

toll of relocation has also been suggested. Little can be done to compensate people for the loss of familiar neighborhoods, the scattering of friends and relatives, the dispersal of churches and other local institutions, or the destruction of a small business built up over many years. Increased awareness of these effects of displacement has led in some cities to greater sensitivity in the choice of areas for renewal or highway locations, and to greater emphasis on neighborhood improvement rather than clearance in urban renewal.

There is little disagreement about the effect of relocation on the housing conditions of displaced families in the early years of urban renewal. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has stated that through the mid-1950's "relocation often created additional slums and brought blight into new areas" and that "relocation was often poorly done and human suffering frequently occasioned."⁴³ Many current provisions for relocation assistance under urban renewal and many innovations in Federal housing programs were instituted in an effort to improve upon the poor quality of earlier relocation.

Renewal officials and outside observers disagree in their evaluation of more recent relocation experience. Statistics compiled from the reports of local renewal agencies indicate that over 90 percent of relocated families whose postrelocation housing conditions are known have moved into sound housing.⁴⁴ Several informed critics of the program have questioned the reliability of these local reports; independent studies have generally reached less optimistic conclusions about the quality of postrelocation housing.⁴⁵ Independent studies and a recent survey undertaken for HHFA agree in their finding that relocated families typically pay higher rents in their new housing.⁴⁶ A recent review of a large number of relocation studies concludes that "on the whole relocation has made a disappointingly small contribution to the attainment of 'a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family.' Given the premise that one of the cardinal aims of renewal and rehousing should be the improved housing welfare of those living in substandard conditions, it is questionable whether the limited and inconsistent gains reported in most studies represent an acceptable level of achievement."⁴⁷

⁴³ Robert C. Weaver, *The Urban Complex: Human Values in Urban Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), pp. 53, 54.

⁴⁴ William L. Slayton, *Report on Urban Renewal*, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

⁴⁵ See Chester W. Hartman, "The Housing of Relocated Families," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXX (November 1964), pp. 266-286; Charles Abrams, quoted in "Meeting of Six Minds," National Housing Conference, *The Housing Yearbook, 1962* (New York: Abco Press, 1962), p. 11; Alvin L. Schorr, *Slums and Social Insecurity* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963), pp. 62-67.

⁴⁶ Chester W. Hartman, "The Housing of Relocated Families," *op. cit.*; Housing and Home Finance Agency, *The Housing of Relocated Families* (Washington: Office of the Administrator, HHFA, March 1965). The HHFA report is based on a special survey of relocation housing conducted in 1964 by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, which indicated that 94 percent of the families covered had been relocated in standard housing. This finding must be qualified by a number of limitations of the census survey: the study covered only displaced families, not displaced individuals; of the original sample of 2,842 families, 542 were "lost" and no information was available on their rehousing; no information is presented on how many relocated families were living in other areas slated for clearance; the report presents aggregate data for the entire country, including many small cities outside metropolitan areas.

⁴⁷ Chester W. Hartman, "The Housing of Relocated Families," *op. cit.*, p. 275.