of an Affirmative Action Program which will insure minority employment levels equal to the percentage of minority persons within the general [Kingston] County population.

In a memorandum to council [Hessler] said the city has been preparing such a program during the past year and can complete it within the required 120-day period. Under the program, for example, the [CRC] will provide a list of agencies to be solicited for minority applicants.

In the memo, [Hessler] admits the city has had little success with minority recruitment, "probably for two primary reasons; a lack of employee turnover resulting in few employment opportunities and a very small number of minority applicants."

The [CRC] had notified the city April 9 that after a preliminary investigation probable cause was found that the city had engaged in unlawful discrimination practices.
Conciliation pact approved

In another matter, council unanimously adopted as an emergency measure an ordinance authorizing Hessler to sign a conciliation agreement and consent order with State Civil Rights Commission.

The agreement requires development of an Affirmative Action Program which will insure minority employment levels equal to the percentage of minority persons within the general [Kingston County] population.

In a memorandum to council Hessler said the city has been preparing such a program during the past year and can complete it within the required 120-day period. Under the program, for example, the SCRRC will provide a list of agencies to be solicited for minority applicants.

In the memo, Hessler admits the city has had little success with minority recruitment, "probably for two primary reasons; a lack of employee turnover resulting in few employment opportunities and a very small number of minority applicants."

The SCRRC had notified the city April 9 that after a preliminary investigation probable cause was found that the city had engaged in unlawful discrimination practices.
to the public, and established a precedent that is preserved in the historical records of the community. From this precedent, the Project Bootstraps members, or any minorities in the community, present or future, or any persons interested in justice, whether minority or majority, could continue to build toward a reality in which fair employment practices applied equally to all citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or ancestry.

The work of the local chapter of Project Bootstraps was also a likely factor in producing more immediate changes in the community. Within a time interval 3 months before and after the State Civil Rights Commission formally announced its determination against the city, the Project Bootstraps members counted more than two hundred new jobs that were acquired by black residents, which they regarded as a direct result of their legal suits. Most of these new hirings had come from employers other than the city and county. A large number of these new jobs were in skilled and white collar clerical areas, and many of them were jobs that blacks had been barred from holding. The Project Bootstraps members pointed out that within the above mentioned time limit, in addition to having gotten a number of new semi-skilled and unskilled jobs, black residents had been hired as firemen, water meter readers, telephone operators, telephone linesmen, and secretaries. Also, the county had hired an additional black sheriff's deputy, and a black worker in its bureau of employment services, and the city police department was training a black law-enforcement officer.

Another apparent immediate change to which Project Bootstraps contributed was in the black residents' perception of their community.
On the pilot study of the community self-survey, 40.0% of the residents interviewed said, "nothing," "don't know," or gave "no-response" to the question, "What do you think is the nicest feature of this community?" Based on the characteristics of the responses it elicited on the pilot, this question was used subsequently as a pre-post test item. A change in the residents' percentage of positive responses to this question would be interpreted as an indication of a change in the residents' perception of their community. The test item was placed at the beginning of the survey, and first asked to the residents before the survey was administered. One year later, after the activities of Project Bootstraps (and other activities of the community self-survey project, such as the Concerned Residents group), the conditions for administering the survey were duplicated, and the residents were again given the test item. When the test item was first asked, of 133 respondents, 73 responded positively, and 60 responded with "nothing," "don't know," or refused to respond to the item by asking the interviewer to go on to the next question. When the test item was asked one year later, of 131 respondents, 101 responded positively, and 30 responded with "nothing" or "don't know." On this data, the chi-square with one degree of freedom, equalled 13.51, and was significant at the 0.0002 level. These figures indicate that the probability is very high that a positive change occurred in the residents' perception of their community. The investigator's lack of control over all the factors that may contribute to an effect, makes it difficult to link definite outcomes with specific variables in a participant-observer project. However, this result
occurred at a point in time with the community self-survey project when certain variables of the project (such as the work of Project Bootstraps and the Concerned Residents group) could well have contributed to the positive change in the black community residents' perception of their community.

Although the black community residents, in general, remained hesitant about outwardly revealing their support for Project Bootstraps, they were quietly watching what happened, and they expressed their approval in indirect ways. Mr. Evans, the Project Bootstraps coordinator, had been looking for a full time job for several months. After his work with Concerned Residents and during his work with Project Bootstraps, a small group of black community residents approached him privately, and asked him to apply for a job they knew had opened in the maintenance department of the local college. He applied and was hired for the job. Mr. Evans also appeared to achieve community "insider" status through his work on behalf of the community. He was invited to be initiated into the local Masonic Order at the same time that such "insiders" as Med Taylor and Lamar Foxworth were.

After the consultant terminated from their group, the Project Bootstraps members continued their active involvement in community work. They kept abreast of developments in their legal cases, and they took action steps in attempting to bring a legal determination against the county, as they had done successfully against the city. Too, they began working in other areas of community concern, even though the State Civil Rights Commission did not negotiate their becoming participants in jointly preparing the affirmative action
plan with the city.

A strategy of the county had been to let the case against them lapse, but in a local newspaper article on 5/3/76, it was reported that:

The [State] Civil Rights Commission, Compliance Department, has issued a finding of probable cause of unlawful discrimination against the [Kingston] County Commissioners. ...preliminary investigation...showed that the county 'maintains discretionary policies with regard to advertising employment opportunities, methods of application and the hiring of new employees which have worked to the detriment of black persons as a class and cannot be justified by business necessity.' The finding also said that the county 'employs an insignificant number of black persons within the total community.'

With this finding, as in the case of the city, the State Civil Rights Commission requested that the county attend a conciliation meeting. The county refused to attend this meeting, and said its reason for not doing so was because the finding was by the Compliance Department, instead of the Commission. Later, the Commission formally approved the Compliance Department's finding, but the county again resisted attending a conciliation meeting. Apparently, under the advisement of its lawyer, the county wanted to draw a formal complaint from the State Civil Rights Commission, which would initiate "formal proceedings." Formal proceedings meant that a public hearing would be scheduled by the State Attorney General's Office, and held in Kingston county, itself. If the findings were upheld, it was likely that the county would file an appeal in its own Common Pleas Court, then conveniently dismiss the case. (For more details on these issues, see

In response to the county's maneuvers in resisting to conciliate on the discrimination finding, and in support of the State Civil Rights Commission's efforts, the Project Bootstraps members negotiated getting an article of their own into the newspaper. Their article presented a new perspective, which was that Project Bootstraps would seek to cut off government and state funds to the county until the discrimination suit was conciliated or finalized. In that newspaper article on 9/15/76, it was reported that:

The local chapter of [Bootstraps] said today it will attempt to halt the flow of state and federal funds to [Kingston] County until settlement is reached in the discrimination suit.... [Bootstraps] Coordinator, [Morris K. Evans] said today the organization has requested legal counsel from the [Bootstraps] headquarters in [Metroton], 'to research the feasibility of getting a federal injunction on all state and federal monies coming into [Kingston] County until the suit can be finalized on conciliated. We do not feel our tax dollars should any longer be paid to state and federal agencies until we are equally represented in city and county employment positions,' [Evans] said.

(See, "[Bootstraps] may try to halt flow of gov't funds," on the following page.)

This maneuver on the part of Project Bootstraps was not meant to be an idle threat, because the members of the group actually worked to cut off the flow of government funds to the county. Toward that
Legal action eyed

Bootstraps may try to halt flow of gov't funds

The local chapter of Bootstraps said today it will attempt to halt the flow of state and federal funds to Kingfisher County until settlement is reached in the discrimination suit filed against the county in 1973.

Coordinator (Hermes K. Evans) said today his organization has requested legal counsel from the Urban League headquarters in New York to research the feasibility of getting a federal injunction on all state and federal monies coming into Kingfisher County until the suit can be finalized or conciliated.

"We do not feel our tax dollars should be paid to state and federal agencies until we are equally represented in city and county employment positions," Evans said.

County Auditor Ted R. Bean said such an injunction, if granted, would affect the county's revenue sharing funds which amount to about $222,000 annually, as well as approximately $108,000 received here through the local government fund and the local welfare program. "We could operate without it," Bean said, "but it would mean drastic welfare cuts."

Evans also sent letters to the Office of Revenue Sharing in Washington and to congressmen and senators "to let them know about the discrimination in Kingfisher County."

At last month's meeting the State Civil Rights Commission finally took official action in the Kingfisher County.

The finding was based on the contention that fewer blacks and minority group representatives were employed than the percentage of the race living in the county. The commissioners contend that 5.3 per cent of the employees under them are black as compared to 2.9 percent black residents in the county.

The commission requested a conciliation meeting within ten days but the county's attorney, Kendall Stanford of Kingfisher, was unable to meet in that time frame. He requested a meeting be scheduled anytime after Labor Day.

Indications that Stanford's inability to meet with the time frame set by the [SCRC] would be considered as refusal to conciliate were confirmed today.

The agenda for this month's [SCRC] meeting, being held today in Kingfisher, includes a request for the issuance of a formal complaint against the county and states that "conciliation efforts have been unsuccessful."

PROCEDURE CALLS for the case to be reviewed by the attorney general once a complaint is filed. Stanford said he would probably be meeting with the attorney general during the review process.

Based on the attorney general's recommendation, the case will either be dismissed or scheduled for a public hearing. Stanford said this month's agenda shows eight cases dismissed on submissions from the AG's office.

Over 200 cases where complaints had been issued were dismissed in June and July," Stanford said.

Stanford was unaware of the Bootstraps efforts to stop federal and state monies coming into the county but indicated that such action is possible. "It's been done," he said.
end, they wrote to the U.S. Office of Revenue Sharing, to their congressmen and senators in Washington, D.C., to the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, to the U.S. Attorney General, and to the President of the United States.

Because their case was administrative rather than judicial, the Project Bootstraps members encountered barriers in their efforts to cut off the county's government funds. However, their actions were successful in getting the county formally reprimanded by national officials. One such reprimand was a letter from the National Director of Revenue Sharing, Office of the United States Secretary of the Treasury. (A copy of the letter was sent to the Project Bootstraps leaders.) The letter was addressed to the Chairman of the Kingston County Board of Commissioners and states:

By letter dated September 30, 1976, the Office of Revenue Sharing notified you that a complaint had been received against your government alleging a violation of Section 122(a) of the State and local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. Specifically, it was alleged that the County of [Kingston] discriminates against minorities on the basis of race in employment. ...this letter...is requesting that [Kingston] County provide the Office of Revenue Sharing with written assurances that the County will recruit minority and female applicants for positions as they become available...and that construction...be done by contractors and subcontractors who are equal opportunity employers. The contractor's employees should be reflective of the minority and female composition of the labor force in [Kingston] County.

In addition to prompting such letters, the Project Bootstraps group also likely prevented the case from progressing to the county's Common Pleas Court. From there it would have been convenient for the
county to dismiss the case, but since the case would have become judicial at that point, the county ran a much greater risk of getting its government funds cut off. As it was, the case was turned over to the State Attorney General's Office where it remained open to further legal action from the black community residents. The Project Bootstraps group members' active involvement in the case against the county is one of the ways they demonstrated their ability to use the resources available to them in functioning effectively without the consultant.

Without following the exact sequence of steps in their projected course of action, nevertheless, the members of Project Bootstraps also became more aggressive in attending city council meetings, and otherwise seeking out public officials who could alleviate problems of the black community. An example of how they came to conduct themselves occurred when they were successful at getting repairs to the tracks of a railroad spur that ran through their community. The defective railroad tracks were a long-standing community problem, because trains traveled those tracks carrying dangerous chemicals, and there was a high probability that a serious accident could occur. On the survey, 96.2% of the community residents had indicated that they would like to see the railroad tracks repaired. Representing themselves only as residents of the community, the local leaders of Project Bootstraps, through initial contact with the city council, held a meeting with the proper public officials, and again presented the problem posed to the black community by the defective tracks. The three Project Bootstraps leaders then invited these public officials
to visit the black community and to walk the tracks with them, so that they could actually see the deteriorated condition. This was done, and within a short time afterward, the railroad tracks were repaired. (See, "R.R. spur may trigger action," p. 213 of Appendix C). This description of the way they went about getting the defective railroad tracks repaired is a model of how the Project Bootstraps members began conducting themselves. Whether they represented themselves as Project Bootstraps, or as Concerned Residents, or as concerned residents, they became active in dealing with the problems of their community.
DISCUSSION

The project described in this paper did not begin with the intention of measuring a specific hypothesis. Its goals, as stated in the Introduction, were to develop a psychological approach to community organization, and to explore the feasibility of this approach in a black community. The psychological approach to community organization uses conceptions and strategies drawn primarily from psychology in assisting community residents to deal with their concerns. This approach regards the contact between the consultant and individuals and small groups as the pivotal contact between the professional and the community. It is individuals and small groups who initially act on the system and effect some change in the system through a chain of events.

An analogy, using the idea of concentric circles, offers a paradigm of how a community organization project may progress from this perspective. At the center of the circle is the consultant's contact with individuals. On successive circles out from the center are the consultant's and individuals' contact with small groups, the groups' contact with other community residents, and the community residents' contact with various networks within and outside the community boundaries. The consultant's sphere of direct contact in this process is with individuals and small groups on those circles closest in to the
center. On those circles farthest out from the center, ideas may take the form of action through people who have had little or no direct contact with the consultant.

The importance of the role played by individuals and small groups in this process makes it necessary for the community consultant to develop an applicable theoretical model to facilitate dealing effectively with individuals and small groups. Whether the model is a personality model, behavioristic model, or psychodynamic model is not as important as the consultant having a model and applying it consistently.

The particular framework used in this study was derived from psychoanalytic constructs as described in the Introduction. Briefly, this model stresses the relationship between the consultant and key individuals in the community. Largely through the building of relationships and the residents' experience in working on actual issues, it is expected that they will gain not only skills, but also the maturity and ego-strength to increase their own self-reliance and ability to plan and function effectively within their own cultural framework. The consultant uses psychoanalytic concepts in order to interpret for himself, psychodynamic and sociodynamic processes in which key individuals are involved. Based on these interpretations, the consultant then plans his own actions which are intended to facilitate the community members' efforts. These psychoanalytic constructs are used in combination with a process approach, encouraging residents to see themselves as the mainsprings of action and decision-making and to assume a strong sense of ownership in their accomplishments.
The consultant’s role changed in the course of the project and his developing relationship with the residents. Initially, he was one who gathered information, simply both to get knowledge about the community and to establish rapport with community residents. Secondly, he began to involve them in the community self-survey, functioning in some ways as a teacher, as he guided them in the construction of the survey and in developing the methodology for its interpretation. His participation, though quite active, was technical rather than providing explicit content or directions or giving advice as to what people should do, except for the proposal of the survey as a method for gathering information and involving the people.

During the latter phases of the survey project and the school addition struggle of the Concerned Residents, the consultant functioned more as a process type resource person and Alinsky organizer. In process terms, a substantial number of community residents had taken an active part in the survey and had gained not only in special understanding of their community, but also in active concern about it that had not been present before. However, they did not really know what to do with this concern. To translate their concerns into action, some issue of vital interest to them had to be identified. The consultant felt that unless the community could become actively engaged in something that could have a successful outcome, their interest could not long be maintained, and there would be very little reason for the residents to remain active and see a sense of purpose in their activities. The school addition issue seemed an ideal one for
this purpose, in that it required quick mobilization, quick action and promised a fairly quick outcome.

In his participation in Project Bootstraps, the consultant played an extremely active role, at least initially, both as an advocate and as an organizer. He urged Morris Evans and Fred Taylor to pursue the legal suits because it was an issue the survey had indicated that the community residents would support. Again, he actively helped prepare them for their presentations to official hearings and committees, using role play, emotional support, and most particularly, the relationship the leaders had established, to help them get going. Once the group was organized, however, once they had reached a fairly high level of success, the consultant then became primarily a technical resource rather than a leader. By that time, indeed, the leaders had come to see him as a friend, as someone who had some expertise and information, but they were really perceiving themselves as leaders who were functioning autonomously, making their own decisions, as indicated by the fact that they felt free to reject the consultant's suggestions and request that he assist them instead in the direction that they, themselves, found appropriate.

These changes in the consultant's level of activity in the community are somewhat at variance with most of the recommendations that community organizers make. In general they suggest that, although the organizer may have to be quite active initially in stimulating community efforts, there should be a gradual process of withdrawal from active involvement as the organizer's participation continues. From the perspective of the orientation presented here and the
experience described, the degree of the consultant's involvement does not simply go from high to low, but rather adjusts to the particular phases through which the community organization project evolves. When the black community residents had experienced success through the school additions being approved, it seemed likely, given the original assumptions, that there would be both leaders and a sufficient number of community participants who maintained an active interest and involvement, encouraged by their knowledge and their success. As described in Chapter 3, the consultant found, to his surprise, upon returning at the end of the summer, that there was great reluctance, indeed resistance, to becoming involved in new efforts to develop the community further.

In the absence of empirical data, it is possible only to speculate about the reasons for this resistance. One possibility is that the Concerned Residents' successful effort with the school had served as an emotionally abreacting experience, releasing the anger that had built during the survey. Another possibility from a rather different dynamic, also seemed apparent to the consultant. A number of leaders whom he had encouraged and supported had become visible in the community. Though they were not without recognition and respect, some of them were not part of the most respected establishment, and, in that sense, saw themselves as highly vulnerable to economic and political pressures. Also, the struggle between the white community establishment and the Rev. A.J. Marlow, who had organized civil rights actions, had reached its peak during this period, forcing him out of the community and turning the Steadman Community Center over to an
agency that had little involvement with the black community. From this perspective, it does not seem surprising that many residents, and particularly the new leaders, were somewhat hesitant to take further risks. In a sense, building community interest, community concern, community participation and even relatively strong leadership require a social and political context to be effectively actualized. In particular, even though community interest had been aroused, it was still at a relatively low level. The Libertyville community was still predominantly apathetic in most of its relations to the white community. They still depended on the white community for their survival, and though disadvantaged, most of them were not in an economically desperate state. What was needed, therefore, as Chapter 3 shows, was an issue that could have wide support in the black community, one that could not easily be suppressed by the power structure, one that provided reasonable probabilities of success, and an issue that was recognized as important by the community. Finally, it had to be an issue which would provide visibility and recognition for the local community leadership that had emerged. The consultant recognized that the legal suits met the above conditions and might therefore be an ideal issue for the community, and it was for these reasons that he urged them to pursue it.

As the concentric circles metaphor indicates, the community involvement approach used here worked from the individual outwards toward larger units, so that the white power structure and the larger community formed only a backdrop, although certainly a most influential one. The white community was rather taken by surprise by the
Concerned Residents' involvement in the school issue. As far as the consultant could determine, no community groups had previously taken the trouble or mobilized the energy to present well-developed, carefully documented, well-reasoned arguments and proposals to an official body in opposition or support of policies, apart from perhaps some individually voiced protests or support. The strong, well-organized effort by the Concerned Residents, particularly since it was rather well publicized, and did not present any serious challenge or economic threat to the white community, went through without serious difficulty, though not without some opposition. The issue was quite different with Project Bootstraps. Here, the white community was confronted not only by a local community group who was seeking change, but also by a national organization (Project Bootstraps) and the power of government through the State Civil Rights Commission which intended to implement the law of the land. The first reaction of the city government in Kingston was to deny that any problem existed and even to ignore the presence of the suit. Using a psychoanalytic analogy, this was an institutional counterpart of a defense mechanism of "denial." Even though numerous official communications were addressed to city government through the State Civil Rights Commission, they remained largely inactive. They were quite convinced that since they had succeeded in driving the Rev. Marlow, who had previously organized the local chapter of Project Bootstraps, out of town, there no longer was a leadership or any active group to push for such pursuits at the local level. They, therefore, felt quite safe in ignoring the local group, did not hire a lawyer, or bother to pay attention to the local efforts,
even though these constituted a very serious threat to their normal ways of operating the city. Any further detailed discussion of the city and broader social context in which the Libertyville community development project operated would be beyond the scope of this dissertation, but these comments should indicate that the consultant kept the larger social implications of the project well in mind in his thinking, planning and acting.

The assessment of this project can be approached by attempting to deal with several key questions.

(1) How reasonable (feasible) was it to use a combination of a personality theory (in this case a psychoanalytic one), a process approach, and community organization approaches? During the course of the project it was clear that all three components of the combination were needed to different degrees at different times. Leadership development, and sometimes the analysis of interpersonal interactions on both the small group and the larger social level required the sensitivity and understanding of both intrapsychic and interpersonal dynamics. In the author's view, his awareness of the ambivalences, doubts, and resistances experienced by the leaders, the problems of conflict that inevitably arose between them, the process of group dynamics in the development of the groups—all psychological concepts were of key importance in the organizing process. Although community organizers from different perspectives might intuitively use such concepts as well, a systematically formulated psychological approach provides a potentially more rigorous way of incorporating such notions into community organizing. Psychological perspectives in and
of themselves are not, of course, sufficient. They do not deal ade­quately with many of the political, economic and social issues that arise, and the consultant, therefore, freely borrowed from other approaches. Nevertheless, the work described here should serve to illustrate how others might be able to use a psychological approach as part of their community organizing efforts.

(2) As indicated in Chapter 1, Libertyville could be considered as functioning near the lower end of a Needs—Functioning spectrum, in that most residents felt powerless and helpless and pursued their own security needs with little sense of involvement in their community. Such communities have typically been described as extremely difficult to organize and activate. How well did the Libertyville project do? Judged by the residents' involvement in the survey, the activities of Concerned Residents, the activities of Project Bootstraps, and the publicity and attention generated throughout the larger community about these activities, it would seem that with sufficient energy and effort, mobilizing interest and concern, at least some degree of successful activity is quite possible within relatively short periods of time. The problem may be one of stimulating conditions through which people get a sense of hope that they can exercise some control over their fate. Each of the activities carried out through the project were explicitly designed so as to place ordinary citizens in control. At no time were they dependent on either money or power provided by outside sources.

(3) What is the expense—economically, personally, socially—in carrying through a project like the Libertyville project? In this
case, one individual, working with no monetary support directly allocated for this particular purpose, using his own time and energy, was the only professional resource used. It is clear that, though not many individuals can be expected to work for long periods of time without any source of income, no large staffs, no substantial funding or facilities are really required to help communities become more active and self-reliant.

(4) Finally, one might inquire into the long-range impact of a project like this one. At this writing, even though the consultant's involvement in the community is presently on a short-term, time-limited basis, the groups and their activities continue to have an impact on the community. Black people continue to be hired in increasing numbers by local employers. As an example, the police department has hired a black policeman and Confederated Charities hired a black staff person. It is clear that, beyond the civil rights commission suit, there is a slow but perceptible opening of community resources to black people. Recently, the community received federal funding for a daycare center. Such a center had been desired by many in the community for a long time, but local agencies were largely unresponsive to the black community's concern. Other civil rights actions have been initiated by several of the key people who have been involved in Project Bootstraps. No one can tell, of course, to what extent the continuing economic and political inequality from which most of the black citizens in Libertyville suffer may cause many if not most of them to revert to a relatively apathetic security-seeking state.
However, there is now leadership, some organization, at least a slight penetration of the white community by black people in managerial and professional economic positions, all of which suggests at least a somewhat altered basis for the future.
APPENDIX A

THE LIBERTYVILLE-KINGSTON SURVEY ACTION COMMITTEE

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY
INTRODUCTORY QUESTION:

I. What do you think is the nicest feature of this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A nice place to live</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are friendly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood improving (Garfield) School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Campus Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment complex</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Park Standpipe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing/Don't know</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 133  N=131

Traffic

1. Do you feel there is a traffic problem in this community? (N=133)

( ) Yes 75.9%
( ) No 24.1%

2. What kind of traffic problems do you think are the worst? (N=105)

20.0% ( ) A. traffic too heavy
66.7% ( ) B. speeding cars
13.3% ( ) C. Other _________________

3. Do you think more one-way streets could make our traffic problems better? (N=105)

31.4% ( ) Yes
67.6% ( ) No
1.0% ( ) No response

4. Do you think we should ask for more enforcement of the law against speeding cars? (N=132)

( ) Yes 86.4%
( ) No 13.6%
5. Would you be willing to serve on a mothers' or father's traffic safety patrol? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  54.5%
   ( ) No   45.5%

6. Would you like to see more police patrolling the traffic near the Garfield School district? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  90.2%
   ( ) No   9.8%  

   Senior Citizens

7. Do you have relatives or friends who are senior citizens? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  91.7%
   ( ) No   8.3%

8. Do you have special concerns about senior citizens? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  80.3%
   ( ) No   19.7%

9. Would you be willing to help senior citizens with a home improvement program? (Cut grass, paint houses, carpentry, weed control) (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  73.5%
   ( ) No   26.5%

   Transportation

10. What kind of transportation do you use most? (N=133)
    64.7%( ) A. your own car
    10.5%( ) B. a friend's car
    2.3%( ) C. a car pool
    3.8%( ) D. taxi
    3.0%( ) E. bicycle
    15.9%( ) F. walk

11. Do you have transportation problems? (N=133)
    ( ) Yes  26.3%
    ( ) No   73.7%
12. Do you think a bus system would be good for Kingston? (N=133)

( ) Yes 69.2%
( ) No 30.1%
No Answer 0.8%

13. What kind of bus system do you think would be best? (N=92)

18.5% ( ) A. dial-a-bus
39.1% ( ) B. mini-bus
39.1% ( ) C. regular rate bus
3.3% ( ) D. other

14. What hours should the bus run?

15. Should our bus system let senior citizens and children ride for less than regular adult fare? (N=93)

( ) Yes 97.8%
( ) No 2.2%

16. Which of the following do you think would be best: a bus system funded by (N=90)

56.7% ( ) A. the federal government
12.2% ( ) B. the state
17.8% ( ) C. the city
8.9% ( ) D. a private enterprise
4.4% ( ) E. other

17. What route would you suggest for a bus in the Libertyville area? (see map on next page)

18. Would you be willing to utilize the services of a bus to and from work? (N=121)

( ) Yes 57.9%
( ) No 42.1%

19. Are you willing to approach the school board with a group from this community to get the services of unused school buses during the summer to transport our children to and from recreational places? (N=130)

( ) Yes 84.6%
( ) No 15.4%
20. In your opinion, recreational facilities in the city of Kingston are: (N=131)

( ) A. very good 1.5%
( ) B. good 5.3%
( ) C. average 22.1%
( ) D. poor 35.9%
( ) E. very poor 34.4%
( ) F. no response 0.8%

21. Are there any bars or clubs downtown that you favor attending? (N=133)

( ) Yes 21.8%
( ) No 78.2%

22. Show how you see this neighborhood's recreational facilities for the following age groups by listing as either good, average or poor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre school</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle age</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Would you like to see a new recreation center in this area? (N=132)

( ) Yes 95.5%
( ) No 4.5%

24. Do you see a need for better playground facilities? (N=133)

( ) Yes 91.0%
( ) No 8.3%
( ) No Answer 0.8%
25. Are you in favor of the recreation program at Garfield School gym?  (N=132)

( ) Yes  73.5%
( ) No  3.8%
( ) Don’t Know 22.7%

26. Do any members of your family attend Steadman Community Center programs and activities?  (N=133)

( ) Yes  55.6%
( ) No  44.4%

27. Would you be willing to volunteer some time to help supervise a recreational program at the Steadman Center?  (N=133)

( ) Yes  62.4%
( ) No  37.6%

Programs

28. Would you want Kingston City College to start educational programs open to our community?  (N=131)

( ) Yes  87.8%
( ) No  12.2%

29. Which do you think is most important right now to you or your family?  (N=115)

27.8% ( ) A. adult continuing education
40.9% ( ) B. a tutoring program for school children
27.0% ( ) C. courses in reading and vocabulary
  4.3% ( ) D. other

30. Which one of the following services do you think is most needed in Libertyville right now?  (N=130)

27.7% ( ) A. Big Brother organization
32.3% ( ) B. legal aid society
23.1% ( ) C. counseling service
  8.5% ( ) D. tenants union
  8.5% ( ) E. other
31. Do you have talent you'd be willing to share with other community people in any of the following areas (interviewee may respond to more than one): (N=133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Other Talent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arts and crafts</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>martial arts</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgeting money</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>musical instruments</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpentry</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>photography</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaching-sports</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>printing</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer programming</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>proposal writing</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counseling</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>secretarial skills</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawing</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>sewing</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family/Children

32. Are there children in your family? (N=133)

( ) Yes 72.2%  
( ) No 27.8%

33. How many children are in your family? (N=95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 1 child</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 2 children</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 3 children</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 4 children</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 5 children</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. 6 children</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. more than 6 children</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. What are their ages (interviewees may respond to more than one category): (N=98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. to 5</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 6-12</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 13-15</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 16-18</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 19+</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. How many of your children live at home with you? (N=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 1 child</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 2 children</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 3 children</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 4 children</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 5 or more</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. How well would you say that you understand your children? (N=93)

62.4% ( ) A. very well
29.0% ( ) B. fairly well
2.2% ( ) C. somewhat
4.3% ( ) D. very little
2.2% ( ) E. not at all

37. How well would you say your children understand you? (N=93)

54.8% ( ) A. very well
29.0% ( ) B. fairly well
8.6% ( ) C. somewhat
4.3% ( ) D. very little
3.2% ( ) E. not at all

38. Is this a one-parent family? (N=96)

37.5% ( ) Yes
62.5% ( ) No

39. Do you believe one-parent families have a more difficult time than two-parent families? (N=41)

68.3% ( ) Yes
31.7% ( ) No

40. How would you feel about a parents-without-partners group being started in Libertyville? (N=43)

83.7% ( ) A. Like the idea
16.3% ( ) B. Do not like the idea

41. What percentage of your family buying is done in Kingston? (N=133)

56.4% ( ) A. 90%
18.8% ( ) B. 75%
10.5% ( ) C. 50%
9.8% ( ) D. 25%
4.5% ( ) E. 10% or less
42. What would you say is the most serious problem that faces you as a family? (N=116)

55.2% ( ) A. Money
14.7% ( ) B. Nothing
6.0% ( ) C. Medical
6.0% ( ) D. Jobs
0.9% ( ) E. Religion
1.7% ( ) F. Housing
5.2% ( ) G. Rearing children
2.6% ( ) H. Lack of activities
3.4% ( ) I. Lack of understanding
0.9% ( ) J. Adjustment to changing times
3.4% ( ) K. Don't know

Medical/Dental

43. Are local medical services suitable to your family's needs? (N=132)

( ) Yes 59.8%
( ) No 40.2%

44. List the following health services in Kingston as either good, average or poor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Good %</th>
<th>Average %</th>
<th>Poor %</th>
<th>No Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Are you concerned about sickle-cell anemia? (N=132)

( ) Yes 80.3%
( ) No 19.7%

46. Do you visit the dentist at least once a year? (N=132)

( ) Yes 59.8%
( ) No 40.2%
47. Which of the following are reasons you visit the dentist less than once per year: (N=52)

- 25.0% ( ) A. can't afford it
- 13.8% ( ) B. no transportation
- 7.7% ( ) C. didn't know about available service
- 63.5% ( ) D. forgot about it
- 19.2% ( ) E. other

48. In what condition are your teeth? (N=129)

- 23.3% ( ) A. very good
- 48.1% ( ) B. good
- 20.2% ( ) C. fair
- 3.1% ( ) D. poor
- 5.4% ( ) E. bad

49. Is there anyone in your family who needs dental care? (N=132)

- ( ) Yes 56.1%
- ( ) No 43.9%

50. Do you feel the people in Libertyville get enough dental care? (N=127)

- ( ) Yes 18.9%
- ( ) No 72.4%
- ( ) Don't know 8.7%

51. If a group in this community arrange for the county to establish a dental care unit would you make arrangements in your schedule to participate? (N=128)

- ( ) Yes 78.1%
- ( ) No 21.9%

52. Would you be willing to coordinate schedules for a dentist doing volunteer work in this community? (N=130)

- ( ) Yes 76.9%
- ( ) No 22.3%
- ( ) Undecided 0.8%
Day Care

53. Do you think this community needs a children's day care center? (N=132)

(  ) Yes 97.0%
(  ) No 1.5%
(  ) Don't know 1.5%

54. Would you be willing to participate on a committee from this community to investigate ways of getting a day care center for Libertyville? (N=131)

(  ) Yes 77.9%
(  ) No 22.1%

55. Would you support the idea of a federally funded day care center here? (N=131)

(  ) Yes 96.2%
(  ) No 3.8%

56. Do you have any children that you would place in a day care center if Libertyville had one? (N=129)

(  ) Yes Ages 40.3%
(  ) No 59.7%

57. Do you babysit now? (N=131)

(  ) Yes 17.6%
(  ) No 82.4%

58. If Yes:

A. how many hours per week _____
B. number of children ___________
C. ages of children ___________
D. how much do you earn babysitting (hour) ___________

59. Would you be interested in working in a day care center caring for infants and children? (N=131)

(  ) Yes 35.9%
(  ) No 64.1%

60. Would you be interested in providing transportation for children to a preschool program? (N=131)

(  ) Yes 45.0%
(  ) No 55.0%
Housing

61. Are you satisfied with the condition of your home (house, apartment)? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes 51.9%
   ( ) No 48.1%

62. Does your home (house, apartment) need any repairs? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes 72.0%
   ( ) No 28.0%

63. Do you either own or are buying your home (house, apartment)? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes 57.1%
   ( ) No 42.9%

64. Does your landlord make needed repairs? (N=65)
   ( ) Yes 43.1%
   ( ) No 55.4%

65. Have you or any of your relatives or friends had trouble finding suitable housing? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes 60.2%
   ( ) No 39.8%

66. Was the trouble because: (N=80)
    20.0% ( ) A. housing was unavailable
    31.3% ( ) B. housing was too expensive
    10.0% ( ) C. housing was poorly constructed
    5.0% ( ) D. housing was unfavorably located
    33.8% ( ) E. discrimination
    ( ) F. other ____________________

Jobs

67. Are you working at present? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes 54.9%
   ( ) No 45.1%

68. Are you satisfied with your present job? (N=73)
   69.9% ( ) Yes
   28.8% ( ) No
If you are not satisfied it because: (N=20)

55.0% ( ) A. you are qualified for better position
25.0% ( ) B. your interest lies in a different area
5.0% ( ) C. you don't like your working hours
( ) D. you don't like the people you work with
15.0% ( ) E. salary too low

Are you looking for a job? (N=60)

( ) Yes 41.7%
( ) No 58.3%

Have you had difficulty finding a job? (N=56)

( ) Yes 46.4%
( ) No 53.6%

What type of job would you like? (N=25)

28.0% ( ) A. unskilled
20.0% ( ) B. skilled and semi-skilled blue collar
36.0% ( ) C. white collar clerical and sales
12.0% ( ) D. professional and managerial
4.0% ( ) E. don't know

Do you think schools of Kingston are preparing people for jobs of today? (N=131)

( ) Yes 33.6%
( ) No 61.1%
( ) Don't know 5.3%

Do you feel there is a need for better career counseling in the schools? (N=132)

( ) Yes 91.7%
( ) No 6.1%
( ) Don't know 2.3%
75. Do you know there is a Joint Vocational School open to any resident of Kingston County? (It offers courses toward getting a high school diploma, courses in auto mechanics, welding, tax preparation, typing, etc.) (N=132)

( ) Yes 80.3%
( ) No 19.7%

Crime

76. Do you feel that the crime rate in Libertyville is on the increase? (N=132)

( ) Yes 58.3%
( ) No 39.4%
( ) Don't know 2.3%

The Police/Law/Courts

77. Do you believe the police are rougher on blacks than they are on whites? (N=130)

( ) Yes 66.9%
( ) No 28.5%
( ) Don't know 4.6%

78. Do you believe the police harass certain people? (N=131)

( ) Yes 77.1%
( ) No 19.3%
( ) Don't know 4.6%

79. Do you believe the police are properly trained? (N=130)

( ) Yes 34.6%
( ) No 57.7%
( ) Don't know 7.7%

80. Do you feel that minorities get fair treatment in the courts? (N=132)

( ) Yes 26.5%
( ) No 68.2%
( ) Don't know 5.3%

81. Do you feel that there should be a minority recruiting program for the police department? (N=133)

( ) Yes 91.0%
( ) No 8.3%
( ) Don't know .8%
82. Do you feel there should be minorities working in the court system? (N=133)

( ) Yes 96.2%
( ) No 3.8%

83. Do you feel there should be a police review board? (With a variety of classes of people.) (N=133)

( ) Yes 95.5%
( ) No 4.5%

Drug Abuse

84. In your opinion, people in Libertyville regard drug abuse as a: (N=132)

40.9% ( ) A. Major concern
30.3% ( ) B. Moderate concern
18.2% ( ) C. Small concern
9.1% ( ) D. little or no concern
1.5% ( ) E. Don't know

85. The primary age range of drug users in this community is:
(N=125)

1.6% ( ) A. 6-9
3.2% ( ) B. 10-15
51.2% ( ) C. 16-20
40.0% ( ) D. 21-39
2.4% ( ) E. over 40
1.6% ( ) F. Don't know

86. Is drug abuse a problem for anyone you know? (N=133)

45.1% ( ) Yes
54.9% ( ) No

87. Who would you contact if someone close to you were having problems from an over-dose of drugs: (N=131)

75.6% ( ) A. a hospital emergency squad
3.1% ( ) B. the local community mental health center
8.4% ( ) C. help anonymous
6.1% ( ) D. an ex-drug user
6.9% ( ) E. other __________________________
Would you like to see the following in Libertyville:

A. better drainage systems and open ditches closed? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes  95.5%
   ( ) No   3.8%
   ( ) No response  .8%

B. the burned-out houses torn down? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  99.2%
   ( ) No   .8%

C. better paved roads? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  97.7%
   ( ) No   2.3%

D. better pet control? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  82.6%
   ( ) No   17.4%

E. a clean-up on the junk cars? (N=130)
   ( ) Yes  97.7%
   ( ) No   2.3%

F. street lights on Walnut Street? (N=131)
   ( ) Yes  96.9%
   ( ) No   3.1%

G. the machinery fenced in? (N=132)
   ( ) Yes  94.7%
   ( ) No   5.3%

H. weed control on vacant lots? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes  99.2%
   ( ) No   .8%

I. the railroad tracks repaired? (N=133)
   ( ) Yes  96.2%
   ( ) No   3.8%
89. How do you see the following city services (good, average or poor):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street lights</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewers</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash pickup</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. Would you be willing to participate in a clean up program in Libertyville? (N=133)

(  ) Yes  75.9%
(  ) No   24.1%

91. Recently the City of Kingston began exploring possibilities to rezone a portion of this community B-3, for General Business, and a smaller part M-2, for light manufacturing. With regard to rezoning in this area you are: (N=133)

18.8% (  ) A. definitely for rezoning
48.9% (  ) B. definitely against rezoning
20.3% (  ) C. undecided
12.0% (  ) D. don't know

Climate of the Community

92. If you get involved with seeking solutions to local problems are you afraid:

A. You will lose your job? (N=132)

(  ) Yes  14.4%
(  ) No   85.6%
B. you will not get bank loans, other credit, extra jobs and political assignments? (N=131)

( ) Yes 19.1%
( ) No 80.9%

C. of personal attacks on your character from blacks? (N=131)

( ) Yes 16.0%
( ) No 84.0%

D. you will lose your white friends?

( ) Yes 6.9%
( ) No 93.1%

93. Are you dissatisfied with the results achieved from groups that have tried to bring about change? (N=130)

( ) Yes 60.0%
( ) No 39.2%

94. Have you lost interest because so many groups have organized and died in a short time? (N=131)

( ) Yes 63.4%
( ) No 36.6%

95. Do you believe change is possible for Kingston? (N=132)

( ) Yes 91.7%
( ) No 8.3%

96. Do you believe Kingston lacks black leaders really interested in improving the community? (N=132)

( ) Yes 81.1%
( ) No 18.2%
( ) Don't know .0%

97. Do you believe Kingston has no problems? (N=132)

( ) Yes 4.5%
( ) No 95.6%

98. Do you believe it will do no good to try to change conditions since white people run everything anyway? (N=131)

( ) Yes 19.1%
( ) No 80.2%
99. Do you believe those trying to bring about change will stop when they get what they want? (N=132)

( ) Yes 40.2%
( ) No 58.3%

100. Are you afraid you will have to do all the work if you get involved? (N=131)

( ) Yes 16.0%
( ) No 84.0%

101. Have you been betrayed to whites by blacks? (N=128)

( ) Yes 32.0%
( ) No 66.4%
( ) Don't know 1.6%

102. Do you question the background of some of the people who do get involved in groups seeking change? (N=131)

( ) Yes 51.9%
( ) No 48.1%

103. Do you prefer to take care of problems that affect you only and let each person do the same? (N=126)

( ) Yes 34.1%
( ) No 65.9%

104. Would you be willing to join a discussion group to explore methods of solving community problems? (N=131)

( ) Yes 77.9%
( ) No 21.4%
( ) Undecided .8%

105. Which of the following would you patronize if they were owned and operated by people in this community. Interviewer may respond to more than one item: (N=133)

57.6% ( ) A. savings and loan association
56.8% ( ) B. a funeral home
75.0% ( ) C. a bowling alley
81.8% ( ) D. a restaurant
68.2% ( ) E. a night club
72.7% ( ) F. a skating rink
68.9% ( ) G. a laundromat
74.2% ( ) H. a cleaners
66.7% ( ) I. an auto repair shop
64.4% ( ) J. a games parlor
Discrimination

106. Do you feel discrimination is a problem in this community? (N=133)

( ) Yes 78.2%
( ) No 21.8%

107. Are you presently doing anything to correct the problem? (N=102)

( ) Yes 38.2%
( ) No 61.8%

108. In what way are you working on the problem? (N=59)

40.7% ( ) A. in a group
59.3% ( ) B. as an individual

109. In which of the following areas do you feel the problem of discrimination is the greatest? (N=104)

21.2% ( ) A. housing
24.0% ( ) B. education
44.2% ( ) C. employment
5.8% ( ) D. lending institutions
4.3% ( ) E. others

110. What would you suggest be done in the way of resolving the problem? (N=104)

21.2% ( ) A. invite in outside civil rights agencies and/or initiate legal action
13.5% ( ) B. organize black people in the community to act as a group
3.8% ( ) C. improve communications between blacks and whites
5.8% ( ) D. increase hiring of blacks at all levels of employment, especially in professional and managerial positions
1.0% ( ) E. Prepare blacks to hold jobs at all levels of employment, especially professional and managerial positions
5.8% ( ) F. Hire more black teachers and counselors
5.8% ( ) G. provide better education for blacks
1.9% ( ) H. develop low income housing projects
1.9% ( ) I. move into better houses outside the black community
2.9% ( ) J. develop more black financiers, brokers, realtors, and other businessmen
2.9% ( ) K. fire some of the existing white public officials
1.9% ( ) L. get rid of "Uncle Toms"
1.9% ( ) M. Have demonstrations and/or a city war
1.9% ( ) N. develop more love for humanity
16.3% ( ) O. don't know
11.5% ( ) P. no response

111. What is the real problem? (N=29)

17.2% ( ) A. There are no problems
3.4% ( ) B. Lack of money
3.4% ( ) C. Lack of jobs
3.4% ( ) D. Lack of communication and understanding
3.4% ( ) E. Lack of recreation for kids
( ) F. Lack of organization
3.4% ( ) G. Too much traditionalism
6.9% ( ) H. Too many groups formed with no results
1.9% ( ) I. People not working together
6.9% ( ) J. People worrying about others and not themselves
6.9% ( ) K. White people running the town
13.8% ( ) L. Ignorance, laziness and selfishness
3.4% ( ) M. Government
20.7% ( ) N. Don't know
3.4% ( ) O. No response

112. Would you be willing to help in directing the community in solving this problem? (N=26)

( ) Yes 53.8%
( ) No 46.2%

113. Why do you feel people identified this problem as discrimination? (N=29)

6.9% ( ) A. Not getting the right type of jobs
6.9% ( ) B. Discrimination in the whole city filters to our community
6.9% ( ) C. Residents not organized
3.4% ( ) D. Welfare people and criminals always shouting that something is wrong
13.8% ( ) E. Nothing else to say
114. What steps can we take to show the people the real problem? (N=29)

10.3% ( ) A. There are no problems
10.3% ( ) B. Organize black people
6.9% ( ) C. Let white people know that black people in this community are qualified for jobs
3.4% ( ) D. Put blacks in high capacities
3.4% ( ) E. Train the children in the community
3.4% ( ) F. People can't be changed
10.3% ( ) G. Try to make people aware that there is a problem
31.0% ( ) H. Don't know
20.7% ( ) I. No response

Sex: Male 42.9% (N=133)
Female 57.1%

Age: Under 20 12.8% (N=133)
20-34 42.1%
35-44 11.3%
45-54 15.0%
55-64 6.0%
65 or over 12.8%

Marital Status: Single 30.8% (N=133)
Married 42.9%
Widower 8.3%
Divorced 14.3%
Separated 3.8%

Occupation: Unemployed 11.3% (N=129)
Retired 11.3%
Student 12.0%
Housewife 12.0%
Unskilled 16.5%
Skilled & semi-skilled 15.8%
White collar clerical & sales 14.3%
Professional & manag. 3.8%
Formal Education (N=131)

(a) elementary school diploma 28.6%
(b) high school diploma 55.6%
(c) 4-year college diploma 6.0%
(d) graduate school diploma 0.8%
(e) professional school diploma 6.0%

How long have you lived in Kingston? (N=128)

1. less than 1 year 1.5%
2. 1-5 years 7.5%
3. 6-10 years 12.0%
4. 11-15 years 9.0%
5. 16-20 years 12.8%
6. 21-25 years 12.0%
7. 26-30 years 15.0%
8. 31-35 years 5.3%
9. 36-40 years 4.5%
10. 41-45 years 5.3%
11. 46-50 years 3.8%
12. 51-55 years 3.8%
13. 56-60 years 0.8%
14. 61-65 years 0.8%
15. 66-70 years 1.5%
16. over 70 years 0.8%

Ending Question: Is there anything else you would like to have seen covered on this survey? (N=107)

Yes 16.5%
No 63.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Approx. Age</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle, Lawrence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>Machine operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleon, Hernandez</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Trade School</td>
<td>Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlap, Carolyn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B.A. Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Morris K.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Factor worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Yvonne L.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Business College</td>
<td>Beautician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Francis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 Years College</td>
<td>Recreation Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, Billie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Business College</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Fred (Stag)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2-3 Years College</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Paul</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Flora</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Daniel</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Grover</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>College teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillen, Jack</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Theological College</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill, E.F.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, Robert</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B.A. degree</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Prospective Membership Status</td>
<td>Approximate Age</td>
<td>Educational Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, James</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Matthew</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Charles</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Meadow</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyers, Jacquelyn</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman, Robert</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Lloyd</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Betty</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Business College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, Gregory</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Attendance Record of Project Bootstraps Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>11/14</th>
<th>11/21</th>
<th>12/1</th>
<th>12/3</th>
<th>12/15</th>
<th>1/5</th>
<th>2/2</th>
<th>3/1</th>
<th>3/22</th>
<th>4/5</th>
<th>5/3</th>
<th>7/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle, Lawrence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLeon, Hernandez</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlap, Carolyn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Morris K.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Yvonne L.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Francis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, Billie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Fred (Stag)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Flora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Daniel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Grover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillen, Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill, E.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, Robert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Members</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>3/22</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyers, Jacquelyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Newspaper Articles
Bootstraps charges
not considered by rights unit

The Civil Rights Commission failed to act Tuesday on charges of unfair minority hiring practices leveled against the city of Kingston by the local chapter of [Bootsraps].

The charges were filed last January against both the city and county. Last week [Newton Inn], an investigator of the Civil Rights Commission, said he had found "probable cause of discrimination" in city government and indicated he would recommend to the commission that action be taken to reach a "voluntary agreement to bring the city into compliance with the law." He said action could be expected at Tuesday's meeting.

Although nine cases were considered at Tuesday's meeting, there was no report of discussion involving the local charges. By law the commission must rule on the charges within a year of filing.

A spokesman for the Civil Rights Commission in [Centralton] said today the matter will undoubtedly be considered at the Jan. 9 meeting of the commission to comply with the deadline statute.
Bootstraps' charges remain active for CRC action

The charges filed by the local chapter of 'Bootstraps' against the City and County failed to make the agenda of today's Greene Civil Rights Commission meeting. According to local interpretation of the Revised Code, they should have pushed the case past the deadline and meant that the charges were no longer valid.

However, an official at the Greene Civil Rights Commission today denounced that interpretation and indicated the commission's jurisdiction in the matter will continue.

'Bootstraps' chief investigator for the southeast region of the SCRC said the deadline applies only in situations where a clear-cut violation occurred on a specific day. 'Then,' he said, 'the commission has one year, less one day, from the date of the violation in which to take action.' He said the charges against the Kingsport governmental units were 'of a general nature and constitute a continuing violation not affected by the deadline.'

He charged discriminatory hiring practices against blacks prior to the date (Jan. 15, 1973) when charges were filed. According to the Civil Rights Commission's interpretation, the practices are continuing.

One year or unless a 'substantial black hiring effort is instituted the charge affidavit remains open.'

City Manager Frank Hessler said today there apparently is no way for the city to get away from the charges.

'We're still working on an affirmative action program and continue to be concerned that our hiring practices are not discriminatory—but any substantial black hiring effort is out of the question,' he said. He explained that the turnover among city employees is so low that only two or three jobs open up in any given year.

An attorney employed by the county commissioners to represent the county in the action, was not available for comment this morning. It was 'Bootstraps' who originally pointed out the one-year time limit on Civil Rights actions.

Under the new interpretation of the code, both the city and county are still subject to action by the commission. Investigations of both governmental units have been made and additional requested materials supplied to the investigator.

When the charges are finally considered by the commission, a determination of the validity of the charges will be made. They can be found invalid and no action will follow or they can be found to be true and a series of actions will follow to bring compliance with fair hiring laws.

The latter action can culminate in a court case if the local governments fail to make satisfactory efforts to comply.
**Bootstraps Suit Pending**

The [Project Bootstraps] job discrimination suit against the city of [Kingston] and [Kingston] County is still pending according to [Morris Evans] coordinator of [Bootstraps].

The charges were filed in early November, and no action has been taken by the [State] Civil Rights Commission. [Evans] said they had hoped for action by now, but it is hard to say when they will rule. He added that the commission could take one of three alternatives on the suit: noruling at all, probable cause, or favorable.

[Evans] said [Bootstraps] objects to "stringent qualifications" for government jobs, and if on-the-job training was established these qualifications could be met.

"They will have to decide what actions to take which could be as soon as a week," [Evans] added.

[Project Bootstraps] is not involved in an indictment of the [Kingston] County Bank for job discrimination, [Evans] said. "At the present time there is nothing against the bank, however it may come up later."
Another month has passed with no action by the State Civil Rights Commission on discrimination charges filed over a year ago by the local chapter of Bootstraps.

A spokesman for the Commission in Kingston today confirmed that the Bootstraps charges were not on the agenda for today's monthly meeting of the civil rights group. The next meeting will be March 9.

The charges were filed on Jan. 16, 1975, alleging that both the City of Kingston and County practice discrimination in their hiring of blacks.

Investigations were conducted personally by Newton Ives whose reports will form the basis of a decision by the commission. That body decides on the validity of the charges and will determine whether further action is to be taken.

County officials said they have had no word from the commission recently. Requests for additional information on county hiring practices are being funneled through Kendall Stanton, a River City attorney employed by the county commissioners.

City Manager Frank Hessler reported a request for more "technical information", including names and dates, was received by the city just Monday.

Because the original charges were general rather than specific, the commission's jurisdiction in the matter can continue indefinitely.
The Stohg Civil Rights Commission met today but again there was no action on local discrimination suits filed by the Kingston Chapter of Bootstraps.

The suits were filed against both the City of Kingston and County in February, 1975, charging those governments were practicing discriminatory hiring practices.

Investigations into those charges have been conducted by an employee of the Civil Rights Commission but no further action can be taken until the charges are considered by the commission.
With SCRC

Council to study conciliation pact

City Council at its May 10 meeting will consider a proposed ordinance authorizing City Manager Frank Hessler to sign a conciliation agreement with the State Civil Rights Commission.

Hessler and City Attorney Don Curry met for 30 minutes Friday with SCRC field representative, Newton Ives, the conciliator assigned to handle the case. Hessler and Curry found no objection to the proposed conciliation agreement which would require the city to develop an Affirmative Action Program for minority hiring.

The SCRC notified the city April 9 that after a preliminary investigation probable cause was found that the City of Kingston has engaged in unlawful discrimination practices.

UNDER THE PROPOSAL the city would submit an Affirmative Action Program within 120 days of ratification of the proposed order to the Southeast Regional Office for approval. The Affirmative Action Program is aimed at insuring minority employment levels equal to the percentage of minority persons within the general Kingston County population.

At the Friday meeting in Central Office Hessler told Ives that City Council will have to authorize him to sign the agreement and that council may want to take the matter to three readings.

Ives told Hessler he will write him a letter explaining the need for prompt action by council.

Hessler said he asked Ives why the decision was sent to the city April 9 before the matter was placed on a formal agenda of the SCRC.

Ives explained that the matter will be on an SCRC agenda at a later date—possibly in May—but added that normal procedure is for the Compliance Department to send out the notice in the name of the commission.

Hessler said Hessler said the commissioners usually confirm the Compliance Department's decision.

The local chapter of Bootstrap filed charges Jan. 16, 1975 against the City and County of Kingston. Although the suits were filed simultaneously, a Civil Rights Commission spokesman has explained that the investigations have been handled separately.
SCRC urges city action on conciliation

City Manager Frank Hessier turned over to City Council Monday evening a letter from the State Civil Rights Commission urging council action on a conciliation agreement at the May 10 council meeting.

Hessier received the letter from Newton Ives, field representative handling the conciliation, who stated that the SCRC must receive final notice on the results of the conciliation efforts on or before May 11. This would mean that council could not hold three readings on the matter but could pass it as an emergency measure.

Council must authorize Hessier to sign the agreement which would require the city to develop an Affirmative Action Program for minority hiring.

The SCRC notified the city April 9 that after a preliminary investigation probable cause was found that the City of Kingston has engaged in unlawful discrimination practices. The local chapter of Bootstrap filed the charges Jan. 16, 1973.
County faces finding it discriminates in hiring

The St. Croix Civil Rights Commission, Compliance Department, has issued a finding of probable cause of unlawful discrimination against the St. Croix County Commissioners.

The finding stems from a discrimination suit filed in January, 1975 by [names redacted].

Conciliation has already been reached in a similar suit against the city.

According to the finding, preliminary investigation by the SCRC showed that the county "maintains discretionary policies with regard to advertising employment opportunities, methods of solicitation and the hiring of new employees which have worked to the detriment of black persons as a class and cannot be justified by business necessity."

The finding also said that the county "employs an insignificant number of black persons as compared to the percentage of black persons within the total community."

The finding came as a surprise to county officials. During a general meeting last week between county staff and [names redacted], a St. Croix attorney employed to represent the county in civil rights action, indications were that there were no problems and that the case might well be allowed to lapse.

The case has never been before the Civil Rights Commission as a whole, but a spokesman at the SCRC said today that the Compliance Department was delegated the authority to make an initial finding. The commission will approve the finding at its regular meeting on Aug. 10, the spokesman said.

The case against the city was handled in a similar manner.

The SCRC set Thursday as the final day for county representatives to meet with Civil Rights officials on a possible conciliation. If conciliation is not reached the case will go "formal proceedings," the letter said. The SCRC spokesman said "formal proceedings means a public hearing would be scheduled by the State Attorney General's office.

Although the county's official stand was that it would be "inappropriate to comment" since the matter is in the hands of an attorney, indications are that the county plans to take a firm stand in the matter. There was an obvious feeling that conciliation would be a tacit admission of guilt.

"We haven't done anything wrong and we're not going to allow them to make it look as though we have," Commissioner [names redacted] said.

An initial response to the Civil Rights investigation claimed the commissioners are responsible for hiring 19 of the 223 total county employees. The county also filed the required affirmative action policy with the SCRC last fall.

The St. Croix will meet this week with SCRC officials to attempt to determine the basis for the negative finding.
County holds back on conciliation talks

Representatives of the Kingston County did not meet with the State Civil Rights Commission Wednesday and there are no indications that a meeting will take place today, according to Hugh Hopkins of the Central Office of the SCRC.

The SCRC Compliance Dept., after issuing a finding of probable cause of discrimination last week, asked the county commissioners or their representative to meet either Wednesday or Thursday of this week for a conciliation effort.

Charges of discrimination were filed against the county in early 1975 by the local chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The county employed attorney Kendall Stanton of the River City law firm of Bevin and Randall to represent local officials in the matter.

Stanton reportedly told Civil Rights officials he would not meet with them until the commission as a whole confirmed the discrimination finding made by the Compliance Department. Hopkins said the authority to make such a finding had been delegated to Compliance and the commission approval at its Tuesday meeting is assured.

Hopkins said today the commissioners and Stanton will be “verbally notified” of the SCRC's confirmation of the earlier action after Tuesday's meeting.

“We'll try to set up another conciliation meeting at that time,” Hopkins said, but added, “We're not overly enthusiastic about the prospects for conciliation.”

The SCRC is claiming the affirmative action statement, filed by the county last fall, has not been followed. “We'd like to see the county be more aggressive in its hiring of minority groups,” Hopkins said.

If conciliation cannot be reached, Hopkins said a public hearing will be scheduled in Kingston County with a hearing examiner appointed by the SCRC. He said the examiner would likely be a Central attorney.

If the examiner, after the hearing, upholds the SCRC finding of probable cause of discrimination, the commission will issue an order for the county to comply. At that point, Hopkins said, the issue can be appealed in the Kingston County Common Pleas Court and could even be appealed all the way to the supreme Court.

A similar suit, filed against the City of Kingston, was conciliated earlier this year but county officials have evidenced a reluctance to conciliate, claiming conciliation is a tacit admission of some wrongdoing.
Against county

[SCRC] okays finding of discrimination

The State Civil Rights Commission has formally approved the finding of probable cause of discrimination against King County.

At its regular meeting Tuesday the [SCRC] upheld the finding made earlier this month by the Commission's Compliance Division. Hugh Hopkins, a spokesman for the compliance group, said the county was not actively following its affirmative action plan submitted in 1975.

Hopkins said the county's attorney, Kendall Stanton of the River City law firm of Barton Bevin and Randall, would be contacted today to attempt to set up a meeting. Stanton refused to meet with the [SCRC] after the earlier finding, maintaining the commission had not followed its own regulations.

Hopkins could not be reached today for comment.

Hopkins said the meeting would be aimed at some type of conciliation agreement. He added that while he is hopeful that some agreement may be reached, he is not too optimistic.

County officials have held that conciliation indicates a tacit agreement that there has been wrongdoing on the part of the county. The commissioners say they have not been guilty of wrongdoing and have indicated they will take a hard line in opposing the finding.

If the county chooses to fight the finding there could be an appeal through the appellate process which would probably lead to a reaffirmation of the finding by the [SCRC]. A compliance order could be issued to the county which would then put the county in a position to file an appeal in the local Common Pleas Court.

The finding resulted from charges filed in 1974 by the local chapter of [Boots strap].

No specific instances of discrimination were listed in the charge, only an overall discrimination. This allowed the case to drag on beyond the usual one-year limit.

A similar suit, filed against the city, has been conciliated.
SCRC may file complaint against county Sept. 14

A formal complaint may be issued against the Kingston County Commissioners at the Sept. 14 meeting of the SCRC Civil Rights Commission.

At its Tuesday meeting, the commission approved an earlier finding by the SCRC Compliance Division that there was probable cause of discrimination in the county's hiring practices. The county's civil rights attorney, Kendall Shawford of River City, was notified of the finding and asked to meet with commission representatives this week to conciliate the finding.

A conciliation meeting was requested earlier after the initial finding by the Compliance Division but Shawford refused to meet until the SCRC took formal action. Responding to the new request for a meeting, Shawford asked that a past Labor Day date be set because his schedule "did not permit an earlier time."

Hugh Hebner, a spokesman for the Civil Rights Commission, said today that Shawford's refusal to meet on the commission's timetable is being construed as a "refusal to conciliate." The refusal will result in a complaint being filed, Hebner said.

Shawford called the commission's attitude "unreasonable" adding, "It's taken them 30 months to take action on the initial charge filed by Boestrap, but now that they've finally acted they won't allow us 18 business days."

The attorney said he cannot change his schedule and "if that's their decision then the next move is up to them."

A formal complaint would mean that a public hearing will be scheduled sometime after the required 60-day waiting period. The hearing would be conducted in Kingston County by a hearing officer appointed by the SCRC. At that hearing the county would be represented by Shawford and the SCRC by the State Attorney General's office.

The hearing might result in the case being dropped, a settlement being negotiated or the complaint being upheld. Should the complaint be upheld, orders would be issued mandating the county to certain hiring practices.

Shawford said if goes that far, the county can either file an appeal in the local Common Pleas Court or defy the order. "I can't see them defying an order," Shawford said.

In January, the local chapter of Boestrap filed the discrimination charge against the county. An SCRC investigator found probable cause that the county did practice discrimination in that fewer blacks and minority group representatives were employed than the percentage of the race living in the county.

The county responded with figures showing the commissioners are directly responsible for hiring on 30 of the 22 employees on the county payroll. Of that total 5.2 per cent are black as compared to 2.3 per cent black residents in the county. Shawford said today even those figures are misleading since the actual number of blacks in the workforce total only 2.7 per cent of the total county population.
R. R. spur study may trigger action

A Shore Public Utilities Commission inspector Friday morning of the Penn Central railroad spur along Linden Ave. may bring action on replacing ties to make the track safe. City Engineer Max Teal reports.

City ward and area residents have expressed concern for the last five years about the safety of trains hauling chemical materials over the deteriorating ties. [Teal] said the spur which runs to the Industrial Park is a limited-use track which restricts speeds to 5 mph.

[Teal] said the SPUC inspected the stretch about two years ago and promised action on upgrading the track. The city again contacted SPUC last fall and again requested action on the replacement which was promised for January or May.

[Teal] walked the track for about two hours Friday morning with an SPUC inspector, a railway track supervisor, and about five Second Ward residents.

Both the SPUC and railroad representatives agreed that the track is in deplorable condition. [Teal] said.

The city engineer added that area residents and the Kingston Fire Department are concerned because some of the trains—there are usually two a day—haul tank cars filled with flammable solvents. [Teal] said the worst section of track appears to be between Interstate 31 and Century St.

The SPUC inspector told [Teal] that misalignment of the track and ties warrants replacement of certain ties. He told [Teal] that if a tie replacement program is not begun in May the SPUC will request further action.

"The SPUC and Penn Central are concerned and I hope we'll get some results," [Teal] said.
APPENDIX D

The Constitution of Bootstraps Kingston
THE CONSTITUTION OF BOOTSTRAPS KINGSTON
We, the members of the Kingston (Auxiliary) chapter of Project Bootstraps, have written this constitution to serve as guidelines for the functioning of our local organization. We want it known that we are totally committed to the philosophy, objectives and goals of the national Project Bootstraps organization. Too, we want it known that we believe strongly that we, as citizens of Kingston, know better the history, guiding philosophy and actual practices of the people of Kingston. The broader purpose of this constitution is to serve as guidelines for our local organization in such a way that our actions integrate the philosophy, objectives and goals of national Bootstraps with the specific needs of our Kingston community.
I. MEETINGS

1. The purpose of meetings shall be:

   (a) To provide an opportunity for concerned citizens to gather and discuss community issues

   (b) To keep in touch with local and national Bootstraps activities

   (c) To anticipate problems that may arise within our local Bootstraps group, or within our local community, and discuss in advance many alternate ways to solve such problems

2. The meeting format shall be:

   Open Meeting

   (a) Reading of the minutes from the last meeting

   (b) The Coordinator's report

   (c) Discussion and analysis of relevant issues

   (d) Summary and recommendations

   (e) Close meeting

3. The meeting date, time and place shall be:

   (a) Date: the first Monday of each month

   (b) Time: 7:00 P.M.

   (c) Place: members' homes. (Meeting place shall rotate from one member's home to another. The current meeting place is agreed on in the previous monthly meeting.)
II. MEMBERSHIP

1. There shall be three levels of membership: the Advisory Board, the Active Members, and the Executive Committee.

(a) The Advisory Board

There shall be no less than 5, but no more than 9, Advisory Board members at any given time. Advisory Board members' primary function is to stand in advisement to officers and members. Advisory Board members are citizens of the community who keep up on important community issues, but maintain some distance from Bootstraps, so that they can objectively advise Bootstraps officers and members on critical issues. Advisory Board members are expected to attend no less than two regular Bootstraps meetings per year. They are not expected to pay dues, nor do they have voting privileges. Advisory Board members are selected by the membership and invited to serve on the Advisory Board for a two-year term.

(b) The Active Members

There shall be no limit to the number of Active Members in Bootstraps providing that each member admitted is approved by the current membership. The primary functions of the Active Members are to bring creative ideas into Bootstraps, and to actively participate in the process of solving problems, both large and small, both within Bootstraps and within the community, as they arise. Active Members are not at liberty to make press releases, or any other public statements or decisions representing Bootstraps, unless authorized and designated to do so by vote or expressed consensus of the entire voting membership. Such is the job of the Executive Committee (see Executive Committee, below). It is through voting privileges and discussions raised in monthly meetings that Active Members have control over activities of the Executive Committee, and, in this way, participate in all major decisions. Active Members are expected to pay dues, carry Bootstraps cards, have voting privileges, and all rights and full status in the Bootstraps organization.

(c) The Executive Committee

There will be no less than 3, but no more than 5, Executive Committee members at any given time. The Coordinator and the Chairman are always two members of the Executive Committee. The primary function of the Executive Committee
is to make decisions on behalf of Bootstraps during the month between meetings. The Executive Committee is the primary decision-making organ of Bootstraps in order that all decisions and activities of Bootstraps are tightly coordinated and Bootstraps presents a consistent, unified front to the community. Active Members funnel important or desired information about prospective decisions, etc., to the Executive Committee during monthly meetings or anytime during the month. The Executive Committee may call emergency meetings among themselves or with the entire membership, depending on the projected consequences of an impending issue. As to their actions, the Executive Committee is bound to reflect the feelings and opinions of the Active Membership, and are accountable to the Active Membership for any decisions they make on behalf of Bootstraps. This necessitates that the Executive Committee is in close touch at all times with both the Active Membership of Bootstraps and the community arena in which decisions are made. Along with their other functions, the Executive Committee members, as Active Members, are expected to pay dues, carry Bootstraps cards, have voting privileges, and all rights and full status in the Bootstraps organization. Executive Committee members are voted on by the Active Membership for a two-year term.

2. The steps in the procedure for admission of new members shall be:

(a) Any current Active Member of Bootstraps submits the name of a prospective new member to the Secretary who compiles a list of all names submitted.

(b) The Secretary's list of prospective new members is presented four times a year to be voted on by the Active Membership. The list is presented at meetings during the months of January, April, July and October.

(c) A 3/4 vote of the Active Membership and a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee is required for acceptance. If a vote is close, but does not meet the requirement for acceptance, the membership may decide (by 3/4 vote of the Active Membership and a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee) to place the person's name on "hold."

(d) Those persons voted for acceptance are sent a letter from the Secretary inviting them to attend the next meeting and bring appropriate dues. The Secretary may include a copy of the meeting format. A copy of the constitution is given to new members upon their payment of dues. If prospective new members fail to attend their "initiation" meeting, the Secretary sends them one additional invitation. Unless extenuating
circumstances prevent their responding to the Secretary's second invitation, they are no longer candidates for admission during the current intake period, but may be in the future, providing steps in the procedure for admission are again observed.

(2) Those persons not accepted for membership are informed of such by the Coordinator.

(3) The names of persons voted for "hold" are placed back on the Secretary's list to be voted on during the next new-member intake period. Those persons too are informed of such by the Coordinator.

3. The steps in the procedure for expulsion of members shall be:

   (a) Any current Active Member of Bootstraps submits the name of a member thought to be in violation of the constitution and/or the Bootstraps philosophy to the Secretary who compiles a list of all names submitted.

   (b) The Secretary's list of alleged violators is presented four times a year to be voted on by the Active Membership. The list is presented at meetings during the months of January, April, July, and October. (The alleged violators are informed about the impending action for their expulsion from the group and they are invited to attend the meeting where such proceedings are initiated.)

   (c) The Active Membership votes on each name, determining if the alleged violator will be expelled or retained. The expulsion of an Active member requires a 3/4 vote of the Active Membership and a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee. In the case in which the alleged violator is an officer or a member of the Executive Committee, the vote for expulsion by the entire membership must be unanimous. (If the alleged violators are present they can speak on their own behalf, but cannot vote on this particular issue.)

   (d) (1) Those persons voted for expulsion are sent a letter by the Secretary informing them that they are no longer members of Bootstraps, and that they are to submit their Bootstraps cards which are torn.

   (2) Those persons not getting a 3/4 vote of the Active Membership and a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee for expulsion are retained under appropriate probation or sanctions offered by the membership, if deemed necessary.
4. All membership shall be assessed in the month of November of each year.

At the monthly meeting in November, all members pay dues in order to receive membership cards for the following year.
III. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. The Coordinator

The Bootstraps Coordinator shall be primarily responsible for the coordination of external functions of Bootstraps, i.e., functions pertaining to the relationship of Bootstraps to other organizations. These responsibilities include the bulk of public relations activities as well as functions within the organization itself. Some duties of the Coordinator shall be:

(a) To coordinate all press releases regarding the local organization.

(b) To coordinate functions between Kingston Bootstraps and the national Bootstraps organization.

(c) To coordinate and/or negotiate functions with other local groups such as the City Council, the Steadman Community Center Board, The Concerned Residents of Libertyville, The Libertyville-Kingston Survey Action Committee, Kingston City College groups, etc.

(d) To keep the Active Membership informed about community activities and local and national Bootstraps activities through a monthly report.

(e) To stimulate planning of legal strategies, program strategies, etc. and otherwise encourage the membership to:

(1) detect problems in advance

(2) explore many possible avenues to solutions of problems

(3) act quickly but with good collective group judgment, toward solution of problems

2. The Chairman of the Executive Committee

The Chairman of the Executive Committee shall be primarily responsible for the coordination of internal functions of Bootstraps, i.e., functions pertaining to relationships within the organization itself. Some duties of the Chairman shall be:

(a) To preside over monthly meetings

(b) To coordinate programs, rallies, etc., that Bootstraps shall present to the public
(c) To keep members pointed toward relevant issues and attuned to discovering different ways to solve problems

(d) To call emergency meetings of either the Executive Committee or the Active Membership or both.

(e) To serve as arbitrator in disputes between members. The Chairman will bring disputing members together in a face to face meeting to discuss differences. (If one of the disputing parties is the Chairman, then an Advisory Board member is called in as arbitrator.)

3. The Secretary

The Secretary shall be primarily responsible for keeping an accurate written account of the local chapter of Bootstraps as its history unfolds. Some duties of the Secretary shall be:

(a) To read the minutes from the last meeting and record an account of the current meeting

(b) To assist with keeping members focused and attuned to relevant issues in light of the minutes

(c) To supervise all Bootstraps correspondence

(d) To serve the functions of membership chairman

4. The Treasurer

The Treasurer shall be primarily responsible for keeping an accurate written account of all money matters pertaining to Bootstraps. Some duties of the Treasurer shall be:

(a) To keep secure all money in the Bootstraps treasury

(b) To give financial reports upon request of the Chairman

(c) To authorize release of money for Bootstraps activities, to the Secretary or other officers and members
IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Election of officers shall be as follows:

(a) November shall be the month of election of officers

(b) Officers and Executive Committee members are elected by a 3/4 vote of the Active Membership.

(c) Officers and Executive Committee members are elected for a two-year term, beginning in 1978.

(d) Officers can succeed themselves in office if elected by a 3/4 vote of the Active Membership.

(e) Newly elected officers are given a period of on-the-job training by current officers until the first meeting in January following their election in November.

V. INDUCTION OF NEW OFFICERS

Induction of new officers shall be as follows:

In the first meeting in January, following the election of new officers previously in November, the induction ceremony requires the current officers to publicly present the new officers with all essential materials and records, and a copy of the constitution. The new officers read the constitution preamble aloud before all present. The new officers are now duly charged and immediately assume the responsibilities of office.

VI. PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENT TO THIS CONSTITUTION

In the future this local chapter of Bootstraps may want to develop in a different direction, i.e., this chapter may want to become more political, more humanitarian, more social, or the like. The national Bootstraps organization may minimize its activities and this local chapter may want to retain its activities under a local charter. Or, independently of the national organization, this local
chapter may want to suspend its activities for a prescribed period of time and resume activities at a specified future time. Situations may suggest it convenient to rotate officers less often, or more often, or meetings be held less often, or more often. The future may bring an infinite variety of situations in which effective functioning requires a unique balance between stability and flexibility. This constitution as it stands is in the interest of stability. This procedure for amendment to the constitution is in the interest of flexibility. Together, this constitution and its procedure for amendment serve as a guide toward the effective functioning of this local chapter of Bootstraps in light of both present and future realities.

Amendments to the constitution shall require:

(a) A brief survey of all currently Active Members to assess the entire voting membership

(b) A unanimous vote in favor of the proposed amendment(s) by the entire voting membership
HAVING ACHIEVED UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT ON THIS DAY, APRIL 5, 1976, 
WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, DO HEREBY PROCLAIM THIS DOCUMENT AS THE 
CONSTITUTION GOVERNING THE LOCAL CHAPTER OF BOOTSTRAPS AT KINGSTON.

Morris K. Evans
Yvonne L. Evans
Jacquelyn Myers
Gregory Woods
Fred Stag Taylor
Carolyn Dunlap
Charles Johnson
Lawrence Carlisle
Hernandes DeLeon
Lloyd P. Smith
Daniel J. Powell
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