OPPRESSION, PUERTO RICANS AND THE CHURCH IN THE EMPOWERMENT STRUGGLE FOR A "NEW SOUTH END"

by

RICARDO MAYOL

M. Div., Andover Newton Theological School
(1988)

B.A., Geography, University of Puerto Rico
(1981)

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

May 1990

Signature of Author_____
Department of Urban Studies and Planning
May, 1990

Certified by_____
Dr. Edwin Meléndez
Professor of Urban Studies and Planning
Thesis Advisor

Accepted by_____
Don Schon
Chair, MCP Committee

Rotch

OPPRESSION, PUERTO RICANS AND THE CHURCH IN
THE EMPOWERMENT STRUGGLE FOR A "NEW SOUTH END"

by
Ricardo Mayol

Submitted to the Department of Urban Studies and Planning on May
19 in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master in City Planning

ABSTRACT

This study explores the participation of the church in the
Puerto Rican community's struggle for empowerment. Can the church
serve as an instrument of empowerment for Latinos in the U. S.? If
the church can serve this function, what factors facilitate the
church's participation in the community empowerment struggles?

The Urban Renewal Program threatened Puerto Rican South End
residents with displacement and demolition of their barrio. The
gentrifying forces attempted to disband people. In such a context,
St. Stephen's Episcopal Church assisted Puerto Ricans excluded from
the benefit of the renewal plan to fight for their rights.

The main finding of this study is that, although churches
sometimes reproduce class and ethnic inequalities, at times
churches can also serve as catalyst for change by raising questions
and bringing about new forms of empowerment. Churches situated in
oppressive circumstances can understand their religious demands in
conformity with a liberation ethics. Communities with a strong
religious worldview need religious mediation to develop a class-
ethnic consciousness. The church can have some influence in
undermining oppression by strengthening the community, developing
an alternative conceptualization of reality, and mobilizing the
community to challenge the systems of oppression.

My argument is based on St. Stephen's Episcopal church and its
participation in community struggles in the South End. Although
one single case study is not enough to draw generalization for the
church, my findings reinforce what other authors have found about
the church's participation in the process of social change.

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Edwin Meléndez
Title: Professor of Urban Studies and Planning

To my wife, Jeannette and
to my children, Tito and Yeris

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was fortunate to have the constant support and encouragement of many people.

Professor Dr. Edwin Meléndez was not only my thesis advisor and professor, but he was also <u>mi amigo, compañero, y compatriota</u>. As a professor, he always provided thoughtful, analytical and critical comments. As a <u>compañero compatriota</u> he helped me to explore the complex reality of my <u>barrio</u> and affirmed my commitment to serve my people.

Mel King always offered me his wisdom, direction, and encouragement. For this thesis he was not only my reader, but an actor of this piece of history.

Thanks to Professor Frank Jones who paid for me an English course at the Harvard Summer School.

My appreciation to Giwboa Kajubi and Fernando Miranda for editing a final draft of this document.

I am also thankful to Mary Grenham's smile and always kindness.

Thanks to the people of St. Stephen, Fr. Dwyer, doña Paula, and María for your time and openness. I also offer my appreciation to the people of the Episcopal Dioceses of Massachusetts for opening St. Stephen files and for allowing me to copy valuable material.

Last, but not least, my gratitude to Jeannette, my wife, who edited many copies of this document and walked with me on this journey. <u>Gracias a Yerís y Tito mis dos queridos hijos!</u>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This study explores the participation of the church in the Puerto Rican community's search for empowerment. My questions were, whether or not the church can serve as an instrument of empowerment for Latinos in the U. S.? If the church can serve this function, what factors facilitate the church's participation in the community empowerment struggles?

The main argument of the study is that churches under certain circumstances, can serve as catalysts for social change; churches do not always reproduce an oppressive social order. To explore this hypothesis, I have selected St. Stephen's Episcopal Church's involvement in the empowerment struggle over a "New South End" in Boston."

METHODOLOGY

I have used the case study method to research the church's participation in community struggles. Through this method I have reconstructed the events of St. Stephen's Church organizing the South End Puerto Rican residents, during 1963 to 1969. I collected data by interviewing key actors, collecting church documents, and by analyzing secondary sources.

The time frame of this study covers the years 1963 to 1969, the community action period. The case starts on 1963, the year that Fr. Dwyer arrived at St. Stephen. From 1963 to 1965 Fr. Dwyer's approach to the community development followed the assimilation approach. Then, around 1966 to 1969 this approach changed to community organizing and direct action in which the church was the main agent, activating and mobilizing the Puerto Rican community. The year 1969 is an appropriate time to end this case study. From that period another stage in the struggle started in which a more formal organization assumed leadership. The years 1963 to 1969 also make sense because they can be considered a unit with a common political environment, a direct confrontation approach prevailed in the community and St. Stephen played an important role

organizing the community.

The geographical area of the study is the Boston South End, particularly, those streets in which Puerto Ricans were concentrated namely, Washington, Pembroke, W. Newton, Shawmut, and others. St. Stephen's Episcopal Church and its community programs provide the institutional framework for this case. Though, I looked at the complex picture of the Puerto Rican historical reality, the focus of the study is on the struggles for land against urban renewal in the South End.

The data for the case comes from primary and secondary sources. The two primary data comes from: 1) interviews with people from the church and the community who participated as actors during that time, and 2) St. Stephen's archives: memoranda, letters, field reports, organizational histories, inter-organizational correspondence, and other reports. The secondary data are studies about this particular piece of history such as <u>Chain of Change</u> (1981) by Mel King and "Organizing for Survival: The Emergence of a Puerto Rican Community" (Ph. D. dissertation 1988) by Miren Uriarte-Gaston, and articles written by Fr. Dwyer and others.

The first step in collecting the data was an

exploratory research in which I interviewed people from the Emmanuel Gospel Center and St. Stephen's Episcopal Church. These interviews produced a "snow ball" effect, from one interview I was referred to another person that was connected somehow to the case study, and so on. The interviews were semi-structured. I did have a set of questions to ask, but people were free to talk about other topics they felt were important to the research.

Regarding St. Stephen's files, I researched the Diocesan Library and Archive of Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts where St. Stephen archives are preserved. I examined St. Stephen records regarding community programs. These documents are referred to at length in this paper.

At the same time I was examining St. Stephen files, I interviewed other persons related to the church community program at the time. These interviews were more meaningful than the first ones because I already had background information about the event.

OPPRESSION AND LIBERATION

Oppression is the theoretical framework of this study. Oppression is the power and domination of one group over another in order to appropriate social and economic

resources. Puerto Ricans are a nation of people who have suffered colonial oppression in their homeland and in the heart of the colonial power in the U. S. The small Island of the Caribbean sea has produced a great amount of economic resources and a mine of cheap labor to the U. S. The relationship of the Island of Puerto Rico to the U. S. has an impact on every facet of the lives of the Puerto Rican people, including the presence of large number of Puerto Ricans in U. S. cities. The U. S. invasion of 1898, the imposition of the U. S. citizenship on 1917, the Island's rapid industrialization and massive migration of Puerto Ricans to the U. S. after World War II are changes that resulted from U. S. colonialism in Puerto Rico. Consequently, an understanding of Puerto Rican migration requires to place it in a colonial context.

Puerto Ricans living in the mainland are circumscribed to the lowest strata of society. A segmented labor market blocks access to jobs with higher earnings, privileges, and status. Most Puerto Ricans have access only to low-wage and dead-end jobs which locate them in a vulnerable, easily dominated and exploited position. Class mechanisms of oppression are reinforced in every-day events by a racist society. The ideology of white supremacy attributes responsibility for lack of economic and political progress to colonized immigrants. A White-Anglo-

Saxon-Protestant norm is used to measure other cultures. This ideology does not recognize the systemic oppression that hinders people from developing a self-sustaining higher quality of life. White supremacy is part of a structural mechanisms of oppression that maintains Puerto Ricans in a disadvantaged position.

ASSIMILATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION AND THE CHURCH

Assimilation and self-determination are two contending approaches that churches use to understand and overcome the disadvantaged position of Puerto Rican communities in the U. S.

Some authors contend that the only possible function churches can play is to adopt an assimilation approach that legitimate the dominant social order. In this view churches operate to accommodate and integrate people into existing institutions. In other words, churches will accept the subordination of Puerto Ricans in U. S. society and the tensions that arise every day as unavoidable circumstances. By accepting the existing order, they facilitate the assimilation process.

Indeed, churches have played the function of legitimizing the status quo. Ministries of charity (such

as homeless shelters) and advocacy (such as representing people in welfare offices) are services that churches commonly provide to the community. These ministries assume that society is just and people only need access to services that already exist. However, this approach does not help people to critically understand the systemic structure that prevents them from attaining a dignified position in society. Consequently, because this approach is paternalistic, providing things for people, it generates dependency and self-hatred in the recipients.

In contrast, churches have also served as catalyst agents in community struggles for self-determination. Churches do not always reproduce the social order. Some internal dynamics of the church as a religious institution combined with external conditions can induce the church to move from a conservative function to a more progressive one. No church exists in a vacuum, all churches operate in a historical, geographical, cultural and demographic context. Thus, an oppressive environment can stimulate internal transformation within religious organizations. If this occurs, churches with their capacity to influence community ideas can mediate a worldview independent from, and in opposition to, the dominant worldview. Then, religious convictions may contribute to develop a critical consciousness of oppression. If the increasing level of

social consciousness strengthens organizations and mobilize oppressed, churches can play a liberation function within those communities. Is an understanding of those processes and circumstances that allow us to generalize from the case study to similar circumstances that may occur elsewhere. That is why lessons learned here can be applied to groups elsewhere in similar circumstances.

Black Churches during the Civil Right Movement are good examples of religious organizations playing a catalyst role in community struggles and empowering people for self-determination. Churches were the center of reflective-action programs that challenged the system of domination in the South. The Chicano clergy has also been able to take a stand with the oppressed, and through religion promote an alternative view of society. Black and Chicano congregations have strengthened their communities and mobilized their people to resist oppression.

Churches sometimes reproduce existing class and racial inequalities, but at times serve as active agents in raising questions, bringing about new forms of empowerment and fostering social changes. If the group has a strong religious world view, external political changes will have difficulty mobilizing without its religious institutions undergoing a corresponding transformation. The

church can have some influence in undermining oppression. The church can strength the community, develop an alternative conceptualization of reality, and mobilize the community to challenge the systems of oppression. The church is a particularly important institution for Latinos because history has connected them directly with this institution. Thus, for Puerto Ricans, religious mediation could be essential in the development of class and ethnic consciousness.

The case of St. Stephen is particularly relevant because the actions of this church helped Puerto Ricans to organize their community, develop a consciousness of their Puertorriqueñidad, and strengthen the community to fight for their rights to stay in the South End. St. Stephen participation in community struggles empowered Puerto Ricans for self-determination against the urban renewal plan.

Chapter one of this work presents a full discussion of the theoretical framework. Chapter two discusses the socioeconomic and political context affecting Puerto Ricans in the South End. Chapter three examines St. Stephen's community actions and their impact on the Puerto Rican community. Finally, Chapter four presents the analysis, implications and conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER 1

OPPRESSION, PUERTO RICANS AND THE CHURCH

Systems of oppression, processes of subordinating and dominating people, exploit and appropriate socioeconomic resources. Oppression maintains weak and vulnerable certain groups of people to generate on them internalization of oppression. So that victims will perceive the oppressive power as overwhelming and unavoidable, and they will docile pursue the will of the oppressors. Nevertheless, the political dimension of all persons involves possibilities of conflict, struggle and change.[1]

---

[1] Arthur Brittan and Mary Maynord, "Reality of Oppression," Sexism, Racism and Oppression (NY: Basil Blackwell, 1984) , pp. 214-17.

Social, class, and racial inequalities are systems of oppression confronted by two contending approaches. One serves to assimilate people into existing societal institutions without questioning the inequalities rooted in society. This approach many times leads to blame the victims for the systems' failures. The other is self-determination which proposes to develop people's critical consciousness, strengthen people's organizations, and mobilize the community to challenge oppression. In this chapter, I will describe, first, the theoretical controversies related to the assimilation and self-determination approaches. Then, I will discuss the role of the church in assimilating and affirming people for self-determination.

THEORETICAL CONTROVERSIES

ASSIMILATION

In general terms, the assimilation approach compels people to conform to the existing society. It establishes that life chances for individuals are determined primary by personal characteristics. This model assumes that individuals who do not share society's consensus disrupt the social equilibrium. The equilibrium point arrives when outsider

groups become like the core group, and, in turn, the core society responds with more openness and less prejudice.[2] The assimilation paradigm assumes that problems of integration of groups are, on the one hand, rooted in the new group personal and group characteristics, e.g. lack of knowledge of the prevailing cultural values and so forth, and on the other hand, from attitudes prevalent within the host society that block the integration of the groups.[3]

Gordon argues that White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant culture has become the "norm" against which ethnic groups' ability to participate in the economy and social mainstream of the country is measured. For instance, the norm establishes that a protestant ethics of hard work, delay gratification, and independence is necessary to achieve material benefits and attain success. Thus, people of color are stereotyped as socially dependent and with low-aspirations. This racist ideology leads both to invalidate people of color cognitive and linguistic style and to restrict access to prestige, power, and privileges exclusively to those who conform to the dominant group's cultural values.[4]

---

[2] Miren Uriarte-Gaston, "Organizing for Survival: The Emergence of a Puerto Rican Community" (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1988) , 9.

[3] Uriarte-Gaston, "Organizing for Survival..." , p.10.

[4] "Discrimination Attitudinal and Institutional," p. 372; Milton M. Gordon, "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality," in Majority and minority , pp. 245; Howard J. Sherman & James Wood,

People of color, those non-White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant, are forced to absorb the cultural behavior patterns of the dominant society. This acculturation process imposes upon the new group a negative self-image which leads them to self-hatred. The persistent application of arbitrary, unfair dominant standards induces the group to assimilate. This assimilation, in turn, results in an advantaged privileged position for the core group and suffering of unjustified penalties for the excluded one. Although, people of color try to absorb the normative values, they are structurally excluded from social cliques, organizations, institutional activities, and general civic life of the core society. Such an exclusion creates a type of colony with a network of organizations and informal relationships which permit and encourage members of excluded communities to remain together.[5]

The central premise of the cultural inferiority ideology is the "American Dream's myth" --"everyone can make it." Of course, the myth does not take into account inequalities rooted in the system. If someone cannot "make it" is not attributed to low-wage-dead-end jobs or to lack of

---

Sociology (Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1989) , pp.206-08.

[5] M. M. Gordon, "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality," in Majority and Minority ed. by Norman R. Yetman (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1985) , pp. 254-57.

access to develop the required qualifications. Instead, if anyone cannot "make it," the ideology says it is because she or he has some pathological cultural deficiencies.

The ideology of white supremacy supports the subordination and exploitation of people of color. It is a racist ideology because it does not recognize or acknowledge the systemic discrimination against certain groups of people. Instead, white supremacy imputes the primary responsibility for social disadvantage to people of color themselves.[6]

COLONIAL PARADIGM

In contrast to the assimilation approach, the colonial oppression approach develops a marked distinction between the experience of the European immigrants and people of color. Robert Blauner explains that some minority groups entered the U. S. by force rather than by "free choice."[7] The Black American community was captured and enslaved. The U. S. stole the land from Native American, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans.

U. S. troops invaded the Island of Puerto Rico on July 25, 1898 and imposed U. S. citizenship upon the Puerto Ricans

---

[6] "Discrimination Attitudinal and Institutional," p. 360.

[7] Robert Blauner, "Colonized and Immigrant Minorities," in Majority and Minorities ed. Norman R.Yetman (Boston: Allyn & Boston), pp.338-55.

on 1917. After World War II, the Island adopted a "free associated state" form which promoted rapid industrialization and massive migration of Puerto Ricans to the United States. All these changes resulted from U. S. colonialism in Puerto Rico. Consequently, an understanding of Puerto Rican migration requires placing it in a colonial context. U. S. colonialism is characterized by massive U. S. investment in the Island and the circulation of workers across increasingly interdependent labor markets between Puerto Rico and the U. S.. The presence of Puerto Ricans in North-American cities cannot be divorced from colonialism, domination and increasing interdependence with the U. S.[8]

The inner-cities in the U. S., where most Puerto Ricans live, replicates the colonialism in the Island --a lack of the economic and political means to control their circumstances. In the "internal colonies," as Tabb refers to this situation,[9] a variety of mechanisms force Puerto Ricans to surrender their will and attempts to question the system. These mechanisms of oppression maintain Puerto Ricans politically and economically weak and make them easily to be

---

[8] Miren Uriarte-Gaston, "Organizing for Survival: the Emergence of a Puerto Rican Community" (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1988) , pp.1-2.

[9] William K. Tabb, "The Black Ghetto as Colony," in The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto (NY: W.W. Norton, 1970), pp. 21-34.

exploited and dominated.

These mechanisms result in Puerto Rican immigrants being over represented in the secondary labor market. The segmented labor market has primary and secondary sectors. While the primary sector --professional and technical jobs-- have adequate wages and stable work conditions, the secondary sector jobs are unstable, more dangerous, and dead-end jobs.[10] The secondary sector provides, as Shulman contends, plentiful and undesirable jobs, in which exists an extremely high turnover.[11]

Bonacich discusses the split labor market in which white workers exclude colored people from better jobs. Capitalism is characterized by uneven development, and backwardness or under-development for certain nationalities.[12] Availability of inexpensive labor leads dominant workers, to exclude colored workers groups from equal participation in the labor market. Thus, colored workers are kept out of the most advanced sector of the economy.

---

[10] Edward Blakely, "The Argument for Taking Local Economic Development Initiatives," in <u>Planning Local Economic Development</u> (CA: SAGE, 1989) , pp.28-34.

[11] Steven Shulman, "Race, Class, Occupational Stratification: A Critique of William J. Wilson's The Declining Significance of Race," <u>Review of Radical Political Economics</u> 13 (Fall 1981): p. 24.

[12] Edna Bonacich, "Class Approaches to Ethnicity and Race," <u>Majority and Minority</u>, pp. 66-68.

A segmented and split labor market hinders Puerto Ricans from access to better jobs in the United States. As Rodriquez asserts, even those Puerto Rican immigrants who arrived with skills or had training in white collar occupations were forced to accept whatever jobs were offered to them.[13]

Oppression occurs in both concrete every day personal and collective relationships. Many cultural and political practices affect the production process and the appropriation of profits in a capitalist economy. Race relations cannot be circumscribed to an economic determinism because the vast range of events and experiences that racism produces would disappear completely.[14] Otherwise, white people do not oppress, it is the system that oppresses --racism disappears as a form of domination in its own right, and becomes a manifestation of some hidden forces.[15] The white supremacy ideology combined with the systemic exclusion of people of color from the social fabric of society is confronted with the

---

[13] Clara Rodriquez, Puerto Rican: Born in the U. S. A. (Boston: Unwin & Hyman, 1989) , p. 2.

[14] Steven Shulman, "Race, Class, Occupational Stratification: A Critique of William J. Wilson's The Declining Significance of Race," p. 23-24.

[15] Arthur Brittan and Mary Maynord, Reality of Oppression," Sexism, Racism and Oppression (NY: Basil Blackwell, 1984) , pp. 214-19.

assimilation and self-determination approaches in the church context.

THE CHURCH AND THE TWO CONTENDING APPROACHES

Two contending models attempt to explain and overcome colonized's systemic oppression --assimilation and self-determination. This section discusses the substance of the two approaches, their aims and common strategies. Because churches do intervene in community development, they provide the institutional framework for this discussion. Functionalist and conflict theorists argue that churches can only play the conservative function of reproducing the social order.[16] However, others contend that churches not only assimilate people into the existing societal institutions, but that under certain circumstance the church can serve as catalyst to empower people and promote self-determination.[17] These two models --assimilation and self-determination-- are further developed in the following paragraphs.

---

[16] Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1967; Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, On Religion. (NY: Free Press, 1975)

[17] Leonardo Boff, Eclesiogénesis: Las Comunidades de Base Reinventan la Iglesia (Santander, Sal Terrae, 1984) , p. 61-62; Otto Maduro, Religion and Conflict (NY: Orbis Books, 1982) , p. 127; Gilbert R. Cadena, Chicanos and the Catholic Church: Liberation Theology as a Form of Empowerment" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California Riverside, 1987) , p. 6.

ASSIMILATION

Berger argues that religion has functioned to legitimize norms and institutions. He states, "religion has been the historically most widespread and effective instrumentality of legitimation... Religion legitimatizes so effectively because it relates the precarious reality and construction of empirical societies with ultimate reality."[18]

Leonardo Boff, a Latin American liberation theologian, contends that the hierarchical church in Latin America develops ambiguous sermons that promote a non-conflictive harmonic society. The church condemns class conflict while emphasizing the supernatural and moral observances and the offering open support to dominant classes.[19] Otto Maduro also affirms that in Latin America some clergies tend to "produce, preserve, reproduce, and inculcate religious teaching and practices in accord with the interest of the dominant classes." Maduro argues, that these clergies "preach to accept the prevailing order beyond question,...(they) establish the current order as divine punishment, and hold those in power as depositories of a sacred and eternal authority that must

---

[18] Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1967.

[19] Leonardo Boff, Eclesiogénesis: Las Comunidades de Base Reinventan la Iglesia (Santader: Sal Terrae, 1984) , p. 61-62.

be obeyed." In this way clergies affirm that dominated groups ought to submissively accept their subordinate condition.[20]

The aim of the assimilation model is to integrate people into existing structures assuming that these institutions are just and do not need major modifications to accommodate the needs of the subordinated community. This approach to societal institutions leads to blame victims for society's failure. Assimilation constructs on people's deficiencies. As McKnight contends, this model builds on "inadequacies" such as "illiteracy, visual deficiencies, and teenage pregnancy..."[21] Programs and projects that follow this approach propose temporary solutions confined for a small group of affected people. The focus is to help people with their ongoing life, never to tackle the root causes of systemic problems.[22] Adherents provide access to existing services and facilities without questioning the effect of these programs on the recipients and without inquiring about the requirements of the funding sources for providing services to the community. Sponsors of this approach usually manage the service programs for the people in need rather than working

---

[20] Otto Maduro, <u>Religion and Conflict</u> (NY: Orbis Book, 1982), p. 127.

[21] John McKnight, "Why "Servanthood" is Bad," <u>The Other Side</u> (January -February 1989): 40.

[22] Harvey Perkins, <u>Guidelines for Development</u>. Christian Conference of Asia, Singapore, 1980.

with them in defining an agenda that can transform the conditions of programs' recipients. The people are just passive recipients of the provider's benevolence.

Churches monitor assimilation through ministries of charity such as kitchen soup for the homeless and clothing provision. Other instances are churches doing advocacy work for the poor, going with people to courts, or to the welfare office, and mediating on people's behalf in these institutions. Though these programs are oriented to alleviate the pain and suffering of the people, they also create dependency of the recipients on the programs.

Community development in the traditional sense may be also promote assimilation. A reformative approach, as Perkins contends "makes functional improvements and its actions are complementary to the existing socioeconomic condition structures of the society... Its purpose is to help the prevailing socioeconomic political system to work better..."[23] Institutions following this approach serve as established channels in which the state negotiates with and for community affairs. These institutions for the most part are controlled by their funding sources. Michael Novak and Peter Berger argue that churches in the U. S. should become mediating

---

[23] H. Perkins, Guidelines for Development

institutions of federal or state funding program.[24] In these circumstances churches reinforce dependency of the very groups trying to assist, and limit their capacity to question the social order as they become regulated by government entities.

Assimilation aspires to regulate and prevent any attempt of rebellion from the dominated groups. The model targets symptoms of problems --relief but not change the situation-- and increasingly maintain people's dependency.

SELF-DETERMINATION

Contrary to the assimilation model, self-determination requires radical transformation of social institutions. The underlying assumption is the existence of the ever present resistance to oppression. Maduro argues, resistance often "takes the form of silence, confusion, non-cooperation, hysteria, or purely destructive terror. At moments when routes to liberation seem blocked resistance takes the form of a search compensation rather than conscious organized collective rebellion."[25] Because resistance is always present in the oppressed, the possibility of change is also

---

[24] Michael Novak, Freedom with Justice: Catholic Social Thought and Liberal Institutions (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984) , pp. 192-208.

[25] Otto Maduro, Religion and Conflict (NY: Orbis Books, 1982) , p. 70.

always there.

Boff, Cadena, and Maduro contend that the church can be an instrument to empower groups with a strong religious worldview to seek their self-determination. At certain moments the church stands on the side of the oppressed and supports their struggles for empowerment and liberation. When the church develops a worldview independent of, and in opposition to the dominant worldview, the church can serve a liberating function. The Church, then, legitimates struggles for liberation and makes unacceptable the domination of oppressed communities.[26]

The surrounding environment influences the internal dynamics of the religious institution. Churches situated in oppressive situations --which subordinate and exploit the most vulnerable members of the community-- may joins groups resisting their oppression. The external conditions in which the church is situated can make the church understand religious demands in conformity with liberation ethics. Thus, churches situated in oppressive circumstances can develop an

---

[26] Leonardo Boff, Eclesiogénesis: Las Comunidades de Base Reinventan la Iglesia (Santander: Sal, 1984) , p. 61-62 ; Gilbert R. Cadena, Chicanos and the Catholic Church: Liberation Theology as a Form of Empowerment," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California Riverside, 1987) pp. 20-21 ; Otto Maduro, Religion and Conflict (NY: Orbis Books, 1982) , p. 136-40.

independent worldview and initiate a project of liberation.[27]

Self-determination, as Perkins asserts, sees "the problem of the poor... as rooted in and perpetuated by the structural organization of society ... process whereby (the poor are) excluded from economic gains and political power by strategies which preserve the concentration of privilege in the society." The model "helps people to understand the root causes behind their situation, and the sources of the crushing impact them."[28] Self-determination prepares people to actively participate in the solution of their problems. This model, in McKnight words, "builds on the strengths of the drop-out, illiterate, bad-sense, teenage-pregnant, battered women... it's about capacity not deficiency."[29] Cultural affirmation in this model functions as a mean to resist oppression by challenging people's fatalism, superstition, passivity, fear, elitism, and individualism. The model strengthens institutions of the oppressed and develops viable strategies that maximize and mobilize the people to demand changes.

For instance, Morris conteds that this was the role played by Black churches in raising consciousness, organizing,

---

[27] Boff, Eclesiogénesis, pp. 61-62 ; Cadena, Chicanos and the Catholic Church, pp. 20-22 ; Maduro, Religion and Conflict, pp. 136-40.

[28] Harvey Perkins, Guidelines for Development.

[29] John McKnight, "Why "Servanthood" is Bad," p. 40.

and mobilizing the black community to challenge the South's oppressive tripartite system of domination. During the Civil Rights Movement black churches served as moving agents confronting the economic, political and personal oppression in the South. The economic and political systemic exclusion of the black community leads the church -- situated in such a context-- to articulate and promote a worldview independent of, and in opposition to, the worldview from and of the dominant white society. Black ministers through sermons condemned oppression and raised the consciousness level of Black Americans. Black churches also create well organized associations and networks that were effective in mobilizing the community to confront their oppression.[30]

Chicano Churches in the Southwest are another example. Conscious of society's discrimination, churches have allied themselves with the Chicano lay movement. As Cadena's study shows, Chicano clergy have taken steps toward a North American version of liberation theology. The Chicano clergies' common experience of discrimination in the U. S. society (in general) and in the Catholic church (particularly) created the necessary conditions to develop an independent worldview of

---

[30] Aldon D. Morris, The Origin of the Civil Right Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change (NY: The Free Press, 1984), pp. 1-76.

the dominant society.[31] Thus, Chicano clergy support popular struggles, and strengthen and organize Chicanos to resist their oppression in the Southwest.

The aim of the self-determination model is to mobilize communities to participate transforming society's unjust conditions. Consciousness raising, organization and mass mobilization are the strategies utilized to intervene and attack the root causes of oppression.

To sum up, class and race hinder Puerto Ricans from developing a self-sustaining quality of life in the U. S. society. Class and race act on each other reinforcing the weak position of Puerto Ricans in the U. S. society. Nonetheless, as Tamez says, "the tyranny of the powerful that violently despoil and impoverish the oppressed generates the immediate outcry of the oppressed and the persistent hope for the establishment of a new and just order."[32] Holding to that hope and taking side with those oppressed, the church can be an instrument of Hispanic empowerment. The church does not always reproduce an oppressive social order, at times it can act as

---

[31] Gilbert R. Cadena, Chicanos and the Catholic Church: Liberation Theology as a Form of Empowerment," pp. 146-52 ; "Chicanos Clergy and the Emergence of Liberation Theology," Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences 11 (May 1989): 107-21.

[32] Elsa Tamez, The Bible of the Oppressed (NY: Orbis Books, 1982) , p.9.

a catalyst for change. In the next chapter I will explore the context of oppression that affected Puerto Rican in the Boston South End.

CHAPTER 2

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE TERRITORY

The Urban Renewal Program attempted to destroy the
Puerto Rican community living in Boston's South End by
attempting to demolish their homes and displacing their
people.

The socioeconomic and political scenario affecting
Puerto Ricans in the South End includes two contending forces.
On the one hand, the Urban Renewal Program and landowners who
wanted to rehabilitate the residential South End, and on the
other hand, Black and Puerto Rican tenants excluded from the
neighborhood rehabilitation benefits and threatened by
displacement. Puerto Ricans struggled to stay on the land

against the wishes of the Boston Redevelopment Authority
(BRA). To appreciate this fight for the land, in this chapter
I will describe, first, the Boston Urban Renewal Program,
then, the Puerto Rican community and the nature of the
community opposition.

BOSTON URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM FOR THE SOUTH END

During the 1960's America's cities were undergoing intensive
urban renewal... One target in this urban renewal scheme was
Boston's South End. In the center of this area surrounded by
sites designated for renovation and rehabilitation, was Parcel
19; it's designation--large scale demolition! This included
the construction of commercial and public facilities; and a
small amount of housing. In 1967, the South End community,
called Parcel 19, was in varying stages of decay and
deterioration. But for over 1,500 persons it was home. It was
a neighborhood with stable institutions, elderly persons with
roots in their community and a growing population of Puerto
Ricans establishing a new "BARRIO" thousands of miles from
their Island of Enchantment.[1]

The multi-million project for the South End covered
more than 606 acres of land and over 200 separate renewal
parcels, indeed, it was one of the most ambitious renewal
project in the country.[2] Edward Logue, had since moved to
Boston and was in the process of orchestrating major
redevelopment in the Hub City. Logue directed the Boston Urban

---

[1] Humberto Cintron, Community Organization: "No Nos Mudaremos
de la Parcela Diecinueve," Preliminary Script, p.1-2.

[2] BRA, South End Neighborhood Profile, p.1.

Renewal Program. The South End neighborhood was an ideal place for revival, as the BRA stated, for its proximity to the new sources of employment developed at Copley Square and the Prudential Center.[3]

Two cornerstones determined the nature of the Urban Renewal Program.

One arm of the Urban Renewal Program was the federal requirement of community approval and the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) manipulations of community decisions. Logue decentralized the BRA operations at the neighborhood level to meet the federal regulation. However, such a decentralization was an illusion because Logue and the BRA retained the final word and intervened in renewal negotiations. The project director negotiated with residents to neutralize opposition, assure acceptability and legitimate the area's development program.

Mel King asserted that many years of negotiation to obtain the neighborhood approval clear indicated that people wanted to stay in the South End. However, two plans for the barrio, one of 1962 and the other of 1965, intended to displace a large number of low-income tenants. As expressed by King,

---

[3] BRA, South End Neighborhood Profile, p.1.

Over 3000 structures were scheduled for rehabilitation and over 3000 new private rental units were to be constructed with aid from the Federal Housing Program. Nineteen percent of all South End household (3500), two-thirds of them low income people, would be displaced under this plan.[4]

The second arm of the urban renewal policy was the natural alliances between the BRA and landlords. Federal regulations compelled a combination of public and local owner investments in the residential rehabilitation. This requirement created a biased planning process in favor of property owners capable of investing in neighborhood rehabilitation. As could be expected, those residents with less capacity to invest were the most affected by the program.[5]

Langley C. Keyes identified the political parties in the South End scenario.[6] On one side, the property owners, a group that favored the neighborhood rehabilitation and consisted of both long term South End resident and newcomers. Those landlords living a long time in the neighborhood endorsed renewal efforts that ensured steady-paying, reliable tenants, and clean up the neighborhood from irresponsible

---

[4] Mel King, Chain of Change (Boston: South End Press, 1981), p.65.

[5] Langley C. Keyes, The Rehabilitation Planning Game. (Cambridge: MIT, 1969): pp. 1-19.

[6] Keyes, The Rehabilitation Game, pp. 40-52.

landlords. The newcomers property owner, mostly young, white, professional, middle or high income, were strongly pushing the urban renewal program for the neighborhood.

On the other side were the poor, also divided in two major groups. One group composed of tenants with long term unemployment and overburdened with many social and emotional problems.[7] These people lived in the lodging houses of those long time South End residents. These people were not capable of organizing to defend their interest in the urban renewal program. Neither were those tenants living in public housing whose property and rents were not in threat.[8]

The other group of South End poor residents -indeed, the most affected-- were Blacks and Puerto Ricans immigrants. These immigrants mostly came from U. S. and Puerto Rico's rural areas. Puerto Rican South End residents came mainly from Aguadilla, San Lorenzo and Arecibo, three Puerto Rican rural towns.[9] In rural pre-capitalist societies, as Bonacich argues, the living standards of people are lower and people are unfamiliar with labor organization. Thus, when these people migrated to metropolitan areas, they become vulnerable

---

[7] Keyes, The Rehabilitation Planning Game , pp. 1-19.

[8] Langley C. Keyes, The Rehabilitation Game , pp. 40-52.

[9] Carmelo Iglesias, Report presented to advisory Committee, July 1966, p.5.

to capitalist's exploitation as cheap labor.[10] Puerto Ricans, indeed, were exploited as cheap labor in the secondary labor market. Other conditions that made their lives precarious were their large families, the language barriers, and the little support from neighborhood institutions in an hostile environment. For all these reasons, at the beginning stages of the urban renewal program Puerto Ricans had little identification with the South End affairs, and little capacity or will to become involved in the rehabilitation planning process.

The Urban Renewal Program excluded the Black and Puerto Rican communities from the social fabric of the city. The program assumed that Blacks and Puerto Ricans were going "to pull up their roots" and "start all over again" in "some other place", that they were going "to run again."[11] As Mel King conveyed, "the Urban Renewal Program was another manifestation of Northern style racism."[12] The racist intention of the program is evidently expressed in the BRA's 1965-1975 General Plan for the City of Boston and Regional Core.

---

[10] Enda Bonacich, "Class Approaches to Ethnicity and Race," Majority and Minority , p.73.

[11] King, Chain of Change, p. 68.

[12] Mel King, "Gentrification: Creating the Bantustan," Chain od Change, p. 209.

The policy ... is ... to promote stability in the size of Boston's population while increasing the diversity of its composition so that it more reflects the composition of the region's population as a whole. This would, of course, entail a reversal of the present trends toward increasing proportions of low-income groups and non-whites in the core city. However, this can not be accomplished unless a positive effort is made to make residential Boston attractive to families at the time when they acquire the economic means to move elsewhere. For that reason an important objective of the development program must be to the stability of residential neighborhood in the Boston and make them, in as many aspects as possible, competitive with surrounding cities and towns in housing, school, and public services.[13]

The Urban Renewal Program meant to the Puerto Rican immigrants, dispersion of their community (displacement) and demolition of their neighborhood, or in other words, destruction of their _barrio_. The distinction between neighborhood and community is helpful to understand the impact of the Urban Renewal program. The neighborhood is made of buildings and other supporting structures which occupies the land in a particular location. The community is the social and political as well as the physical reality of the people.[14]

Gaston and Kennedy discuss the rational of the BRA toward the neighborhood. They viewed the neighborhood as a commodity, depending on capital flow to build an environment regulated by financial institutions on the ground of rent

---

[13] BRA, 1965-1975 General Plan for the City of Boston and Regional Core," November 1964, p. vi-2.

[14] Mauricio Gaston & Marie Kennedy, The Fight for Community Control in Black and Latino Boston," _Radical America_ 20 (September - October 1986): 9.

structure. Due to Boston city downturns in accumulation, the
South End entered into a devaluation cycle. The cycle produced
a gap between the capitalization of land use for the location,
and rent capitalized under the use of the location.[15] Measured
with these parameters the only possible solution for the South
End Neighborhood was gentrification and displacement.[16]

Mona C. Hull described the devaluation of the Puerto
Rican neighborhood area in the South End.

...the maintenance and sanitation of the apartments are in
flagrant violation of the city and state health codes. Rats
abound in almost every building, and multiply on the garbage
heap of the alleys and vacant lots. Cockroaches are such a
common occurrence that residents accept them as a background
fact of life. Garbage disposal by the city is intermittent and
during the winter refuse piles up in the hallways and
entrance. Loose electrical wires dangle in door-ways and
living rooms present an ever -present hazard, even to
visitors. Shaky staircases, missing banisters, unlit hall-
ways, loose window frame, dirty and tattered linoleum, layer
on layer in entrances and halls, these are but some of the
health hazard present all over Parcel 19.[17]

This slum, however, housed a community of friends and

---

[15] M. Gaston & M Kennedy, "The Fight for Community Control in
Black and Latino Boston" , p. 9

[16] The Urban Renewal Program displaced people by three means:
1) direct relocation caused by the BRA's land taking over, 2)
private speculation in housing units, and 3) voluntary abandonment
of homes because have deteriorated to the point that they are unfit
to live in. CAUSE, "Effects of South End Urban Renewal Plan."
Statement presented to Boston City Council at Mackey School,
January 25, 1968, p. 1.

[17] Mona C Hull, "The South End Needs a Health Center." Report
presented to the Emergency Tenants Council. p.2-3.

relatives. In this place people organized themselves, studied, raised their children, reproduced their culture and ideas as a community. They developed a critical consciousness of their own oppressed situation, a sense of a community, networks of social support, solidarity, and political power. "All of which contradicted the needs of capital of maintaining the neighborhood as a pliable "free" commodity for the market."[18]

The Community Assembly for a United South End (CAUSE) directed by Mel King was instrumental in organizing and activating communities for self-expression and self-control. The strategy was to inform the community about the threat and to mobilize as many people as possible for direct actions around common issues. CAUSE supported organizing efforts block by block, building by building to involve affected communities in the decision-making process. As a mean to protect the organization from becoming a home-owner controlled organization as were the other South End organizations, CAUSE established that 60% of the members should be tenants. CAUSE also attempted to rewrite and re-evaluate the Urban Renewal plan including the input of the tenants.[19]

The Black and Puerto Rican communities understood the threat of displacement and demolition. Through their exclusion

---

[18] Mona C Hull, "The South End Needs a Health Center" , p.2-3.

[19] Mel King, Chain of Change , pp. 67-69.

from the social fabric of the city, Blacks first, and, then, Puerto Ricans developed a consciousness of their own. Blacks and Puerto Ricans both threatened and affected by the renewal plan collaborated and confronted the white power structure.[20]

In the context of displacement and demolition of the people's barrio, an attempt to assimilate Blacks and Puerto Ricans into existing societal institutions was a contradictory strategy. In such a context, programs to alleviate people's pain and social needs would serve in the short-run, but ten-years from that moment the same community would not exist anymore in the barrio. The gentrifying forces would have disbanded the Black and Puerto Rican people. Thus, a more proper approach in such a context was to affirm those groups excluded from the social fabric of the society to fight for their rights, to organize and mobilize their people to confront the BRA and the landlords, and gain control over the force that attempted to destroy their community. To empower people for self-determination involved helping them develop a consciousness of their social, class, ethnic oppression. The next chapter will look at how St. Stephen's Episcopal Church managed to do just that.

---

[20] King, Chain of Change , pp. 67-69.

CHAPTER 3

ST. STEPHEN'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND THE COMMUNITY

St. Stephen's Episcopal Church empowered Puerto Rican South End residents for self-determination. St. Stephen's initial programs promoted assimilation, but at a certain point the church perceived the need to tackle the systemic root causes of problems in the community. In this chapter, I will describe St. Stephen's programs and how they are related to the assimilation and self-determination approaches, and also the processes and conditions that allowed St. Stephen to transform its community programs from assimilation to self-determination of the community. However, before discussing the fascinating story of St. Stephen's community actions, some general remarks about the church's historical and institutional background are necessary.

The history of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church goes back to 1846, however, this study covers only those programs that impacted the Puerto Rican community. To better understand the situation during the years under study, it is necessary to pinpoint previous events that affected and changed the church's community orientation.

During the last part of the 1950 decade, as Koelsch argues, St. Stephen was in a clear declining period, evidenced by its steady decreasing membership and inadequate financial resources, physical plant, and staff. At that time, John Burgess, archdeacon (later Bishop) introduced a new urban commitment, one which reshaped St. Stephen's direction. Such a commitment emerged from a survey that showed that sixty percent of the 30,000 people living in the South End were unchurched. Cuban refugees were the dominant group. Yet, St. Stephen's did not have an organized outreach program. As Koelsh stated, "no representatives of the area's significant Cuban refugee population were yet affiliated with the parish."[1]

Under these circumstances, the diocesan recommended either that the mission be closed or that it be given the

---

[1] William Koelsh, <u>St. Stephen's Mission, Boston, The Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts</u>, 1784-84 , pp.215-16.

resources to conduct "a dynamic inner-city program" which would include a bilingual ministry and a renewed engagement with the problems of the neighborhood.[2] The Episcopal Dioceses of Massachusetts clearly established the guidelines for the church.[3]

Pastor Sotolongo began to implement the diocese's suggestion of a bilingual inner-city program and a renewed engagement with the problems of the neighborhood. He initiated programs that connected St. Stephen with the Cuban community. Sotolongo served as chaplain in St. Stephen in 1962, a year before Fr. Dwyer's arrival.[4]

Father William Dwyer arrived to the South End in 1963, and served in the community until 1981, eighteen fruitful years. Fr. Dwyer, St. Stephen's vicar, obtained a Bachelor of Art and majored in European history from Princeton University

---

[2] Koelsh, <u>St. Stephen's Mission, Boston</u> , pp.215-16.

[3] The mission status influenced St. Stephen participation in community affairs. A comparison between a mission and a parish church might help to clarify the point. A minister of mission (a vicar) hold flexibility to develop programs without worrying about building finance for his salary, while (a rector) a minister of a parish --a self-sustaining church-- has to develop an intense internal parish service to build his/her parish financial base. Obviously, accountability is the key distinction between a parish and a mission. In the case of St. Stephen, the vicar was able to develop a strong community ministry because the bishop supported that effort. However, the church's physical facilities succumbed for the lack of financial support to rehabilitate the church.

[4] Koelsh, <u>St. Stephen's Mission</u> , p. 215.

and a Master of Divinity from the General Theological Seminary
of New York City. He also studied at the Episcopal Divinity
School and the association Ministries of DuBuque University.
Before his appointment to St. Stephen, Fr. Dwyer worked in
three other churches, one in New Jersey and the other two in
New York City. Particularly, his work with Puerto Ricans at
St. Christopher's chapel Trinity Parish in New York City
prepared him for St. Stephen' work. Fr. Dwyer's liberal
education and previous community work eased to identify
himself with the South End poor.

INITIAL STEPS \ SOCIAL SERVICE ORIENTED

Father Dwyer's initial analysis of the community
overwhelming problems suggested the need for social service
programs. Following Fr. Sotolongo approach, Fr. Dwyer assisted
Cuban refugees finding jobs, apartments, and interceding for
them in all sort of difficulties. Fr. Dwyer worked with Rev.
Samuel Tyler of Trinity Church, who acted as sponsor for
refugees.[5]

When Cuban refugees started moving away from the South
End many Puerto Ricans replaced them, and Dwyer decided to

---

[5] Father William D. Dwyer, Letter to Rev. George Lee and Rev.
Daisusu Kitagawa, June 28, 1965, p.2.

concentrate his service to Puerto Ricans surrounding the church. At that time, the Cardinal Cushing center, a religious institution of the community, estimated 6,000 Puerto Ricans living in the South End and especially concentrated in West Newton, Shawmut, Columbus, Union Park, Washington Streets.[6]

Fr. Dwyer knew that an Episcopal church would not appeal to Puerto Ricans, mostly Roman Catholic or Pentecostal. However, with an ecumenical and non-proselytism approach, he began to serve the neighbors of the church. In a letter to Tobey Fr. Dwyer stated:

We attempt to act in a "servant" role in relation to the Spanish-speaking community. (However) many of the Cuban or Puerto Rican who come to us for help with school, welfare or employment problems are not, nor never will be members of our congregation.[7]

He was committed to serve the community because, as he stated, "the church is responsible for the whole neighborhood and not only for its church's members."[8]

The church initiated also social programs to serve the community. Miss Nagle, a volunteer worker, initiated at St.

---

[6] Father William D. Dwyer, Letter to Rev. George Lee and Rev. Daisusu Kitagawa, June 28, 1965 , p.1.

[7] W. Dwyer, Letter to Mr. Tobey, October 5, 1966,

[8] Interview with Father Dwyer, 1989, in Springfield, MA.

Stephen a tutoring and English class program for Latinos.[9] This adult literacy center held its meeting on Mondays and Wednesday evenings at St. Stephen's church.

Edward Jackson, a seminarian field worker, modifying a request for a community worker, recommended an aggressive, competent, pragmatic worker. However, he endorsed assimilation, and naively presented the problems of the Puerto Rican community as the community's fault without considering low-wages jobs or the exclusion of the community from the neighborhood institutions, and, of course, not even mentioning the history that prompted the Puerto Rican migration to the U. S. In a report to Fr. Dwyer, Jackson stated his judgments about the Puerto Rican community,

...some of our newcomers have their gas and electricity turned off simply because they didn't understand our system of paying bills... Dealing with landlords, shopping for groceries, trying to find a job are insurmountable tasks to some, completely alien to our cultural situation. Further, these people come from a background where it is expected that a priest, a friend, an employer will intercede for them in times of difficulty. With Urban Renewal staring everyone in the face in the South End this need for an intercessor is imperative especially for those who can not even speak English.[10]

Father Dwyer also participated in many community boards and committees. He was member of the Police Protection

---

[9] William D. Dwyer, " St. Stephen's Episcopal Church," in _Models of Metropolitan Ministry_ (Nashville: Broadman, 1979)

[10] Edward Jackson, Report to father Dwyer, June 17, 1965.

Committee Association which discussed crime prevention and juvenile delinquency. That committee provided top-down solutions to complex problems. Some of these solutions were to increase the number of patrols,[11] combat prostitution on Columbus Avenue,[12] and to provide better lighting to the neighborhood.[13]

St. Stephen's initial programs and community participation followed a reformist approach as indicated by Dwyer's one-to-one assistance to individuals and participation in the Police Protection Committee and by the adult literacy center.

GRASPING THE ROOTS OF THE PROBLEMS

Soon, Fr. Dwyer realized the need for programs that target broad systemic problems. Through a variety of avenues he discovered the inadequacy of the one-to-one approach to the problems faced by poor people.[14]

---

[11] William D Dwyer, Letter to Commissioner Edmund L. McNamara, Boston Police Department, October 3, 1966; William D Dwyer, Letter to Major John F Collins, October 3, 1966.

[12] William Dwyer, press release; Fr. Dwyer, Letter to Mr. Thomas Atkins, NAACP Office, December 15, 1964.

[13] Minutes of Police Protection Committee, October 1965.

[14] William D. Dwyer, " St. Stephen's Episcopal Church," in Models of Metropolitan Ministry (Nashville: Broadman, 1979)

Seminarians of the Episcopal Divinity School doing field work at St. Stephen influenced the new orientation of the church. Fr. Dwyer assigned these seminarians some particular tasks related to the community needs. For instance, Jackson's recommendation for hiring an aggressive community worker to intervene in direct actions along with the state and national interest in community organization influenced the church interest for programs that truly empower people. In a letter to Miss Nagle Fr. Dwyer expressed his new understanding of community service,

...it is unwise to put money into a program which make people more dependent upon an institution or a church... Instead of looking on the Spanish-speaking people as merely objects of our solicitude and concern, we have to begin to allow them to express their ideas in planning for a program.[15]

St. Stephen's contact with community organizations also shifted the church orientation. Fr. Dwyer was a member of the South End Community Development board of directors. On November 4, 1965 they discussed whether or not they were going to testify at the city council hearing on the South End Urban Renewal Plan, scheduled for Tuesday November 9, 1965. The discussion was about the difficulties of the corporation to produce standard housing at low rentals.[16] In another meeting

---

[15] W. D. Dwyer, Letter to Miss Georgia Nagle, October 26, 1967.

[16] Minutes of the regular meeting of the South End Community Development board of directors, November 4, 1965.

the strategy to relocate people was discussed. [17] Fr. Dwyer's participation in this and other committees allowed him to understand the systemic implications of the Urban Renewal development plan for the neighborhood.

The national and community environment also induced the new orientation of St. Stephen's community actions. As Fr. Dwyer said: "those were good times for minorities to demand changes and confront the establishment."[18] The Civil Rights Movement encouraged many other oppressed communities to stand and demand justice. The Civil Rights Movement also touched the Episcopal church which responded by encouraging churches to participate in community struggles. A link between St. Stephen and this macro environment was a community delegation to a national conference titled "Brown Power and Church." A report of this conference states, "the Episcopal Church... is part of the oppressive white Anglo-culture in its total impact on Hispanic communities... The church has been enslaving people, holding them back, rather than freeing them to be themselves.[19] They called the church to transform its historical role from a conservative function to a progressive one. This national link helped to raise the level of consciousness and empowered

---

[17] Report of the meeting of relocation, leasing and management committee, September 28, 1965.

[18] Interview with Fr. Dwyer

[19] Report on the consultation Brown Power and the Church held at Greymoor Center, Garrison, New York, September 17-19, 1970.

participants to tackle the root causes of community problems.

Perhaps, one of the most significant factors mobilizing St. Stephen's to a new community approach was its connection with the suffering people. As Doña Paula recalls, "the Wednesdays Spanish masses in the houses were very special. We study the bible and reflect upon our reality".[20] Fr. Dwyer visited the people at their homes, walked and resisted oppression with them. These intimate contact revealed that "Puerto Ricans generally do not sit on neighborhood committees, nor do they make their need known to the wider community except in times of crisis."[21] Thus, through that direct relationship with the oppressed, Fr. Dwyer developed a strong commitment to empower the poor to gain control over their circumstances.

SELF-DETERMINATION / DIRECT ACTIONS

Puerto Ricans assited by St. Stephen's Episcopal Church initiated a process of organizing and mobilizing the community. The church recruited a community organizer, Carmelo Iglesias (the first action man), and then, instituted the Emergency Tenants Council / Inquilinos Boricuas en Accion.

---

[20] Interview with Paula Oyola, South End

[21] W. D. Dwyer, Letter to Rev. George Lee, June 28, 1965.

These two programs had their origin in the social action of St. Stephen.

CARMELO IGLESIAS

Fr. Dwyer elaborated and submitted to the National Episcopal Church a proposal to fund a community organizer. He clearly stated that the program is not church oriented. It was a proposal to serve the community surrounding the church. The purpose of the program, as Fr. Dwyer summarized, was:

> ... to place professional leadership (a person) in the South End to develop indigenous leadership amongst Spanish-speaking persons there (mostly Puerto Ricans) enabling them to adjust to an urban culture that might be new to them, and at the same, enable them to react responsibly as citizens in a community. In brief, then the purpose of the program is to provide leadership in the development of the community responsibilities and strengths for the Spanish-speaking persons.[22]

Carmelo Iglesias, a Puerto Rican from New Jersey, became the first action man organizing the Puerto Ricans South End community. Carmelo brought to the South End the stories of discrimination and resistance of other older Puerto Rican communities settled in the U. S. This knowledge helped the Puerto Rican South End community to understand the meaning of being Puerto Rican in the U. S.

---

[22] 1965 Resume: Proposed Spanish-Speaking Project -Boston South.

Carmelo's advisory committee, though ecumenically and interagency in composition, was not representative of the South End Puerto Rican community.[23] In a meeting held on July 28, 1966, Carmelo presented his first report. Mr. Fraggos, member of Carmelo's committee could not tolerate Carmelo's confrontation to existing institutions. Carmelo's critical views are better expressed in his own terms:

My very first impression was this place is great." There appeared to be so many people working with the poor that at first it seemed to me as if an attempt had truly be made to involve the powerless in the decision-making process of the community. As I dug a little deeper, I began to see ... "welfare colonialism" (as) the order of the day... There is no indigenous Puerto Rican organizations in the South End. There is no group, no committee, no body, no club, that speaks for the Puerto Rican people...[24]

At the meeting, animosity seemed high and Fraggos' point of view seemed to prevail. But, Fr. Dwyer and Alex Rodriquez, an influential community leader, wrote a letter supporting Carmelo's work.[25] In this letter Fr. Dwyer acknowledged Carmelo's intervention in the community, and supported the right to question the South End institutions.

---

[23] The members of the committee were Charles Fraggos (United South End Settlements), Fr. Dwyer, Alex Rodriquez, Rev. Gilbert Avery (Episcopal City Mission), Rev. Frederick O'Brien, Peabody, Antonio Del Rios (Office of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico).

[24] Carmelo Iglesia, Report to the Advisory Committee, July 1966, p.4.

[25] Alex Rodriquez and Rev. W. D. Dwyer, Memo to the members of Carmelo Iglesias Advisory Committee, July 30, 1966.

Carmelo acquainted himself with the various community agencies, groups and leaders, and contacted many potential indigenous leaders from the Puerto Rican community. Carmelo's method was, as described by Mr. Houston, working "with local (Puerto Ricans) population and developing indigenous leadership, listening to their expression of need, helping them to organize around issues and to use whatever force or method necessary to bring about social change and better conditions."[26]

Carmelo created a small tenants organization to confront the many problems affecting the Puerto Rican community. This group organized the remarkable action of a rent withholding strike against landlords ignoring basic safety regulations. They called for housing inspections, signed a demand, and asked Fr. Dwyer to hold their money.[27] Following this strike, the group took Mr. Ferdinand Aranella, a Slum landlord, to court who was found guilty of not providing heat to the tenant. Though, he appealed and a higher court ruled in his favor, the strike built confidence within the community.

All along the way, St. Stephen supported Puerto Ricans

---

[26] Alex Rodriquez and Rev. W. D. Dwyer, Memo to the members of Carmelo Iglesias Advisory Committee, July 30, 1966.

[27] Minutes Spanish Speaking Project -South End, March 10, 1967.

efforts to organize their community. The beginning of the organizing effort were informal meetings in which people got to know one another and shared their concerns. These meetings developed a sense of community and the will to intervene and confront their circumstances. Empowerment slowly took place. This small group decided that the first step was to involve the other members of the community. They distributed flyers, visited house to house, and offered talks in different places to mobilize the community to confront their oppression. Doña Paula, a strong Puerto Rican activist member of the church said: "Everybody cooperated, you did not have to pressure people to participate because we all were in need."[28] People aggressively denounced their oppression. For example, Doña Paula, who never learned to speak English, talked in many places confronting the BRA attempt's to destroy their barrio. Doña Paula also organized a group of Mothers for Adequate Welfare which supported women on welfare, and demanded adequate services.[29]

EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL

The Emergency Tenants Council (ETC) --an organization created by three seminarians working at St. Stephen in 1967-
- was also a positive development for the Puerto Ricans

---

[28] Interview with Paula Oyola, South End, Boston.

[29] Interview with Paula Oyola, South End, Boston.

community. ETC's original goals were to change the BRA plan so that the residents would not be forced out of Parcel 19, and to help residents with their many day to day struggles.

One ETC first actions was known by the neighbors as "La muerte del junker." This event was an effort to get rid of a junkyard located between Pembroke and West Brookline Streets. The media's attention of the demonstration helped them succeed in removing the ugly garbage yard from their neighborhood. This demonstration served to boost tenants confidence to fight against other major issues in the community.

The Puerto Rican community developed both a critical understanding of their problems and viable strategies to solve them. The group comprehended the need to go beyond protests to propose creative solutions for their problems. It is, then, that in connection with CAUSE the idea of becoming the developer sponsor emerged.

Father Dwyer sought financial support from the Cooperative Metropolitan Ministries --an association of suburban, urban, and inner-city congregations whose mission was to act together in social needs. This association provided the required seed money for ETC to develop Parcel 19. Thus, during the summer of 1968, ETC invested its time developing

the organization as well as an alternative redevelopment plan. The fall of 1968, John Sharratt, an architect, assisted in designing the alternative development plan for Parcel 19. On July 1969, ETC officially requested to be named sponsor redeveloper of Parcel 19. The following script vividly describes that moment.

Victor Feliciano: We will now call this meeting to order. We've asked the Boston Redevelopment Authority representatives to join us tonight. We've been meeting with them for some time, and now we are going to present our completed plan for Parcel 19. Before we start I would like to read a letter that we have sent to Mr. Hale Champion, the BRA administrator. "It is our desire to work with the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the city of Boston... Your action will determine whether we will be able to do this or not. The responsibility is upon you. If we are designated "Sponsor-redeveloper" the responsibility will be ours. We fully realize we have acquired competent technical guarantee of success... We want the responsibility to determine our destiny. We are tired of other people making our decisions".[30]

Here is the essence of that proposal:

1. The right of ETC to be the Developer, to select their own consultants (with the assistance of the BRA), and to rebuild their community.
2. The opportunity for the existing residents to stay within the Parcel 19 area.
3. Respect for the ethnic character of the existing residents.
4. Housing for low income families through utilization of federal housing programs to subsidize rents.
5. Meaningful participation of residents.[31]

At the same time Puerto Rican tenants gained a

---

[30] Humberto Cintron, Community Organization: "No Nos Mudaremos de la Parcela Diecinueve," Preliminary Script, p.10-11.

[31] Emergency Tenants Council, Preliminary Development Proposal, November 10, 1969, p.2.

significant amount of control over their situation. Puerto Ricans fought for the land and were not removed from their Parcel 19. The Puerto Rican empowerment to defend their rights was a more important accomplishment. Through the struggles around parcel 19 Puerto Ricans gained both the critical understanding of the socioeconomic and political power structure that affected their life, and the will to improve their living conditions transforming their environment.

CONCLUSION

St. Stephen's Episcopal Church illustrates how a church can serve as an instrument of Latinos empowerment. St. Stephen's Church, through Fr. Dwyer initiated a process, that given the historical circumstances became truly an empowering one in which the community itself became actors of their history, and discovered the true meaning of their Puerto Rican identity in the U. S.

I want to stress several areas of conflict that emerge from this case study which can also be generated in similar circumstances elsewhere, and thus make it relevant for others. One is the tension between leadership and community. Though, I have explored the role of Fr. Dwyer as a leader activating the Puerto Rican Community, it is important to acknowledge

that the community's political environment influenced his responses. It was his openness and flexibility which allowed him to work with Puerto Ricans. His Participation in the struggle had profound symbolic meaning legitimizing the empowerment struggle for Puerto Ricans people who have a profound religious worldview. It is in this way that individuals can be catalysts for change.

The Puerto Rican nationalism at the time was strong. As Fr. Dwyer stated, "we assisted in initiating a process, but once it was started many others joined the struggle. They did not want us to control them and we did not want either to have the control."[32] Fr. Dwyer, a white man working with a minority community was sensitive to the needs of the community and represented a positive role of Anglos in the struggle. However, it is important to stress that once the Puerto Rican community was organized, the community itself acted as a catalyst. Puerto Ricans themselves played a role organizing and mobilizing their people for community struggles.

Another area I want to stress is the impact of collective action as opposed to individual participation in institutions. When Puerto Ricans were only recipients of the church and other community institutions' benevolence, they were perceived as a problem --immigrants that do not

---

[32] Interview with Fr. Dwyer

understand the conditions of the new metropolitan society. They need English classes or someone to strongly and professionally advocate for them on their daily struggles. Nonetheless, when Puerto Rican questioned the way neighborhood institutions operated, organized strikes against irresponsible landlords, challenged the welfare offices, they not only help to solve some immediate problems reforming the system, but also emerged as a group with their own identity, ready to act, and to mobilize their community. Their strategy at that point was to inform others about the threat and to involve broad sectors of their community. They were effective organizing because they as a people perceived a common threat. And that is the lesson to be learned from the case study which makes it relevance to struggling communities the world over.

Finally, I want to pinpoint the tension between immigrant adaptation as opposed to their assimilation. The adaptation of Puerto Ricans in Boston's South End rather than gradual was conflictive. Using varying survival struggles, Puerto Ricans developed the consciousness of their Puertorriqueñidad in the U. S. Rather than absorbing the dominant values of the white society, they affirmed their ethnic bonds which gave them the strength to struggle against the racist society that had excluded them from the benefit of the neighborhood rehabilitation.

CHAPTER 4

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL CHANGE

I have studied the role of the church in the Puerto Rican empowerment struggle in Boston's South End. The guiding question were, whether or not the church can serve as an instrument of empowerment for Latinos in the U. S.? If the church can serve this function, what factors facilitate the church participation in the community empowerment struggles? I studied St. Stephen's Episcopal Church's involvement in the community struggle during Fr. Dwyer's ministry, and the impact of such involvement for the Puerto Rican community. I have found that churches under certain circumstances, can serve as a catalyst for social change, and that churches not always reproduce an oppressive social order.

Churches sometimes reproduce existing class and ethnic inequalities, but at times they could serve as catalysts by raising questions, bringing about new forms of empowerment and fostering social changes. The church have some influence in undermining oppression. The church can strength the community, develop an alternative conceptualization of reality, and mobilize the community to challenge systems of oppression. For Latinos and other groups with a strong religious worldview, religious mediation is essential to develop a class and ethnic consciousness.

ST. STEPHEN'S COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The participation of St. Stephen's Episcopal church in the community struggle over a "New South End," indeed, contributed to the Puerto Rican community empowerment. The community's programs of this church strengthened the Puerto Rican community and helped them develop a U. S. identity of their <u>Puertorriqueñidad.</u> St. Stephen assisted Puerto Ricans to gain control over their precarious situation.

Some relevant factors prompting St. Stephen's participation in community affairs were: 1) its mission status with the Episcopal Dioceses of Massachusetts, 2) Fr. Dwyer's liberal education and work experience, 3) the national and

local political environment, and 4) the church's proximity to the people's suffering.

In my opinion the key element mobilizing the church to participate in the community struggles were the national and community political environment.

The Puerto Rican South End community faced displacement and demolition of their Barrio. Yet, housing was not the most important problem of the Puerto Rican community, it was the urgent problem to be confronted. The community would had been disbanded, if they did not confront this problem. More importantly, the poor condition of the housing stocks, the displacement threat, and the selection of the neighborhood area for demolition were related to their poor, weak, and vulnerable position in society.

The local environment pressured the church to actively participate in community struggles. CAUSE, an organization that Mel King directed and Carmelo was a part of, fostered the demands of the poor. This organization developed many protest manifestations. A particularly important one was the taking over of the United South End Settlements. In that occasion, Mel King, Carmelo Iglesias, and Fr. Dwyer were arrested. The concrete local context of community struggles induced St. Stephen to side with the oppressed.

St. Stephen was close to the Puerto Rican community in many ways. Father Dwyer visited people's home and shared with them in many community activities. Fr. Dwyer the community people, even when they were not members of the church. From this direct involvement in the community, he heard the cry of the oppressed. Fr. Dwyer stated, "we attempted to adjust our service to community's needs. For that reason, when the community was searching for solutions to their problems, they sought for the church, and we were there to work with them."[1]

Other factors also played a role in connecting St. Stephen's with the surrounding environment. For instance, the mission status established the program direction for St. Stephen. The diocese clearly supported an intense community approach. Thus, Fr. Dwyer was able to participate in community struggles without worrying about finances.

Also, Fr. Dwyer's education and work experience, positively, helped him to undertake his community responsibilities with a systemic approach. However, Fr. Dwyer's ideological conflict with Puerto Rican nationalism suggests that once the church activated the community, it could not control what happened later. As he stated once, "the great struggle of the sixties was trying not to allow our

---

[1] Interview with Fr. Dwyer.

Christian witness to be pushed completely into the background by emerging nationalism."[2] Nationalism was strong during the sixties. This indicates that the political context was stronger than Fr. Dwyer and St. Stephen's intervention in community problems. These larger national and international forces shaped and determined local outcomes. The lesson is that the coming together of the national and international macro forces and local community efforts shape the outcome of the events. Both affect and are affected by each other.

St. Stephen helped to strengthen the community relationships and contributed to develop a critical consciousness of what it meant to be a Puerto Rican in the U. S. Puerto Rican were empowered to struggle for their right to stay in Parcel 19 -- "no nos mudaremos the la parcela 19," --we shall not be removed from Parcel 19. They built houses and stayed as a united community. Puerto Ricans understanding of their right to fight, and of their <u>Puertorriqueñidad</u> (Puerto Rican identity) in the context of a U. S. racist society, indeed, were signs of St. Stephen's affirming Puerto Ricans for self-determination.

Churches in many situations have developed a worldview independent from, and opposite to dominant power. Chicano

---

[2] Father Dwyer, quoted in William Koelsch, "St, Stephen's Mission Church, Boston, p.216.

churches in the South West are struggling with the Chicano lay movement. The Civil Rights Movement and the Black churches initiated a process of change that impacted the U. S. In Latin America, churches are also challenging the hegemonic order of dominant classes and repressive governments. The participation of the church in community struggles legitimates empowerment and liberation. Such participation has an important symbolic content for people with a strong religious worldview.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The case of St. Stephen's community actions suggests that oppression is a also condition to organize and mobilize people. Churches have a great potential to undermine oppression. However, if a church wants to develop a ministry that foster self-determination, the church itself needs a conversion experience. Conversion means a turning point in which the church recognizes the need to go beyond assimilation, and seek for programs that confront the systemic causes of the problems that affect oppressed people. Such a conversion experience occurs when the church is in direct contact with the victims of the systems failures, and when the church does a social analysis to uncover the systems of oppression.

A common experience of oppression between the leader and the community is also a relevant condition for shifting from an assimilation approach to self-determination. For instance, a common experience of discrimination between the Chicano clergy and church's members was a strong factor opening churches to actively intervene in community struggles for justice. The leader is important in the struggle, and if he or she personally can relate to the people's needs, he or she can develop programs that respond to the cry of the oppressed. However, sometime leaders are not personally connected to a common experience of oppression, as was the case of Fr. Dwyer. On these situations, the leader would have to be open to the process and connected to those groups that are resisting oppression. These leader face the challenge of planning with the people without patronizing their actions.

The church needs to maintain relationships with national and local groups resisting oppression in order to feel confidence to intervene in its local immediate reality. In the midst of oppression, community groups will always be resisting oppression. Resistance will occur even if the church does not get involved in community struggles. But, the Church's involvement is important because it acts as a symbolic presence of God in the people's struggle. If the church is open and committed to change, it can also become the

center of activism.

However, if the church does not participate in community struggles of groups with a strong religious worldview, activists will have a difficult time developing a class ethnic consciousness and mobilizing the group to confront their oppression. A religious mediation in this context is necessary to develop a consciousness of the people's oppression.

The churches' internal resources can help communities to articulate an alternative conceptualization of the world. Religion defines demarcation lines between "inclusion and exclusion, association and opposition, thinkable and unthinkable, desirable and undesirable, possible and impossible, useful and harmful, important and secondary, urgent and non-urgent, forbidden and permitted, obvious and dubious, absolute and relative."[3] Churches, by defining a manageable understanding of the world, help people to influence their path in history.

At St. Stephen the assimilation and self-determination approaches were present all along the way. For instance, a food service and the English classes were two programs that were maintained along with community activism. However,

---

[3] Otto Maduro, <u>Religion and Conflict</u> , p. 116.

because the church was also committed to work with the people and plan with them, the church empowered Puerto Ricans to search their self-determination. Churches will always be confronted with the two approaches, but one preponderance over the other will depend on how open the church is to serve the people's needs outside the church's doors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albert, Michael ; Cagan, L. ; Chomsky, N., ; Hahnel, R. ; King, M.
          ; Sargent, L. ; Sklar, H. Liberating Theory. Boston:
          South End, 1986.

Berger, Peter. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory
          of Religion. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1967.

Blakely, Edward J. Planning Local Economic Development. Newbury
          Park: SAGE, 1989.

Blauner, Robert. "Colonized and Immigrant Minorities." In Majority
          and Minority , pp. 338-55. Edited by Norman R.
          Yetman Boston Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

Boston Redevelopment Authority. South End Neighborhood Profile.

Brittan, Authur and Maynord. Sexism, Racism and Oppression. NY:
          Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Boff, Leonardo. Eclesiogénesis. Santander: Sal Terrae, 1984.

_____ & Clodovis. Salvation and Liberation. NY: Orbis Book,
          1985.

Bonacich, Edna. Class Approaches to Ethnicity and Race," In
          Majority and Minority , pp. 62-78. Edited by Norman
          R. Yetman Boston Allyn and Bacon, 1985.

Cadena, Gilbert R. "Chicanos and the Catholic Church: Liberation
          Theology as a Form of Empowerment." Ph.D
          dissertation, University of California Riverside,
          1987.

_____ "Chicano Clergy and the Emergence of Liberation
          Theology." Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science
          2 (no. 2, May 1989): 107-21.

"Discrimination: Attitudinal and Institutional." pp. 357-373.

Dwyer, William D. "St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Boston,
          Massachusetts." In Models of Metropolitan Ministry.
          Nashville: Brodmann, 1979.

Fisher, Robert. "Neighborhood Organizing: Lessons form the Past."
          Social Policy (Summer 1984): 9-16.

Gaston, Mauricio & Kennedy, Marie. "Blueprint for Tomorrow: The
          fight for Community Control in Black and Latino
          Boston." Radical America 20 (September -October
          1987): 7-22.

Glen, Evelyn N. "Racial Ethnic Women's Labor: the Interception of Race, Gender and Class Oppression." Review of Radical Political Economics 17 (No. 3, 1985): 86-108.

Gordon, Milton M. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality." In Majority and Minority , pp. 245-258. Edited by Norman R. Yetman Boston Allyn and Bacon, 1985.

Guest, Avery M. & Lee, Barrett A. " Metropolitan Residential Environments and Church Organizational Activities." Sociological Analysis 47 (Winter 1987): 335-54.

King, Mel. Chain of Change. Boston: South end, 1981.

Koelsch, William. "St. Stephen's Mission Church, Boston." In The Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, 1784-1984.

Maduro, Otto. Religion and Conflict. NY: Orbis Books, 1982.

Marx, Karl & Engels, Frederick. On Religion. NY: Free Press, 1975.

McKnight, John. "Why 'Servanhood' is Bad." The Other Side (January - February 1989): 38-41.

Morris, Aldon D. The Origin of the Civil Rights Movements. NY: Free Press, 1984.

Perkins, Harvey L. ed. Guidelines for Development. Christian Conference of Asia, Singapore, 1980.

Rodman, Canon E. "Will Hispanic Repeat Black History." Our Hispanic Ministry 1989. pp.6-10.

Rodríquez, Clara. Puerto Ricans: Born in the U. S. A. Boston: Unwin & Hyman, 1989.

Sherman, Howard J. & Wood, James L. Sociology: Traditional and Radical Perspectives. Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1989.

Shulman, Steven. Race, Class and Occupational Stratification: A Critique of William J. wilson's The Declining significance of Race. Review of Radical Political Economics 13 (Fall 1981): 21-31.

Tabb, William. The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto. NY: W.W. Norton, 1970.

Tamez, Elsa. Bible of the Oppressed. NY: Orbis Books, 1982.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers. Chicago: University of
        Chicago, 1973.

Uriarte-Gaston, Miren. "Organizing for Survival: The Emergence of
        a Puerto Rican Community." Ph.D. dissertation,
        Boston University, 1988.

Wogaman, J. Philip. "The Church as Mediating Institution
        Theological and Philosophical Perspectives." In
        Democracy and Mediating Structures, pp. 69-84.
        Edited by Michael Novak. Washington, DC: American
        Enterprise Institute for Policy Research, 1980.

_____ "The Church as Mediating Institution:
        Contemporary American Challenge." In Democracy and
        Mediating Structures, pp. 85-05. Edited by Michael
        Novak. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute
        for Policy Research, 1980.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research: Design and Method. CA: SAGE,
        1984.

INTERVIEWS

Dwyer, William. St. Peter, Springfield, Massachusetts. Interview,
        5 May 1989.

Gamarra, Nater. St. Stephen, South End, Massachusetts. Interview,
        March 1990.

Gray-Pérez, María. St. Stephen's Church, South End, Massachusetts.
        Interview, April 1989.

Keggi, John J. St. Stephen's Church, South End, Massachusetts.
        Interview, April 1989.

Maynard, Eduardo. Emmanuael Gospel Center, South End,
        Massachusetts. Interviews, 2 May 1989, February 22,
        1990.

Mitchell, Rudy. Emmanuael Gospel Center, South End, Massachusetts.
        Interview, 23 February 1990.

Oyola, Paula. Paseo Borinquén, South End, Massachusetts. Interview,
        April 1989.

Rodman, Cannon. Episcopal Dioceses of Massachusetts, Boston,
        Massachusetts. Interview, 22 march 1990.