Goal 1: Provide Decent and Diverse Housing Opportunities for All People Who Live in Over-the-Rhine.

Objectives:
1. Expand low-income housing opportunities for existing and displaced Over-the-Rhine residents.
2. Stabilize the base of decent, safe, and sanitary low-income housing at a minimum of 5,520 units.
3. Maintain an equitable distribution of low-income housing units in each sub-area of Over-the-Rhine.
4. Expand assisted housing opportunities for persons of low income.
5. Develop policies to encourage home ownership opportunities for all-income-level citizens in Over-the-Rhine.
6. Housing opportunities should include city-owned property, HUD boarded-up buildings, and incentives for businesses that provide housing above their storefronts.
7. Increase housing equity opportunities for low-income persons through W.D.C.s, nonprofit housing associations, co-ops, home ownership, etc.
8. With city support, develop new and innovative policies and programs for securing low-income housing.
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5. Ibid., June 25, 1996, A1, and June 26, 1996, B1. The Over-the-Rhine Community Council opposed the ordinance as “a police license to harass residents” backed by business owners, while one of the city’s leading civil rights lawyers disputed the law’s constitutionality. Cincinnati *Enquirer*, September 21, 1996, A10.


7. For a different approach to the history of inner-city treatments (and one that omits historic conservation) see Robert Halpern, *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995). The concept of an African American ghetto is a controversial one. By such a ghetto we mean an area containing an involuntary and high concentration of people with varied interests, religions, occupations, incomes, and behavioral and physical traits who share one attribute, their identification by whites as African American based on their skin color.

Prologue


City planners in this era acted as if a defective group or part affected adversely the functioning of the whole but did not threaten the vitality of all the
other groups and parts. This notion of mechanical interdependence led them to
devise particular solutions to particular problems rather than to comprehensiveness

Biological determinism seems also to have characterized thinking about class
and gender cultures in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, an issue

5. Miller, Boss Cox's Cincinnati.
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4. The Chicago school sociologists suggested these political tendencies in the 1920s without discussing them explicitly. Later, however, Wirth articulated them in “Urbanism as a Way of Life,” American Journal of Sociology 44 (July 1938): 1–24.


7. Robert A. Burnham, “The Cincinnati Charter Revolt of 1924: Creating City Government for a Pluralistic Society,” in Shapiro and Sarna, Ethnic Diversity, pp. 202–24. The new system did not eliminate two-party politics. Instead, reform Republicans, regular and reform Democrats, and the independents and “radicals” who created the new charter organized the Charter Committee (a political party, in fact), which they portrayed as a pluralistic political and civic association dedicated to the welfare of the city as a whole. From the mid-1920s into the 1950s the Charterites’ opposition came from the Republicans, who reorganized themselves on pluralistic principles, touted the GOP as the best representative of the welfare of the city as a whole, and accepted all the features of the new city charter except PR, which they tried frequently but not successfully (until 1957) to eliminate on the grounds that ward representation could more accurately reflect the


Comprehensive planners and housing reformers worked hand in glove in Cincinnati. This leads one to suspect that the secondary literature, which has tended to focus on national professional organizations rather than on people on the line in particular cities, has exaggerated the differences between the planners and the "housers."


12. Ibid., pp. 11–13, 21–22, 27–31, 141–42, 149. The report called specifically for the creation of local civic centers containing churches, firehouses, branch libraries, police stations, hospitals, and other public buildings as "the hubs of the respective (residential) communities" (p. 141).


14. On the ruralness and southernness of native migrants to the city, see ibid., p. 24.

15. Ibid., pp. 50–51.

16. For the four previous proposals see Technical Advisory Corporation, "Program for a City Plan," p. 132.
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21. Ibid., pp. 171, 190–91, 212.
22. Ibid., pp. 50–51.
24. Ibid., pp. 50–53. In this section the plan noted that the Model Homes Company, a philanthropic enterprise, was remodeling and converting abandoned buildings such as the old Good Samaritan Hospital into housing, and recommended other undertakings of this sort. Ibid., pp. 51–55.
29. For an account of Bettman's role in the movement for a new master plan, see Robert A. Burnham, "'Pulling Together' for Pluralism: Politics, Planning and Government in Cincinnati, 1924–1959" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1990), pp. 191–200. Bettman knew about growing opposition in the 1940s to master planning by expert consultants among critics who advocated the elimination of independent planning commissions and more intense involvement of private citizens and organizations in the day-to-day operations of a planning bureaucracy directly responsible to the executive branch of city government. But he felt that popular participation in each stage of the planning process would impinge upon the quality of the plan and undermine confidence in the planning profession. And he continued to defend the independent planning commission
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1930 and 1940, from 127,089 to 118,069), but also another startling phenomenon, a decline in the population of the census tracts immediately surrounding the basin. The planners argued that the black population, unlike the white, had not decentralized significantly, and they observed but did not treat as problematic the continued concentration of blacks in the basin’s West End. The planners also noted the area’s insignificant foreign-born population (5.7 percent in the city and 4.4 percent in the metropolitan area) and questioned the conventional idea that Cincinnati had received in the 1930s a large number of rural migrants from the southern Appalachian region. The planners pointed to the low rate of white migration from the South and stressed that a large percentage of in-migrants from Kentucky, the source of most of the white migration to Cincinnati in the 1930s, had moved from towns and cities, especially those just across the Ohio River within the Cincinnati metropolitan area.
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1. City hall analysts estimated that about one-fourth of the city's population (133,000 people) would be affected by the clearing and redevelopment of all the inner-city slums, that it would cost the city as much as $1 million, and that small projects in the central business district and central riverfront might be undertaken with "very little or no relocation." See Cincinnati City Planning Commission [hereafter cited as CPC] Staff, "Review of Urban Renewal Project Selection," 1960, typescript, pp. 9-12, 21-22, Department of City Planning.


6. Ibid., pp. 32–36.

7. Cincinnati Department of Urban Renewal, "A Preliminary Report to City Council on the Undertaking of Surveys and Plans for Renewal Area #3," June 13, 1956, revised September 7, typescript, pp. 1, 4–5, Municipal Reverence Library; Casey-Leininger, "Creating Democracy," pp. 141–47, 151–55, 167. The Avondale-Corryville urban renewal plan began with the acknowledgment that it deviated from the plan of 1948, which indicated that rehabilitation could shore up a neighborhood for fifteen years, "after which time slum clearance and redevelopment would be necessary." But "current thinking does not share this view," the Avondale-Corryville plan asserted, for the cost of the rehabilitation treatment could not be justified if, "in such a short period of time, redevelopment were inevitable." As a consequence, the Avondale-Corryville plan prescribed
techniques for "lasting restoration and stability far beyond the scope of the treatment and expected results envisioned by the Master Plan" of 1948. CPC (and Department of Urban Renewal), *Avondale-Corryville General Neighborhood Renewal Plan* (December 1960), pp. 1–2.

8. Ibid., pp. 4–7.
9. Ibid., pp. 7–8.
10. Ibid., p. 8.
11. Ibid., pp. 9–10.


17. Ibid., pp. 5, 8, 9.

23. CPC, Inventory and Appraisal, pp. 1, 5, 6, 15, 73, 95, figs. 1–3.


26. Ibid., pp. 6, 7, 29.

27. Ibid., pp. 43, 110. Uptown already had one institution of higher education, the Ohio Mechanics Institute, but its programs catered to younger people seeking advanced training in various vocational areas, not adults in the managerial class or retirees.

28. A survey of opinion on proposals in 1941 for Cincinnati’s downtown noted an agreement on “the good planning principle to so zone central business districts to provide for a segregation of office buildings, amusements, women’s shopping areas, etc.” Walter S. Schmidt, Proposals for Downtown Cincinnati: A Digest of the Report Submitted by Walter S. Schmidt to the Urban Land Institute (Chicago: Urban Land Institute, January 1, 1941), p. 8. The designation of Over-the-Rhine as part of the Downtown Fringe did not prevent the city, in the mid-1960s, from widening Liberty Street to improve traffic flow between I-75 and I-71, an improvement that destroyed 194 buildings. S.v. “Liberty Street,” index to the Planning Commission minutes; and Cincinnati Enquirer, July 17, 1997, B16.
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2. Council on Social Agencies, Cincinnati Report (1952). The literature on
the origins of community action neglects the diversity of those origins by focusing on such programs as Mobilization for Youth, the experimental delinquency program in New York City, and Columbia University social work professors Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin's *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs* (New York: Free Press, 1960) as the antecedents of the war on poverty.


11. The conference was organized by the Social Service Association of Greater Cincinnati and the Mayor's Friendly Relations Committee, a volunteer organization established in 1943 to promote harmonious race relations. *Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 30, 1954, A:16-4.


13. Ibid., pp. 6, 8, 12.


20. “Proposal for Establishment of Committee on Migration,” November 7, 1966, Cincinnati Human Relations Commission Papers, box 12, folder 5, Department of Archives and Rare Books, University of Cincinnati. Although the Council on Appalachian Migration appears to have been active between 1963 and 1965, records of its activities in these years have not survived.


The Main Street Bible Center was one of three such centers established by the students of Mount St. Mary’s Seminary. See Report on the Main Street Bible Center, September 21, 1964, Alter Papers, Saint Mary’s Bible Center Folder, Archives of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. See also Edmund M. Hussey, A History of the Seminaries of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati (Norwood, Ohio: Mount St. Mary’s Seminary of the West, 1979), p. 56; “An Interview with Michael Maloney,” Appalachian Journal 17 (Fall 1989): 38–41; Reverend John Porter interview, April 21, 1986; Philip Obermiller interview, December 12, 1986. Underlying these programs were some assumptions about both the past role of the Catholic Church in Over-the-Rhine and its potential contribution to the community in the present. First, the archdiocese saw the neighborhood’s past, symbolized by St. Mary’s start as an immigrant church, as a basis for the revival of Catholicism among recent newcomers in the inner city. Second, church workers assumed that poor people
needed opportunities and choices in employment, health care, education, and housing as well as food and clothing, and that the church should act as a liaison between the poor and outside individuals, agencies, and institutions, especially Catholic ones, that wished to provide such opportunities in poor neighborhoods. Third, the initiation of community organizing activities by church workers indicated that they had abandoned the policy of helping poor people move out of the neighborhood in favor of assisting them in their struggle to rehabilitate both their own lives and the neighborhood itself. Catholic Telegraph, March 19, 1965, A:3:3; Most Reverend Edward A. McCarthy to Right Reverend Monsignor Ralph A. Asplan, September 6, 1968, Alter Papers, Catholic Commission on Poverty folder, Archives of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati; and Catholic Telegraph, September 18, 1965, A:6:3, and December 11, 1964, A:3:2. For a theological articulation of this point of view in the mid-1960s, see Harvey Cox, The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective (New York: Macmillan, 1965). Urban historians have come late to the study of religion and the inner city, a recurring theme in part 2 of this book. But see also John T. McGreevy, Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).


25. Ibid., pp. 5–6.


27. CPC, Minutes, vol. 29, March 6, 1964, p. 35, March 13, p. 39, April 3, p. 44.

28. CPC, Dayton Street Preservation Area Study (February 1965).


30. For an account of the variety of perspectives on the urban renewal project that emerged from this situation, see Zane L. Miller and Thomas H. Jenkins, eds., The Planning Partnership: Participants' Views of Urban Renewal (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982). See also Cincinnati Department of Urban Development, “History of


32. The Task Force was chaired by Edgar "Buddy" Mack, treasurer of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra (the major tenant of Music Hall) and an officer of Seasongood and Mayer, investment counselors. Other members of the Task Force included representatives of the Planning Commission, the city's Department of Urban Development, the Cincinnati Public School District, the Metropolitan Housing Authority, the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and the St. Peter in Chains Roman Catholic Cathedral across from the city hall building on the eastern boundary of the West End. See Thomas H. Jenkins, "The West End Task Force: Community Participation and Policy Planning," in Miller and Jenkins, Planning Partnership, pp. 84–85.


34. The Task Force adopted the alternative housing policy that some members of the university consulting team thought would produce little if any integration. See Zane L. Miller and Hayden B. May, "Housing: The Critical Nexus," in Miller and Jenkins, Planning Partnership, pp. 141–56. Two of the black participants in the Queensgate II policy planning process later contended that they aimed from the outset to "provide for the continuous development of black communities over time," a goal that implied an immediate strategy of racial residential segregation. See Jerome R. Jenkins and Richard W. Lewis, "Queensgate II and 'the Movement': A View from the Community," in ibid., pp. 106–7.

35. Institute for Metropolitan Studies, University of Cincinnati, Queensgate II Development Program, vols. 1 and 2, submitted to Peter Kory, director, Department of Urban Development, City of Cincinnati, August 28 and 31, 1970, copies in the Project Files.


Queensgate I after the adoption of the plan, see Miller and Jenkins, “Postscript,” in Miller and Jenkins, Planning Partnership, pp. 191—97.

38. See Jenkins and Lewis, “Queensgate II and ‘the Movement,’” p. 107.

39. For one version of that history, see Miller, “Queensgate II,” pp. 51—80. For the use of elements of that history for the purposes of building ethnic pride and cohesion, see Jenkins and Lewis, “Queensgate II and ‘the Movement,’” pp. 112—13.
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1. Kevin A. Shepard, Cincinnati Housing Policy: An Analysis of Cincinnati’s Housing Problem and Governmental Response (Institute of Governmental Research, University of Cincinnati, 1982), pp. 43—44.


10. City of Cincinnati, Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Devel-
opment for a Grant to Plan a Comprehensive City Demonstration Project (Office of the City Manager, April 26, 1967), Part IV, p. 1.


18. See in particular WCKY Radio, "The Southern Mountaineer: An Audio Study of a People, a Place, and a Condition," September 1963, transcript in the Foster Library, in which several public officials and social workers are interviewed about the presence of Appalachians in the inner city. The series was billed as Cincinnati’s response to the publication of Night Comes to the Cumberlands.

19. See the minutes of United Appalachia Cincinnati, 1968–70, Urban Ap-
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Urban Life and Urban Policy in the United States, 1940–1980 (Jackson: University


20. Draft proposal, Appalachian Identity Center, Urban Appalachian
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22. Cincinnati Enquirer, April 13, 1971, A:40:1; Cincinnati Enquirer Magazine,
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34. Kevin A. Shepard, *Cincinnati Housing Policy: An Analysis of Cincinnati’s Housing Problem and Governmental Response* (Cincinnati: Institute of Governmental Research, University of Cincinnati, 1972), pp. 43—44.
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