

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

People Power: Community Participation in the Planning and Implementation of Human Settlements

Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner

Philippine Studies vol. 24, no. 1 (1976) 5–36

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

People Power: Community Participation in the Planning and Implementation of Human Settlements*

MARY RACELIS HOLLNSTEINER

Although people's participation in affairs governing their lives dates back to the beginnings of human society, the concept has taken on a new significance as societies have grown in size and complexity. This is partly because the governance or management of large groups has become more and more a specialized enterprise, an area for "technocrats," trained bureaucrats, and well-educated political leaders to handle.

Catering simultaneously to general and specific vested interests, these modern-prone elites seize the initiative to plan policy and implement programs for society. Although they verbally advocate people's participation, in practice they bring them into the picture only after the major decisions have been made. Hence they often leave the ordinary citizen, the grassroots populace, the man in the street, the proletariat, the masses — all equivalent definitions of "people" as used here — to follow their predetermined paths. If a path is crooked where it should be straight, or straight where it should be crooked, the people have little recourse. They must accommodate to the preordained design. Even if the blueprint is inappropriate to their needs and aspirations, they are expected to conform. The results range from submissive apathy to violent resistance.

It is this perceived discrepancy between the more universalistically-oriented actions of planners and administrators, on the one hand, and the particularistic preferences of ordinary people in complex large-scale societies, on the other, that has led to the emergence of people's participation as a controversial sociopolitical

*This is the revised version of a paper presented at the Interregional Seminar on the Social Aspects of Housing, Holte, Denmark, 14-27 September 1975, sponsored by the United Nations Centre for Housing, Building and Planning and the Government of Denmark.

issue. From there it is but one more step to confronting the issue of power and where it is lodged.

One need not look too hard to realize that differential access to economic resources generally parallels power-holding disparities. Those persons strongly imbued with this awareness diverge nonetheless in preferred strategies for redressing the imbalance. One group focuses on immediate gains and advocates open confrontation of the powerful by the powerless through a multitude of tactics and strategies. This is accomplished by the latter's banding together and in so doing generating collective power through mass action. This militant approach forces negotiation on an equal bargaining basis and promotes immediate, specific gains for the poor and powerless.

A second group dismisses such an approach as merely palliative, seeing even hard-won gains as temporary delusions that lull the powerless into continuing acceptance of distorted social structures. In reality, argues this group, these partial victories only deter the powerless from facing the real and ultimate issue, namely, the need to overturn and revamp societal structures totally and completely, violently if necessary, so that the distinction between powerful and powerless is forever eradicated.

This article addresses people's power from the first group's point of view, avoiding judgments on the validity of the second. It deliberately selects from among the many possibilities for enhancing the majority poor's participation in developing societies. The particular aspect of people's involvement in the planning and implementation of human settlements, specifically housing and community management, makes up the focus of this paper. For where matters close to family life are concerned, like one's home and community environments, people do take an interest. The sad part of it all is that as people are incorporated into organized housing and community schemes, this great human potential for residents' creating a satisfying environment for themselves remains too often overlooked by the authorities.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

The rationale behind people's helping to formulate the kinds of homes and communities in which they will live goes beyond a simple reference to democratic ideology. Involving people in the decisions that affect their own lives is significant for several reasons.

First, program results are more successful if the intended beneficiaries take part in their design and implementation. Because they have had a share in deciding, for example, that houses should also serve as home industry work sites, or whether vehicular traffic should be prevented from entering sections of the community, or how many floors multi-storey units should have, they will enjoy their subsequent residential setting more. For it will conform more closely to their aspirations and accustomed lifestyles.

Moreover, if people like living in their community, they will more readily take care of it and express their interest in action. If uncollected garbage draws flies, or canals get clogged and overflow, or if dirt pathways become ankle-deep mud sloughs in the rainy season, they will likely do something to remedy the situation — from complaining to the Department of Sanitation to dredging canals and filling in the rutted, muddy pathways themselves. If a sense of friendly neighboring has emerged, they will help a needy neighbor out with the children when she is sick, or go out of their way to tell her husband to follow up a promising job opening. By getting people involved in a neighborhood building or renewal project before actual work starts, the administrators ensure a better fit between people and community.

A second reason for people's participation is the reeducation it gives architects, planners, and administrators directly involved in the project. By showing them another perspective on the matter under study, low-income groups can give their middle- and upper-class counterparts new insights into the ways of their clientele. The product of years of technical training, the specialist has probably lost his capacity to empathize with lower-income people's viewpoints. Not only was he never a member of the lower class; school curricula, especially if he comes from a developing society, have probably further alienated him from them. Nor has he ever taken a behavioral science course that might make him more sensitive to people's values or social patterns.

This combination of circumstances therefore has probably left him with little appreciation for lower-class people's outlooks. He will thus insist on the irrationality of a squatter group's determination to obtain individual land titles for separate detached housing units, when the rational thing to do, in his view, would be to consolidate the land and build more economical high-rise dwellings that allow ample open space around them. He finds it difficult to

sympathize with the squatters' conviction, drawn from five or six moves in about the same number of years, that unless they possess land titles, they can be evicted. "But *this* time the government is sincere in helping out your community," he will insist, unaware that several sets of predecessors said the same thing about earlier and now defunct plans.

People's participation thus rectifies planning errors by making it possible for clients to point out to technician-managers what will work and what will not. It is a wise listener who takes these points seriously and revises plans and programs accordingly.

A third benefit of people's participation derives from the very process itself. For if it is genuinely mass-based, it builds up the self-enabling character and cooperative spirit of the community. Facing common problems as a solidary group and finding solutions collectively leads to greater self-assurance and pride over the group's ability to act productively. Consciousness of a larger whole whose welfare is every individual's concern is more likely to evolve in organized participating groups. While conflict within is also unavoidable, it can, if handled properly, be turned into a strengthening device and yield effective results.

Further, when people learn to operate and even manipulate the institutions of modern urban society, to interact as peers with its technicians, managers, and government officials, and to grapple with technological problems and complex bureaucratic structures, they grow as individuals and learn to cope with modern urban life. Successful adaptation depends in large measure on one's belief that he *can* manage his environment, and on the evidence that proves to him that he is indeed doing so.

Finally, people's participation springs from guarantees cited in most national constitutions of the world. The right of citizens to express their views and share especially in decisions that affect them is the mark of a modern society. That ordinary people are poor and often powerless does not mean they need be voiceless. Since most nations espouse the republican principle leaving sovereignty vested in the people, it should not be difficult for private and public authorities to give the people their just due.

THE PROBLEMATIC CHARACTER OF PEOPLE'S POWER

Considering the number of valid reasons that can be advanced

for fostering people's participation in the formulation, implementation, and management of human settlements, why are people not brought into the picture as often as they might be? Or, put another way, why is popular participation often resisted by or even denied by the planner-administrator-manager? One can suggest several reasons.

Perhaps the major one is that the elite specialist believes that where technical information is concerned, he knows best. In his view a professional education and degree equip and entitle him to make the decisions. It is only a small step from "knowing best" to "knowing what is best for them" especially when "them" represents barely literate people who cannot tell a building blueprint from a flow chart. In less developed countries especially, where advanced education is at a premium, specialists are so accustomed to telling others less trained than they what to do that they find it virtually impossible to accept as valid the practice of listening seriously to the views of lower status persons, particularly contrary views. The fact of the people's being the end users and having ideas based on practical realities carries little weight. Ironically, while an architect-planner will spend hours convincing one wealthy client that the home designed for him should be built according to plan, and sometimes gives in to revisions insisted upon by the client, the same kind of interaction is rarely allowed poor, "non-paying" clients, though they number in the hundreds or thousands. Education, status and income differences evidently authorize a dual approach.

The higher status "experts" thus set the framework of the discussion and carry it through in categories meaningful to themselves but often incomprehensible to the ordinary layman, poor and lowly educated as he is. Even if the latter should by some chance have access to the neighborhood plan for comment, his non-participation in earlier phases renders it extremely difficult for him to understand the conceptualization, much less to argue on an equal plane in favor of any divergent view. Generally embarrassed by his lack of education before such prestigious personages, the lower-status citizen lapses into silent acquiescence. If his suggestions or arguments are demolished by the specialists, his demoralization is complete. The paternalistic or even superior attitude then of the specialist toward ordinary people serves to convince the specialist that *he* must talk while *they* must listen. No genuine participation is possible under such circumstances.

Yet the reluctance or outright refusal of elites to encourage meaningful people's involvement cannot be blamed wholly on any particular elite group's actions. Part of the problem lies in the people themselves. Years, indeed centuries in some cases, of being planned *for* have rendered them apathetic about taking a hand in matters beyond their immediate family domain. On the other hand, a pattern of community participation does exist, but it revolves around the observance of traditional rituals like religious festivals or wedding celebrations. Redirecting people's efforts to the level and type of active secular participation that housing and settlements participation requires poses a special problem. It entails defining a new role for them in the daily round of life.

Often outsiders like social workers or community organizers help people delineate the issues that need organization and action. Alternatively, people can get forced into a position of aroused consciousness through a recalcitrant housing manager. High-handedness, arrogance, or sheer inefficiency on his part can do the trick better than any earnest social worker can. For the most part, however, people forfeit any claims to participation by apathetically letting the specialists decide for them. Experience has not led them to believe that anything else is possible or feasible.

While apathy about self-help, in the context of human settlements management probably characterizes the majority of prospective residents in developing countries, there are a number of militantly organized people's groups who not only take the initiative to define their wants but actually demand participation. The organized shanty-dwellers who invade unoccupied lands and turn them into dwelling sites in various Latin American countries provide such an example. Often at a loss to counteract such moves, some governments have simply conceded to their *de facto* occupancy and have subsequently provided sites and services components. A similar case in Tondo, Manila, provides a counterpart Asian experience. One can predict that given the conscious articulation by government agencies and others of people's participation as a new ideal, more and more people's groups will find a legitimization of their conviction that when other conciliatory mechanisms have failed, open confrontation and a demand for negotiation is the only avenue left to them.

Herein lies an inherent contradiction in governmental espousal of people's participation, for once grassroots awareness is aroused and

people demand a say in housing and community actions, government may eventually find itself sending out police to control angry demonstrators. Charges of subversion may be levied and jail terms meted out to offenders who go beyond the government's definition of legitimate participation. Unfortunately, the designation of the legitimacy-nonlegitimacy line remains an ambivalent product of differential outlooks where government and militant people's groups are concerned. Even if this extreme level of violence is not reached, planner-administrator-managers approach people's participation with some reluctance. They fear it will lead to delays in implementation because an array of contradictory recommendations has to be reconciled.

In summary then, people's participation in mass housing and settlements planning constitutes a problem area for many planner-administrator-managers. While they may espouse its desirability, they nonetheless find it difficult as "experts" to accept the views of less technically qualified people on what should be done. Further, even when they try to encourage interest and participation among people, they find all too often that the apathetic role taken on by the ordinary folk over the years is too deeply lodged to be changed quickly. Finally, at the other extreme, where people do get intensely involved in community affairs, as have Latin American and Tondo squatters, their insistence on sharing in decision-making or in having their way can verge on defiance of the law in the eyes of enforcement agents. Little wonder then that the advocacy of low-income people's participation especially and their bid for power encounters a range of reactions among power elites, from guarded approval to outright resistance.

MODES OF PARTICIPATION

A number of modes exist whereby people may join with planners-administrators-managers in the developing of housing and housing estates. Six are delineated here. They are by no means the only ones, but they do constitute some major types. One can assess them in terms of (1) the type of participation; (2) its functions; and (3) the locus of power. The closer people come to controlling their own life situations, the more fully participant they may be adjudged.

The first mode involves the educated "solid citizen" group as

the key actors. They bear the brunt of representing the people in dealing with government or private development agencies. As prominent people in the district or in the community undergoing change, their own educated backgrounds render them acceptable to officials, as they tend to share the same outlook and categories of thought. Further, they possess a certain amount of influence in their own right and can rally support for projects needing it. Generally enthusiastic and sincere in their commitment to improving neighborhood life, they take the position of speaking *for* the people in the community and planning *for* them, whether the people have given them that mandate or not. They sit on the community council as symbols of civic consciousness. Correspondingly, the ordinary people are organized into associations where they serve as followers to these upper- or middle-class leaders, leaving to the latter the responsibilities of dealing with outsiders, of raising funds, and initiating action. Success is reckoned in terms of the number of meetings held, projects launched in the community, and material benefits resulting from them. Since the leadership is of a voluntary nature, these leaders must exert a great deal of energy and personal magnetism in order to get people to provide a mass base of support.

This mode of participation, so typical of Filipino towns, has the function of legitimizing outside-planned programs by having prominent local elites endorse the activities offered and play key roles in them. As assessment in terms of grassroots participation would have to conclude that under this mode the locus of power remains at local elite levels. The grassroots sector plays only a minor, if any, role in decision-making; the function allocated to them is to follow and to serve as a populace needing help.

The second mode of participation embodies appointed local leaders in the government bureaucracy as representatives of the people. They may consist of ward leaders, or community relations officers, or neighborhood chairmen. As local residents they take the lead in bringing government and civic agency programs down to the grassroots level, interpreting for the people what is to be done and how it should be done. Their acquaintance with bureaucratic procedures and prominent people enables them to accomplish activities requiring agency assistance and influence. At the same time their authority enables them to mobilize groups of people for all sorts of events — to march in civic parades and wave

flags on national holidays, to serve as audiences for political leaders or other speech-makers, or to join work brigades for widening streets or cleaning canals.

These officially or semi-officially appointed bureaucrats serve to legitimize programs drawn up outside the community, be it a cleanliness drive, a rice distribution scheme, or a lottery to determine the choice of dwellings. Moreover, their authority allows them to direct neighborhood activities and perform as spokesmen to higher authorities. With the locus of power residing in these lower-level bureaucrats, the grassroots citizen finds himself far removed from decision-making even if he participates by choice or otherwise in the community activities designed for him. Direct sharing on the part of the mass populace in the plan formulation and management remains virtually nil, even though a kind of participation evolves through their followership roles.

The third mode entails *ex post facto* consultation by development personnel with the people at the community level. The classic situation occurs where a development agency is upgrading or renewing a low-income neighborhood or building a new relocation site to house a specific evicted populace. Here architects, economists, engineers, and the like spend months drawing up plans for community layouts and job creation. When the plans, or one phase of them, are completed, these technocrats then call a meeting with the community to explain the plans and solicit their views.

In terms of people's participation this mode comes closer to the mark than the first two since the grassroots populace actively enters into the picture, making up a majority of participants. Moreover, people do have a say in telling the planners whether or not they like the designs or job creation schemes or neighborhood rules laid out for them. Fullscale participation is nonetheless wanting in this situation since the options have already been predetermined by others. Nor are the assumptions behind the scheme always clear to the people since they did not go through the same process as the designer-planners in considering a wide range of possibilities and rejecting some in favor of others. Consequently, the people are offered Plan A, Plan B, and Plan C, and asked to choose among them. This is accompanied by the presentation of maps, charts, and diagrams in confusing succession. Plans A and C usually turn out to be mere variations of Plan B. As a people's planner once remarked, "Believe me, it's always Plan B

that bureaucracy planners want people to 'choose'." Since Plan A approximates the people's interests more closely and Plan C the technocrats' ideal, Plan B usually wins the day because it represents the compromise that presupposes harmony and cooperation from then on. Thus, the *ex post facto* mode of participation does see people participating in community decisions, but on a token basis more than on a real one. For the plans have been devised long before the first consultation. The people are merely expected to endorse them or suggest minor revisions without changing the basic outlines of the scheme.

A significant breakthrough comes about in the fourth mode of participation — namely, consultation between people and planners right from the beginning of the plan formulation. The very conceptualization of the scheme occurs with ordinary people sitting in and expressing their opinions. To facilitate discussion their elected or chosen leaders meet with planners more frequently and regularly, with community assemblies held every so often for wider dissemination of information and discussion. These sporadic meetings allow a two-way communication process; the people are kept abreast of developments to date, and at the same time check the directions their leaders are taking in representing their interests. Since no community is homogeneous, the varying views and interests of the populace emerge in such gatherings, dramatizing a range of sometimes conflicting interests which the chosen leaders must reconcile.

Early involvement in the planning process not only leads to a more suitable outcome for those who are most affected; it also gives people an appreciation of the complexity of the process and an awareness that issues are rarely simple and clearcut. When, for example, they accept the constraints of a fixed budget or a finite amount of space, and realize that they must choose between a strategy of establishing a factory site to generate jobs at the cost of displacing 100 families currently located there, on the one hand, or maximizing residential accommodations but losing the factory building, on the other, then the realism of the planning process begins to hit home. They can be more sympathetic to the constraints faced by planners, and at the same time begin to think in terms of priorities and preferences rather than in the simultaneous acquisition of multiple wants. Needless to say, the planners also profit from the interchange of ideas which enable them to learn how

ordinary people evaluate the costs and benefits of development projects. Consultation between planner and people from plan formulation to implementation comes close to the model of genuine people's participation.

The fifth and sixth modes of participation have people's chosen representatives actually serving on decision-making boards. In the first case, the people of a housing community, for example, have one or two representatives sitting on the board to express their interests and viewpoints; in the second, the board is in effect a people's board because the majority of members on it come from the grassroots sector. A model of the fifth mode involving minority board membership would see, for example, a five-member group made up of a representative each from the social welfare department, the housing authority, the relocation administration, the manpower council, and the people's organization. The people's representative thus participates in the deliberations over policy, such as whether recent renters in a squatter community facing relocation to a nearby site have the same rights in the new site as long-time house owners. He votes on the matter. However, his minority status vis-a-vis the outsider specialists may mean that he is frequently overruled in a conflict of views pitting middle-elite orientations against grassroots ones. In this sense his decision-making power is token rather than total.

The sixth mode marks the triumph of people's participation in that the grassroots elements dominate the membership of the decision-making board. The expenditure of funds falls completely under their control, meaning that they allocate it according to a scheme suited to the people's wishes. They can if they wish hire their own architects and planners, and consult with whomever they want to. Even here of course, their independence is not total, since the funds come to them from higher levels of government or from international agencies. Hence negotiations with these entities remain necessary, but usually on a peer basis. For the aim of people's participation is not to divorce people's groups from the state or decision-making centers of society as a whole. Rather in human settlements development, it is to give the ordinary residents a significant voice in that development.

A summary presentation of the six modes described here appears in the following paradigm. One must remember that some overlapping of modes may occur at different community levels.

Modes of people's participation in the planning and management of human settlements

Identity of participants	Locus of power	Functions
1 "Solid citizen" educated group appointed by outside authorities	Planners and local elites	Legitimizes outside-planee programs through endorsement and implementation via local elites
2 Appointed local leaders in the government bureaucracy	Planners and local elites	Legitimizes outside-planee programs through endorsement and implementation via local elites; facilitates implementation of outside programs, since local elites have authority from above
3 Planners in <i>ex post facto</i> consultation with people's groups	Planners; people to a slight degree	Legitimizes outside-planee programs by having people feel they have a say in matters affecting them; allows some feedback from people on their views about plans
4 Planners in consultation with people's groups from the beginning of plan formulation	Planners and people, but planners have more authority than the people	Allows a meeting of minds and views between planner and people; gives people more realistic understanding of planning process and need to establish priorities
5 People have one or two minority representatives on a decision-making board	Planner-administrators and people, but planner-administrators have major decision-making power as the majority membership	Legitimizes the concept of people's formally having a voice in local affairs through direct participation and representative vote; also legitimizes board with outside elite in contro
6 People have the majority representation on a decision making board	People and planner-administrators, but people have major decision-making power as the majority membership	Legitimizes the concept of people's having the dominant voice in local affairs through direct participation, control of votes, selection of technician-planners to assist them as advocates

Assessment in terms of
direct exercise of power
by the people

People minimally involved, if
at all, in decision-making

People are minimally involved in decision-making, although official character of leaders' authority encourages people to join in program activities as followers or recipients of the benefits entailed

People's involvement in discussion of plans after they have been formulated allows few genuine options; participation exists but only in token fashion

People's involvement in the formulation of plans and in the manner of their implementation gives them a significant share in decision-making; planners still control the process however

People's participation is significant because they share in decision-making by having an official vote on a local governing board

People have attained full participation in controlling the actions of the official decision-making body

Further, the strength of a community is likely to be greater the more closely it approximates those modes nearer number 6 than number 1.

It is evident from the discussion summarized by the paradigm that the six modes of participation reflect three basic approaches, namely: (a) local elite decision-making (modes 1 and 2); (b) people acting in an advisory capacity to elites in authority (modes 3 and 4); and (c) people sharing in or controlling local political decisions affecting their lives (modes 5 and 6).

Two divergent orientations to the causes of poverty apply to the choice of any particular mode. Where poverty is believed to be the product of individual disadvantages or deficiencies, action programs focus on changing people so they can function more effectively in society. Hence, providing them with improved social services is deemed to be the solution to helping them compete more effectively in the larger society. Having obtained these benefits, they presumably can cast aside their poverty and achieve a decent level of living.¹

Here lies the rationale behind modes 1 and 2, namely, the emphasis on providing assistance and benefits to enable people to live better lives. It is the basis of the community development approach espoused by private and public welfare-oriented agencies in which harmonious cooperation is the dominant ethic. Self-help will, it is believed, arise out of people's raising their incomes through joining manpower training programs or availing of limited amounts

1. Ralph M. Kramer, *Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies of the War on Poverty* (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969).

of credit for small-scale entrepreneurial operations. Their common welfare will grow out of community councils organized by social workers to channel the flow of goods and services from the larger society into the community. These arrangements may indeed lead to somewhat more prosperous communities, but they do not challenge the basic power structure. Instead they accept the prevailing principle of elite control.

The second orientation explains poverty as a product of social and economic systems that remain intact precisely because of the "powerlessness of the poor and the dominance of the wealthy power-holders." In this view, only as the poor acquire political power can they negotiate as peers with their wealthier counterparts and themselves change community policies and conditions inimical to their state. Modes 5 and 6 best express this policy-making orientation.

The transitional situation represented by modes 3 and 4 combines the two extremes in espousing the community development approach with incipient versions of the grassroots-policy-making one. While often difficult for elites to accept, it nonetheless represents the position currently taken by more progressive agencies. The object of far greater resistance among authorities the world over is the political power orientation advocated by a few militantly organized people's groups. For aside from being a nuisance or a downright threat to beleaguered groups in authority, they give rise to a controversy over whether the government or established private agencies can or should subsidize with funds or otherwise support citizen groups apparently in open opposition to duly constituted authority. From the people's power point of view, however, this confrontation stance has proven to be the only really effective means of jolting slow-moving bureaucracies out of their lethargy and forcing them to take seriously conditions adversely affecting the everyday wellbeing of the people. Since the role of government is to serve the people, they say, these active grassroots groups and their supporters feel their conflict strategies and political goals need no further justification.

COMMON ISSUES IN PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SETTINGS

The worldwide literature on issues involving community residents' interaction with government or private development agen-

cies reflects several common patterns. They encompass the demand for better on-site services, employment or better job conditions, land for landless residents, and a share in the decision-making process involving any or all of these desires.

THE DEMAND FOR BETTER ON-SITE SERVICES

Squatter residents almost universally decry the lack of piped water into their communities. The absence of water systems means that large numbers of them have to congregate at a congested community well and wait long hours for their turn at the faucet, or haul water from great distances, or resort to buying it by the can or container. This scarcity explains why squatters are visibly dirtier than their bonafide fellow-urbanities, or why their surroundings necessarily remain unkempt.

Electricity also falls into this desired category, not so much for cooking as for lighting purposes. The failure of municipal governments to furnish it means nights spent with dim oil or flickering kerosene lamps that render any further close work impossible. Moreover, the absence of electric lines renders the community unsafe after dark as thieves ply their trade and other felons take advantage of the cover provided them. Enterprising households with electricity exploit their poorer neighbors by allowing them to tap onto a house line at rates much higher than the electric company charges the home-owner.

Ironically, while a chronic water shortage consistently plagues these areas, the surroundings frequently go underwater after a rainstorm. Inadequate drainage facilities during torrential rains or cloudbursts turn the community into a "little Venice." Rickety shanties are washed away by the swirling waters or at least are structurally undermined. Pneumonia, gastro-enteritis, and cholera stalk the children and the weak as flood waters take a fortnight to recede.

At other times disastrous fires break out, uncontrollable because of the lack of fire-fighting equipment on-site, or the inability of standard fire engines to get through the densely packed shantytowns to the scene of the fire. If they wait long enough of course, the fire will eventually reach the edge of the community engulfing the highly inflammable shacks en route. Yet the prospect of paved roads or walkways through slum areas, or other infrastructure

improvements like public toilets, sewage facilities, and recreation sites strain the imaginations of government officials reluctant to service squatter areas lest more such settlers be attracted there.

The lack of health centers has aroused many a mothers' group who seek nutritional services for their children, family planning for themselves, or at least first aid treatment or diagnostic services for injured or sick family members. They want schools built in the immediate vicinity so that their young children need not go far away each day or have to spend precious money for transportation fare to distant school sites. In countries where extended kinship no longer prevails, working parents need nursery and day-care centers to supervise their children while the parents are away.

For settlements at some distance from the central city or work sites, the urgency of convenient, cheap transportation facilities looms as a major problem. Low-cost apartment dwellers complain over the poor upkeep of their surroundings, where building repairs are rarely made, elevators or water pumps are not working, broken hallway bulbs remain unreplaced, rat and insects overrun the premises, and unpoliced teenager rumbles explode on the stairwells. These close-to-home issues have polarized housing settlements in country after country. Once people are aroused enough to overcome their generally apathetic outlooks, they remonstrate with the authorities they see as responsible for their recurring plight. Being poor and therefore virtually powerless when acting as individuals or in small units, they usually give up the fight. Long hours of waiting at government agencies, each of which suggests they make inquiries of another agency, exhaust them. The old order persists because the poor simply cannot afford to take time away from their meager earning activities to track down those parties responsible for alleviating their situation.²

THE DEMAND FOR EMPLOYMENT

For many residents of poor neighborhoods, housing and com-

2. Robert Coles, "Like it is in the Alley," *Daedalus* 97: 1315-30; Lisa Redfield Peattie, *The View from the Barrio* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968); Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner and Maria Elena Lopez, "The Face of Poverty: Implications for Urban Development" (Paper presented to the Symposium on Urbanization, Population and Development, Tokyo, Japan, 5-10 May 1975).

munity facilities do not so much constitute their immediate problems, uncomfortable though they be, as does the sheer need for employment. With unemployment rates much higher in these neighborhoods than in the rest of the city, the unskilled or low-skilled, low-educated populace desperately searches for some way of earning a living from day to day. Sympathetic relatives and neighbors help from time to time, but there are limits to their cooperative capacities. A regular job with a steady wage marks the initial dream of the urban poor. Fringe benefits are especially welcome but not demanded by people having nothing to begin with. A 1971 survey conducted in the Tondo Foreshoreland of Manila revealed that one out of four household heads rated the lack of employment as their major family problem. The only other element receiving greater mention (48 percent) was the sheer lack of basic necessities and money. Rated a poor third were the combination of education for children, housing and furniture acquisition or repair, water, drainage and sewerage facilities, family harmony, and health.³

Given this pragmatic priority scale, it is little wonder that elaborate programs for housing construction command scant attention from poor residents. Only one out of five Tondo squatters cited improved housing and lot ownership as the top problem. By far superseding that ratio were the three out of five who listed the inadequacy of water and electric lighting facilities as their main difficulty.⁴ It is not that they do not value improved housing. They do, so long as it conforms to their own ideas of what is better. The crux of the matter rather lies in the greater importance the householder must allot to earning a living, feeding his family each day, and having the most basic necessities for daily existence. Hence, a better shell around him and cleaner surroundings may not excite him as much as the prospect of an improved income. He rejoices if a number of factories or other enterprises with jobs for him are to be set up in the vicinity, or if he can create his own business with a no-interest loan from a generous relative or friend who expects repayment only when he can make it. He may well demand, from his sense of frustration and exasperation at government investments wrongly conceived (in his view), that anti-

3. Mary Racelis Hollnsteiner, "City, Province or Relocation Site? Options for Manila's Squatters," *Philippine Sociological Review* 21 (1973): 207-213.

4. Idem, "Metamorphosis: From Tondo Squatter to Tondo Settler," *Ekistics* 40 (1975): 211-15.

poverty programs focus less on settlements infrastructure and more on job creation and maintenance. His appeals to the authorities may focus on preferential hiring for local manpower in neighborhood construction projects. When neighborhood employers are seen as wanting, it is of course a relatively easy matter to launch an attack on them directly.

THE DEMAND FOR RESIDENTIAL LAND

The heavy influx of rural migrants to cities in most developing nations has created numerous large and small squatter sites. Clinging precariously to hillsides or stream banks, hidden under bridges or lining railroad tracks, these shanty-towns or squatter clusters constitute eyesores, welfare pockets, or crime centers to hostile city officials. To those who understand better the people who reside in such settlements, the squatters represent a striving populace hopeful of raising their socioeconomic status by finding opportunity in the city. Seen in this light, the harassments they must undergo at the hands of city officials seem inhuman.

Because by definition his residential status is illegal, and he can be legally evicted at any time, the squatter dreams of having title to his own land, preferably the piece he currently occupies, so that he can live in peace. His fear of eviction and the possible demolition of his house encourages him to ally himself with influential politicians in hopes that, ever-conscious of the voting power of the community, the latter will legislate the land into the residents' hands. Where this strategy proves unsuccessful, squatter organizations make representations with government officials or enlist the aid of civic, charitable, religious, student, or worker groups to intercede for them or support their cause. More extreme tactics emerge in the case of squatters who confront the authorities with their demands or actively resist police and other authorities attempting to oust them from their dwelling sites. Or, as in South America, they simply invade and occupy overnight a designated territory according to previously laid plans. Whatever the strategy, the theme remains constant: "Give us our land," or "Sell us our land at rates we can afford."

Security of tenure can, of course, be obtained by means other than freehold or proprietary ownership. In countries where land has been nationalized, the issue may revolve around the duration

of long-term leases and the conditions under which they are obtained. For squatters in societies that sanctify private property and land titles, however, residential land ownership takes precedence over long-term leases. To own one's piece of land gives not only security to the ordinary person but also accords him full status as an upstanding citizen of society. The beleaguered squatter yearns for that respect, too. Moreover, once he is assured permanent occupancy, he can seriously tackle the improvement of his house and furnishings, doing so gradually as his income permits.

Another aspect of the clamor for security of land tenure emerges in the suspicious or apprehensive attitudes evidenced by resident squatters toward relocation, even if it is supposed to give them better surroundings. People's participation may thus be generated by the fear of eviction from the old site coupled with resistance to the new one. This is especially true when the latter is far away from the people's current work places, and cheap and convenient transportation is not provided. Issues in the removal process center around the availability of vehicles for moving relocatees complete with their knocked-down shanty and household possessions. Some evince concern over whether there will be a community kitchen to tide the family over the first day or two; others worry about the adequacy of infrastructure facilities and the distances between neighbors in an isolated, lonely site. As they get used to living in the new settlement, residents find ready issues on the way in which the community is managed, from dissatisfaction with feeder road transportation franchises to security from thieves. Many others never get involved because they filter back to their old site to regain lost advantages.

THE DEMAND TO SHARE IN DECISION-MAKING

Finally, participation itself becomes an issue as people get better organized. Neighborhood upgrading, employment decisions, or the transfer of residence can easily become key rallying points for people at the margins of subsistence. This has already been discussed in sufficient detail so that it needs no further elaboration.

THE INTERPLAY OF PEOPLE AND TECHNOCRATS

When people and planners-administrators-managers deal with

one another, each set uses a range of strategies to achieve its objectives. If a particular people's strategy works, and the other party accepts it, the users come away satisfied; a period of relative quiet and perhaps even harmony prevails. If it does not work, either apathy or a stronger approach is mounted on the people's part. The development personnel, on the other hand, may opt for motivational approaches, bureaucratic inertia, or more authoritarian tactics. A review of the varieties of action available to each set in dealing with the other highlights the interplay.

TACTICS AND STRATEGIES IN PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

When appeals to local politicians and other leaders made through normal contact channels seem to bear no fruit, militant people's groups in low-income neighborhoods often begin to undertake more organized mass activities. They may start with letters directly to the officials concerned; carbon copies are furnished to other influential people, both nationally and even internationally, e.g., the World Bank, United Nations, Islamic Congress, the Vatican, and to the newspapers, explaining and publicizing the people's plight. The next wave sees petitions with a long list of names moving in official directions, followed by straightforward manifestos of protest. Officials are invited to the people's site to discuss the issues directly with them. If the results prove unsatisfactory, delegations of local people follow up their demands at appropriate offices. Outright bribery may be tried. Where these actions do not work, nuisance tactics are devised to put pressure on decision-makers to capitulate.

Thus, in Zone One Tondo Organization's (ZOTO's) 1972 attempt to convince the now deceased archbishop of Manila to follow Pope Paul VI's injunction that the Church help Tondo's poor, the archbishop was asked to donate several thousand pesos to the ZOTO land-titling effort. When the latter replied that his funds were already committed to other worthy welfare projects, several hundred squatters flocked to a local bank largely owned by the Manila archdiocese and proceeded to open accounts simultaneously, with their initial minimum deposits in large bags of one-centavo coins. The harassed tellers called on every staff member present, including the manager, to help out, but nonetheless spent a harrowing day catering to their new customers.

The word quickly got back to the archbishop, who though pressured, nonetheless refused to give in. Other tactics were then tried.

Further to the south, squatter women in Cebu, tired of appealing to the local community development authorities to facilitate a piped water connection to their site, simply marched into the agency's office premises and calmly proceeded to do their laundry under the faucets there. The agency quickly got the new connection installed.

In South American squatter invasions of unoccupied land, a baby's death, even if it stems from the normal illnesses that affect the children of the poor, can be dramatized publicly as having been caused by the hardships of the eviction process or by alleged maltreatment by the police. This serves as a rallying point for the community and courts public sympathy regarding the sad plight of the squatter group. Farther north, American blacks have won successes in their fight to force slum landlords to repair leaky, rat-infested tenements by sending their toughest looking members to the "lily-white" upper-middle class neighborhood in which the landlord resides. There they peacefully picket the latter's house, assured that neighbors will soon exert pressure on their erring colleague to give the group whatever it wants so long as he gets the picketers out of the neighborhood.

In Hong Kong's Yaumati Typhoon Shelter in 1972, the boat-dwelling people seeking places in low-cost government housing found themselves ignored by government housing authorities. A reclamation project had been launched to build a highway across their shelter, reserving open spaces for the loading and unloading of cargo. Finding themselves with reduced space and constantly pushed toward the deep water occupied by large industrial barges and junks, 100 boat dwellers decided in January to march to the Marine Department and demand resettlement in government housing estates. A two-hour conference with officials there yielded no definite answers from the latter. The boat people then decided to drag their boats ashore and leave them there, effectively blocking further work on the reclamation project. Officials reacted by promising to rehouse those who had registered earlier for housing. But the people wanted all the members of their boat community rehoused, registered or not. An all day sit-in involving 40 people on the reclamation site brought government figures to the site to investigate the problem, even though it was Chinese New Year when normally all work ceases. The results: the government

announced that all genuine boat dwellers would be rehoused in three months and that the reclamation project would be halted during that interim period. The nuisance tactics had paid off. Forced to take notice of the problem, and pressured by effective tactics, the officials cut through the usual bureaucratic red tape to make possible a legitimate desire espoused by ordinary people mobilized to exert the power of numbers.⁵

Where nuisance tactics do not succeed, and politicians turn a deaf ear despite a future election, groups may resort to pickets, marches, rallies, and demonstrations. In countries with authoritarian regimes which do not allow assemblies of more than a few people, the better organized groups may utilize the more traditional forms of ritual in the community as their vehicles for expression. Thus, religious processions, prayer meetings, or public ritual offerings that include exhortations to fulfill the people's desires for land or housing or improvement of facilities give pause to law enforcement agencies unsure of whether they dare break into a religious gathering.

In the case of open demonstrations, effectiveness is often enhanced by the sympathetic participation of labor unions, student groups, political parties, and the like. However, because each group may also have its own interests to further, the occasion may turn into a disorderly one as speakers vie for the microphone. An outright riot may develop, depending on how crowd behavior evolves and how the watching policemen or military personnel react to it. While the militant and even violent approach can bring the desired speedy concessions from the embattled authorities, it also serves to alienate the public from the people's original cause in terms of housing or land needs. For the non-involved public, disorder upsets life and is to be abhorred. This is especially true if politically radical groups have associated themselves with the movement, for then the smaller issues get mixed in with larger ideological struggles.

GOVERNMENT TACTICS AND STRATEGIES FOR HANDLING PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

Where disagreements between government officials and people

5. Society for Community Organization, "Yaumati Boat People," mimeographed (Hongkong, 1972).

on local community matters involving housing and estate management cannot be reconciled by conferring with one another, or where support is simply not forthcoming from the people despite their leaders' urgings, the government has other options open to it. Persuasion is the first approach. Officials call public meetings in the neighborhood with themselves in attendance to explain their views to the people at large. Social workers bolster motivational programs. Roving sound systems comb the community broadcasting the importance of this or that activity on their part. Posters spring up in public places and favorable newspaper accounts publicize the message further. If a field trip is deemed necessary to convince people that, for example, a suspiciously viewed relocation site offers better facilities than their current one, buses are arranged and selected parties transported to the site for a visit.

Less ethical, underhanded tactics like buying off influential people in the community through outright bribes, appointments to desirable positions, or promises of special privileges also help resolve the issue. Aware of these temptations, well-organized people's groups insist that all negotiations be held in a group context to avoid cooptation. Undercover surveillance of meetings or community assemblies by plainclothesmen and the planting of agents help government decide how dangerous the threat posed by recalcitrant groups is. Open surveillance, of course, represented by policemen standing conspicuously about, warns the populace that their actions are being monitored. The implied threat is expected to keep them on good behavior.

Most governments manage to project their aims in a more peaceful, voluntary persuasion manner. However, if people's organizations take militant stands against the authorities and refuse to give in, or if they exert pressure and even adopt violent tactics, the authorities can reciprocate in kind. Since the full strength of the government's law enforcement agencies can be brought to bear on the matter, official investigations of key leaders of entire groups can be launched with "invitations" for questioning or outright warrants of arrest issued to the suspected erring parties. Interrogation and short- or long-term incarceration with or without a trial, round out the process.

The threat of force can turn into reality when law enforcers break up neighborhood gatherings and arrest the leaders. Truncheon beatings of unruly demonstrators, tear gas, fire hoses, and the

ultimate control mechanism — shooting into crowds — represent the violent extreme. But the authorities using it justify their actions in terms of security needs, the importance of maintaining peace and order and respect for the law.

The issues, then, come down to how far organized people power and its strategy of confrontation can be tolerated by government, and to what extent forms of people's participation may be accepted as legitimate by law enforcers. Where is the line to be drawn between legitimate representation by people of their collective desires, on the one hand, and outright defiance of government authority, on the other? Certainly, most people and government officials seek and prefer peaceful means of attaining their own ends. But each set can be pushed only so far before it turns to more violent responses deemed justifiable under the circumstances.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD MANAGEMENT

People can participate effectively in the management of their own surroundings only if they have developed a sense of community and have organized themselves into associations. This explains why a grouping of new residents who did not know one another previously proves difficult to organize. It takes time for people to feel at ease with one another and to accumulate the experience of interaction that allows some assessment of what the others are like. The process of breaking down barriers and establishing a modicum of trust can be accelerated, however, by creating opportunities for people to come into contact with one another. Recreational programs geared to the children will often bring out even the most aloof householder. Thus, soccer or basketball tournaments for neighborhood teams, children's games on a Sunday afternoon, and religious festivals at appropriate times draw people together. Mothers' classes in nutrition or income-raising activities, carpentry seminars, or in rural settlements, farmers' meetings for the men, help cement new-found friendships even as they communicate useful knowledge to the participants.

In addition to designing community activities, planners have presumably already given serious consideration early in the planning of the settlement to a building and community design

conducive to neighborly interaction. Clustered housing units, for example, allow natural friendships to evolve because they separate out a discrete grouping from the hundreds or even thousands of households in the new settlement. The location of small neighborhood stores and restaurants, bus stops, pool halls, basketball courts and other natural congregating sites also strongly influence the linkages that arise in a local setting.

Given the dearth of formal associations in settlements composed of residents who moved in almost simultaneously or in waves some months apart, it may be necessary to have professional social workers or community organizers deliberately set about forming the people into organizations, usually on a block basis. Yet one should also be aware that evidence from rural and urban settings the world over suggests that grassroots organizations founded and nurtured by the government rarely succeed in becoming effective means for people to express themselves. Privately organized spontaneous efforts do much better. In view of this, it would be well for the above mentioned social workers to phase themselves out as soon as possible.

In older communities which are being upgraded, one can reasonably assume that a wide variety of formal and informal groupings already exists. These can become the basis of a larger umbrella organization made up of groups who formally file an application to join. If representation on a block basis is also necessary, the existing organizations may plan out the new structure. Whatever the final composition of the community grouping, its existence as a truly representative body is crucial for effective people's participation in the management of their settlement.

An organized community group performs several important functions in housing and neighborhood management. It may plan and implement numerous projects, especially if it has access to funds. Thus, it may decide that high priority should be given to building neighborhood clinics and staffing them in part with locally trained paramedical personnel drawn from neighborhood ranks. Or they may want to clear an open space for use as a park or recreation area for the children, with labor supplied by one member per household. Adolescents may be encouraged to hold fund-raising dances for their own projects. Leftover excavations may become the landfill targets of a cooperative work group fearful lest the children fall into them. Generating income-raising activities may command the attention of the group as its major program.

Setting up emergency relief systems in the event of a flood or fire generally needs community participation. All these activities cannot be undertaken effectively by the people without strong local organization and leadership.

Another function appropriate to the overall community organization is that of self-policing. Safety brigades can be set up to deter thieves and hoodlums from preying on others in the community. Parents can agree on common norms to prevent their children from falling into delinquency. More subtly, residents can exercise surveillance to see to it that their neighbors do not sell their rights to the current site to wealthier outsiders. This is easier to do when neighbors are linked together in a housing cooperative whose interests would be threatened by resale of units to wealthier outsiders. On the other hand, where the housing authority remains the owner or manager, knowledgeable neighbors are not likely to "tell on" their friends who resell, for this may mean some kind of reprisal from the outside-linked housing authority.

Another important function of an overall community organization emerges in its capacity to represent the people in dealing with outsiders. Outside agencies can more easily deal with formally established groups than they can with individuals or informal group clusters. Business transactions like the establishment of a free nursery school in the area or the launching of a child-feeding program can thus be settled quickly. Conversely, a representative organized group ensures that outsiders cannot simply contact anyone in the neighborhood they wish, to negotiate a project that may go contrary to the general welfare of the community. The community as a whole therefore exercises some control over inside-outside transactions affecting the larger whole.

This control extends to the hiring of the organized group's own technicians if it feels that those provided by the housing authority do not express their interests sufficiently. Thus it can obtain the services of an architect-planner to check on whether a street pattern designed by the authorities really has to traverse and raze three houseblocks. Or an engineer responsible to the group can tell them why the drainage canals on a certain street are not working after months of fruitless inquiries directed at estate engineers. If in preparation for a manpower training program they seek data on the skills needed, desired, and already available in the community, they might call in a sociologist to help them run a survey and

train the eligible residents as interviewers. The potential they have for independent action of this kind is great when they are organized. It is greater still when the entire management of the housing estate is turned over to the people's organization, provided funds are still made available to them to render the exercise of power genuine.

TRAINING NEEDS FOR PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD MANAGEMENT

Too often it is assumed that the training component of a housing and neighborhood settlement falls completely on the residents. Yet because of the often wide gulf between the people of low-income communities and elite managers, the latter need just as much of an education, but of a different sort.

EDUCATING MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL

The greatest deficiency found in management personnel is their general lack of understanding of low-income people's lifestyles, outlooks, and aspirations. They tend to censure the residents basically for not being or thinking like themselves. The precariousness of the household economy among the poor is something most middle-class specialists cannot sufficiently appreciate. They will thus deplore, for example, a family's turning to scavenging and littering its immediate surroundings with discarded paper, plastic, metal, and glass bottles. The filth and disarray offend their aesthetic sensibilities, even as they assume that the ragpickers see nothing disturbing about being dirty. A recent Manila study has shown, however, that scavengers do not enjoy their situation any more than anyone else and would gladly leave that occupation if any other viable opportunities turned up.⁶ Since chances are limited, the scavenger accepts this form of income generation as tolerable; it is after all better than theft or outright unemployment.

Attitude change on the part of the manager who looks down on his customers is also called for. It is difficult to inculcate a service orientation instead of the control orientation toward tenants among longtime bureaucrats, used to taking a superior attitude toward their

6. William J. Keyes, "Manila Scavengers: The Struggle for Urban Survival," mimeographed (Quezon City: Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, 1974).

clients. Appreciation of the rights of people, regardless of their lowly social status in society, is a view that often needs conscious learning among elites. Better rapport with the people needs conscious reinforcement as well. So too must an understanding be cultivated of conflict strategy in people's organizations and the possibility of negotiating with them as peers. Finally, an awareness of and concern for the larger social implications of policy decisions need to be developed. Thus, the manager who believes he is doing the community a favor by banning street vendors or hawkers in the interests of order and sanitation may find that his decision eliminates the incomes of 100 local breadwinners, and therefore the source of livelihood for 600 people, mostly children. Hunger, malnourishment, and sickness come in its wake, and he may be forced to initiate costly welfare programs to enable this group to survive.

How are these reformulations to be communicated to the manager? A training seminar would be a good start. Here sociologists and anthropologists who have done research in comparable neighborhoods can describe and analyze the subculture of poverty. Psychologists can help the managers understand the roots of their own attitudes and conduct laboratory exercises in group dynamics, role playing, simulation, and conflict-cooperation games for behavior change. Panel discussions by the more articulate poor residents focusing on their reactions to life in the area under those particular circumstances can communicate something about the rationality of their outlooks. Tours of other communities which have fairly successful people participation in housing decisions, and discussions with their managers and people's organization leaders, can further drive home the message as no amount of lecturing can. Refresher courses with other estate managers every few years enhance the good beginning already made in learning the more progressive approaches utilized by their advanced colleagues. For those seeking genuine empathy with the people they are to serve, actual residence in the community proves to be a particularly enriching, if difficult, experience.

EDUCATING THE RESIDENTS

Residents also profit from various kinds of educational programs. Community assemblies that try to convey the ideas of the manager in a consultative rather than commanding tone generate interest

and understanding on the part of the community. Training local grassroots leaders usually proves a wise decision. Their ability to run meetings so that everyone who wants it has a say, without prolonging the gathering unnecessarily or letting it get out of hand, is a necessary skill. Further, if they learn some of the rudiments of urban planning, management principles, and architectural design, they can better appreciate the constraints under which professionals in these areas operate. Their all too obvious disadvantage at meetings with these specialists becomes less pronounced and their sense of inferiority or defensiveness diminishes as their command of the subject matter increases. Thus later discussion with the managers will be conducted on a more egalitarian basis, an experience which will stand them in good stead should they actually take over control of the housing estate and have to hire their own supervisory and working personnel.

Training of the people involves not only instruction in decision-making procedures, but also in the technical service needs of the community. Ideally, residents should be given hiring preference for local jobs. If self-help housing done gradually as the householder can afford it marks the major orientation of the community plan, then neighborhood men and women can be trained in the range of tasks involved in building or repairing a house. Carpentry, masonry, electrical installations, plumbing, use of electrical tools, interior decoration, buying supplies, reading blueprints, upholstering, sewing curtains and tablecloths, all prove useful to householders. Those who turn out to be very skilled at these tasks may organize work service teams to build structures for those less able or with less time to do so. Road repair gangs, garbage disposal teams, motorized tricycle drivers, and sanitation inspectors can all come from within, provided they are given the proper training early enough. Much can be done to make the community a socially healthy one if housing estate managers consider well ahead of time the social aspects of housing low-income populations in organized settings.

PEOPLE POWER AND PEOPLE PARTICIPATION: FINAL REFLECTIONS

It should by now be amply clear that if people do not participate in the planning and management of their immediate surroundings,

the chances of their environment's improving, not deteriorating, drop correspondingly. The areas of housing and estate management offer natural incentives for encouraging people to act in their own and their neighbors' interests. After all, home and family come closest to a householder's heart everywhere in the world.

Unfortunately, educated elites make people's involvement difficult. They have been "experts" too long to allow their pronouncements to be challenged by near-illiterate, simple people. Their values have been nurtured on middle- and upper-class preferences for beauty, order, symmetry, and reliance on a fat pocketbook for realizing their desires. Little understanding the constraints ordinary rural or urban dwellers face in choosing their lifestyles and residential locations, the technocrats draw plans with a grand sweep but a myopic one vis-a-vis interests of the poorer population.

Perhaps this technocratic approach has recently served to generate people participation. For it ranks technical efficiency, abstract design, and high level cost — benefit analyses based on economic assumptions often alien to the people's real situation, above basic human concerns. The latter can include kinsmen wanting to be located near one another despite a site-raffling plan, fear of losing customers owing to the required transfer of a household industry into a centrally located manufacturing site, a resistance to sharing newly built toilet facilities with one's neighbors, or insisting on lot ownership even if leasehold constitutes the experts' preference.

Peattie has observed that when politicians held sway in less technologically complex times, people could express their views on a more egalitarian basis and expect some kind of sympathetic response from their non-technical vote-hungry leaders.⁷ But in the age of the technocrat, ordinary mortals cannot really meet him on his own terms. His knowledge is too specialized for them to contradict on a scientific or technical basis. Not even the politician-bureaucrat can compete with his judgments. Thus, a growing conviction emerges among ordinary people that the only way to make the technocrat acknowledge other factors to which he has given little recognition thus far is to smoke him out of his air-conditioned office and force him to see reality as it is lived. If he balks — and he usually does at first since no one of lower education has ever

7. Lisa Redfield Peattie, "Reflections on Advocacy Planning," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34 (1968): 80–88.

challenged him before — an organized people's group can restore the balance his expertise has tilted in his favor. The more autocratic he gets about having his way, the more militant an opposing people's group is likely to become. The reaction of unorganized groups, on the other hand, is an increased apathy.

In the long run, people's participation cannot be separated from people's power. For through constant involvement in community affairs they begin to learn what organization and united action can accomplish. It will not take them much longer to discover that so long as basic institutions of society and the existing power distribution do not change, their situation is not likely to improve qualitatively, only quantitatively at best. Thus, more donations of free medicines will come to their children, more lower-level jobs will be opened to them, water will be piped into the houses, parks and playgrounds will be improved — the list goes on and on. Yet they remain at the bottom of the social heap, moving up in small increments perhaps, but always overshadowed by the ever increasing affluence of their countrymen higher up on the scale. Those who move up are, of course, the more fortunate ones. The great majority remain right where they are, beyond the reach of the trickle-down process. Until the total social structure undergoes a drastic reformulation — which presumably can be evolutionary rather than revolutionary — and development policy is assessed in terms of its human costs, especially for the bottom half of the populace, only then can a just society emerge.

How should governments view direct people's participation in their own world? Here lies a dilemma. The housing manager may genuinely seek the views of occupants; but if basic differences become irreconcilable, he cannot condone more violent action on the people's part. At what point does he evict "undesirables" and "trouble makers" who are arousing the populace against him in a hotly debated issue over the installation of hallway bulbs in a tenement, or the revocation of a bus franchise to an outsider? At what point does he call in the police if a sit-in or passive resistance tactic has gone on too long, disrupting ongoing activities? Who are "the people" in the first place? Which of the competing groups in the community should he recognize, if any, as legitimate spokesmen?

It is easier to pose these questions than to answer them, partly because the world's experience with people power and participation

remains limited. The elusive happy medium between apathetic people and paternalistic authorities, on the one hand, and militant people coupled with repressive authorities, on the other, is still being sought in country after country. The more laudable models provide too few examples. But the search must continue, for the age of the common man and the common woman is upon us. They will not tolerate for long always taking the follower role that poverty has heretofore thrust upon them, not when the development ethic trumpets loudly its aim of enhancing the lot of the masses and encouraging self-reliance.

So long as resources and power continue to be lodged in a few in this otherwise enlightened age, the potential for effective grass-roots movements looms ever greater. Since elites seem loath to surrender or even share their decision-making capacities with their poorer brothers and sisters, it is safe to conclude that the struggle for people power will dominate the close of the twentieth century.