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IA. SUMMARY

IA1. Central Thesis This master's thesis in historic preservation explores ways in which person-to-person interviews can supplement traditional means of gaining citizen input for planning purposes. Furthermore, it attempts to demonstrate that such interviews can help residents gain access to the dialogues on issues affecting them, especially in low- to moderate-income areas where many people may lack either articulation or empowerment to take public action.

IA2. Findings The core of the research herein consists of an attitudinal questionnaire which the author devised during a Summer 1989 internship with the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation in Atlanta, Georgia. Following the internship, he utilized the questionnaire by conducting 64 resident interviews in an Atlanta neighborhood known as Cabbagetown. (1)

The questionnaire focused on resident attitudes towards historic preservation, and consisted primarily of open-ended questions but also of simple inquiries which were affirmative, negative or factual. (Please see appendices 1A and 1B, beginning on pages 244 and 249 respectively, for copies of the
first and final versions of the questionnaire.) In addition to utilizing the questionnaire as a basis for interviews with neighborhood residents, the author researched attitudes towards preservation in other cities and general approaches used in other questionnaires and interviews, to provide a context for this case study of attitudinal interviews as a planning tool in Cabbagetown.

To a large extent, before enumerating the more positive results of his research, the author would summarize the limitations brought out by his questionnaire. The primary shortcomings of his results were those of vague answers and/or responses lacking in insight. In the author's interpretation, the two major reasons for this were lack of experience in devising and conducting resident interviews and the lack of articulation and consideration of the questionnaire's issues on the part of many residents.

A second shortcoming was the difficulty of analyzing the interview results, which stemmed from the relative looseness of the questionnaire - particularly in its open-endedness - despite the fact that the author orally presented the same questions, in the same order, to each interviewee. In interpreting his results, the author felt it was important, as well as appropriate, given the questionnaire's comparative lack of structure, to note the prevalence of common attitudes and ideas in different parts of the same interviews and throughout the series of interviews. However, the
presentation of such groups of ideas had to be done cautiously, because while they may have echoed each other, the questionnaires or sections which brought them out were often on different subjects. As with analyses of other questionnaire segments, conclusions were thus by no means definitive in these cases.

However, intermixed with these results were positive ones, in research on both Cabbagetown and other neighborhoods, which convinced the author that a questionnaire such as his could be a useful component of the preservation planning process. These modest successes occurred chiefly in two areas: first, in offering a basic sense of preservation-related attitudes in one neighborhood, and secondly, in shedding light on the relationship between preservation and the social and physical phenomenon which has been labeled gentrification, a connection which was in fact a secondary concern of the research.

As to the sense of attitudes offered by the results, the questionnaire revealed that of those residents interviewed, most did not have especially strong positive or negative feelings regarding preservation, but were generally unconcerned, neutral or mildly supportive. One basic conclusion within this first point was that a very large majority of interviewees were favorable towards maintaining Cabbagetown's older houses (in response to a question on "saving (the) old homes"), but, in the author's observation,
did not associate the attitude reflected in their answers with any particular support for preservation. On the other hand, and almost without exception, people responding to the questionnaire felt somewhat more strongly and positively about preserving Cabbagetown’s most obvious landmark - the large, now abandoned factory complex known as the Fulton Bag & Cotton Mill which once employed many neighborhood and area residents, and which dominates the neighborhood. (See chapter 9 on pp. 188-193 regarding reactions to the Mill.)

Beyond such broad results, the interview process confirmed that it was possible to identify clusters of residents expressing particular opinions or concerns about an issue. The largest group to be drawn out from answers to the question on keeping homes, for example, was that of eighteen people who simply expressed practicality as the basis for saving them. For a question on ways to re-use the Fulton Mill, clusters of people suggested a complex with widely varied uses, a shopping center, a return to the Mill’s industrial purposes, and so on. In responding to a question on whether they felt the neighborhood was historically important, the most interesting cluster of opinion to the author was that of ten people who brought up views relating to their neighborhood’s value and significance in the present rather than its past, an aspect he labeled "present-mindedness."

The value associated with what has survived of Cabbagetown’s historic character has clearly been one factor
in stimulating the slow but noticeable influx of new residents, just as it has been in other historic neighborhoods throughout Atlanta and the United States. While it will be more fully defined shortly, the phenomenon frequently known as gentrification typically refers to low- to moderate-income neighborhoods being physically and socially upgraded by new residents who are usually more well-to-do than residents in the area at the time of their arrival. These newer people are viewed by many of the longer-term residents as "outsiders," and often seen in a negative light.

Because of the connections that have been made between gentrification and historic preservation (to be briefly discussed on pp. 18-20), the author was curious to see if "longtime" residents who were interviewed would raise any connections between gentrification and preservation, especially negative ones, in their responses. He thus designed the questionnaire to demonstrate the hypothesis that at least a noticeable minority of respondents would express negative attitudes towards preservation because of significant negativity over time towards gentrification. Despite the fact that the interviews failed to demonstrate such a connection, (and in part because of that), the author felt that interview results regarding gentrification, through research in Cabbagetown and elsewhere, also supported the validity of the questionnaire as a tool for neighborhood research and planning.
The first point to emerge in analyzing the questionnaire's usefulness regarding an investigation of gentrification, and perhaps the chief insight from its total results, was the clear display by "newcomers" (all of whom the author saw at least loosely as gentrifiers; see p. 21), of a much greater consciousness of Cabbagetown's physical and cultural heritage than the "oldtimers" who largely typified that heritage. It is admittedly quite possible that many oldtime residents had a deep consciousness and/or affinity with their neighborhood's past. However, the fact that very few of them communicated that consciousness suggests that a research tool such as the questionnaire may not be as useful for exposing such abstract and often intellectual issues as "historical consciousness" as it can be for concrete issues such as ways to reuse local structures. Alternately, while the author designed the questionnaire as an objective means of determining feelings, the interview process revealed that it could also be seen as a way to educate respondents on initially complex issues.

The second point regarding the questionnaire and its concern with gentrification was that, in the author's mind, contextual research at least partly explained why none of the connections the author predicted came up. In research besides that on Cabbagetown, the author focused on three neighborhoods in cities besides Atlanta, each of which were expected to offer insights into preservation and gentrification. (See Part
II's Section C, "A Context for the Case Study," on pp. 194-221.) Briefly speaking, each of these contextual neighborhoods (to widely varying degrees) contained instances in which effects, or perceived effects of historic districting brought out negative reactions linking gentrification and preservation from oldtime residents and community leaders who sought to represent them. In this respect, they offered a major contrast with Cabbagetown, which has exhibited strong opposition to gentrification at times, but relatively little opposition to preservation.

IA3. Recommendations The author's recommendations regarding his research come in two major parts: first, ways to use his questionnaire results, and secondly, advice for the design of analogous questionnaires or interviews. Here, these recommendations are summarized, and readers are directed to pp. 229-240 for a full sense of them.

Because of the rudimentary design and results of his work, the greatest portion of the author's recommendations consist of ways to enhance his questionnaire outcomes through deeper interviews which would themselves inform planning decisions. Also, since his results, by and large, could not directly translate into actual planning, some of his ideas are directed towards strengthening a neighborhood's human fabric and thereby paving the way for improvements to its physical
In terms of using the questionnaire results directly, the author thought of just one use connected to physical planning. This would be discussion of questionnaire reactions regarding the Fulton Mill as a way to restart the dialogue on that complex’s rebirth. Two other direct applications of the author’s work would respectively enhance the neighborhood’s social fabric and communal consciousness. The first one would be approaches to more articulate questionnaire respondents as a way to develop new neighborhood leadership. Secondly, the lack of historical consciousness shown in questionnaire responses (whether it was nonexistent or simply unrevealed) could become a starting point for outreach activities designed to increase consciousness and appreciation of history and preservation.

As to planning uses which go beyond the questionnaire itself, the author could think of at least four, two of which are presented here as examples. Each of them stem from fragmentary and interesting areas of sentiment found in the author’s results. If probed further, outcomes in these areas could be one basis for planning decisions.

One area worth expanding upon consists of responses from several people on the aesthetics of six new houses built by a Cabbagetown neighborhood organization in 1989. (See pp. 44 and 98-99 on the "Savannah Street Homes.") A second survey might include photographs of these homes, ask residents to
identify features that they thought were or were not appropriate to surrounding old homes, and incorporate their responses into decision-making for the next project involving compatible new designs. (See pp. 234-235 in the Conclusion.)

Another example of an area of interest worthy of investigation concerns the aspect or phenomenon of "present-mindedness" which the author referred to above (p. 5). Here, as mentioned, several interviewees spoke about Cabbagetown in the present when asked about its past, or its historical significance. A deeper questionnaire could seek to determine reasons for peoples' present-mindedness and, using those reasons as indications of what resident concerns are, develop and implement appropriate plans. For instance, a few interviewees of the author's thought Cabbagetown was not historically significant because programs to rejuvenate its landmarks, especially its chief landmark, the Fulton Mill, had failed. If this were found to be a widespread feeling in the neighborhood, it would be a major indication to at least some planners to focus their energies on reorganizing and giving new energy to rehabilitation programs. (See pp. 235-237 in the Conclusion.)

In giving advice for better design of questionnaires, the author would simply emphasize four points which are well-established in questionnaire methodology. In short, he would stress the need for selective choice of questions and the use of simple language, probing and test surveys. He would
reserve his chief comments for the first point. In hindsight, he would greatly pare down a questionnaire such as his if he were to repeat it, because he has realized that more in-depth answers, through probing the initial responses to well-chosen questions, can take the place of unnecessary inquiries. (See pp. 237-240 in the Conclusion.)

IA4. **Conclusion** The chief underlying assumption of this thesis is that people who will be affected by the implementation of planning decisions should be seriously consulted as one step prior to those decisions being made. As they solicit input, planners should remain sensitive to the limitations of such consultation, the primary one of which is an uncertainty as to the meanings of resident expressions. This was revealed by the author’s results, both inside and outside his experimental questionnaire. (See p. 241 for further comments.) Planners must strive to limit this, but in the end uncertainty has to be accepted. Even in detailed and seemingly quite clear responses, researchers, to the extent that they are familiar with a community, should evaluate the factors surrounding a response or a group of responses. They should somehow resolve, in their conclusions, what appear to be the most widely-held views in an area and that place’s major influences.

Notwithstanding uncertainties, it is vital for planners
to be involved at a grassroots, person-to-person level with at least some of the people whose welfare they are serving. Public participation, whether formal or informal, must be part of a process leading to mutual trust, understanding and more finely planned improvements.

IB. Justifications and Approaches for the Thesis

IB1. Interviews for General City Planning Purposes

A chapter in the 1988 textbook *Urban Planning*, by Anthony Catanese and James C. Snyder, states that interviews are "one of the most common and useful methods used in urban planning." They range widely, from very informal conversations to highly structured and standardized surveys. Their purposes, which are also varied, can simply consist of basic information-gathering on an area, or, much more deeply, they can serve as a firm basis for defining or refining policies. (2)

At times, interviews are simply the best means of reaching specific insights on issues. This is often the case with potential interviewees who have low levels of formal education and/or income. Such people may lack not only the
articulation or empowerment to enter public dialogues, but even more basic elements such as literacy, or, alternately, something as commonplace as a household telephone for self-administered or telephone surveys.

An interview can also be superior to other forms of inquiry because of the interviewer's on-site presence. Interviewers can, in the first place, be of great assistance in obtaining thorough responses; even if they bias responses in some way or ways, they can also use their training and sensitivity to help in different instances, whether by offering an immediate explanation of a question, persuading an interviewee to answer a question upon which he or she is hesitant, or something else. For the interviewer, the experience can be helpful because seeing the environment of his or her interviewees will add an extra layer of understanding which may be concretely utilized once planning decisions are made. (3)

More broadly, interviews can be justified by a number of the same reasons used for other activities which seek to involve citizens in planning. Citizen participation, for example, is advocated in a number of ways by Bruce McClendon in his 1988 book Mastering Change: Winning Strategies for effective city planning. At one point, some of his supportive comments about one Texas city's emphasis on frequent public presentations by its planners could equally be applied to the use of interviews. He feels that these appearances encourage
the planning staff "to be more conscious of the ultimate users" of their efforts. McClendon and others also state that involving the public increases public understanding and support for planning. Edmund Burke, in his 1979 book *A Participatory Approach to Urban Planning*, cites two purposes for citizen participation, the first one being organizational support of planning by everyday citizens and the second one seeing such participation as a "source of information and collective wisdom," from which decisions will "tend to reflect widespread rather than narrow preferences." A comment specifically on interviewing as a method, in the aforementioned text of Catanese and Snyder, can itself reflect on other means of participation, saying that "[interviewing] allows issues to surface that are of concern to those who are deeply involved in, or will be affected by, planning action." (4)

**IB2. Applications of Interviewing to Preservation Planning**

Interviews and questionnaires can be used in specific ways by preservation planners. The headings and ideas that follow can also be applied to different components of the planning field in general.
IB2a. **Attention to Particular Groups**

Based on questionnaire results which reveal a group or groups of residents who are less supportive of preservation activities than neighboring groups, planners may decide to engage in greater communication with such categories of citizens and to design and implement programs with these groups largely in mind. Alternately, results may reveal great social needs among a particular group which can be joined with preservation goals, one example being senior citizen housing. In the case of housing for elderly people, or other specific plans of action, one major "test" of the priority residents place on a neighborhood problem is the extent to which it is brought up not just by those within the directly "affected" category of age, class, location, etc., but by a cross-section of residents.

As one hypothetical example of a group on which planners may focus, one may conclude through an attitudinal survey that the middle-aged males of a community stand out from other categories of respondents in showing low levels of positive reaction to preservation, and that the important role of leadership or at least volunteering which they display in other communities should not be neglected with regards to preservation-minded redevelopment. Therefore, planners, in conjunction with neighborhood leaders, may devise presentations or other forms of outreach at centers such as veterans' clubs where these men can be reached in an effort to
include them in preservation. Planning efforts may respond to a lack of interest among a community's young people by programs at a boys' or girls' club, at libraries or through new curriculum in a neighborhood school. Once a group on which planners and community organizers want to focus efforts is determined, a tangible, relevant goal such as the renovation of a particular community center - for example, the "veterans' club" just called to mind - may be prepared.

IB2b. Development of Physical Emphases within Preservation Programs

In the plans they produce, planners may want to place emphasis on distinctive sections of a neighborhood, types of buildings or particular landmarks, if they feel these are brought out sufficiently in a series of interviews. Reiterating the above comment on the "test of the priority" placed on a structure or physical area, these places can also be determined at least partly by how frequently they are mentioned not just by residents in or adjacent to the places being considered, but by people throughout a neighborhood or larger area.

IB2c. Resolution of Conflicts between Professionals and Non-Professionals Regarding the Visual Environment

In an article on a 1982 study to be discussed on pp. 295-297 in Appendix 3 of this thesis, anthropologist Setha Low and
architect William Ryan write of the great differences in perception and languages between professionals in the visual arts such as architects and architectural historians, and the general body of residents in any community. Making a point which has become painfully obvious to many preservation advocates, they remind people how these and other differences may cause conflict "when these two cultures [professionals and non-professionals] compete for control over land use, building and landscape decisions."

Through their 1982 study, Low and Ryan sought to bridge this gap. In evaluating their study, they have reflected on the usefulness of studies like it, saying that communities can give the professional "a valuable insight into what is [sic] perceived as the commonalities of an environment by someone unencumbered by a formal approach to the establishment of environmental patterns." (5) In stating this, they do not mean to devalue the contributions of professionals, but to allow for greater mutual understanding which will help to moderate the conflicts of which they speak.

IB2d. Clarifications of Misunderstandings Regarding Preservation

In one instance of preservation-related misunderstandings, people in an area may misinterpret existing or proposed aspects of historic district standards, or the standards as a whole. In this case, both city and private
sector representatives - or the governmental employees who oversee such standards and active, concerned residents - should quickly and sensitively respond to these misunderstandings following such reactions within interviews.

The example of misunderstood standards is actually a major one within preservation, as exemplified by two of the neighborhoods the author discusses in Section C of Part II, "A Context for the Case Study."

IB3. Connections Between Preservation and Gentrification

There are a number of examples of the strong negative associations which historic preservation has acquired in connection with gentrification over at least the last fifteen years. An early, implicit display of such associations is found in a 1980 article on a housing rehabilitation program in South Bend, Indiana, in which the authors commented that, "despite gloomy prognostications to the contrary - it is indeed possible to revitalize neighborhoods without displacing residents." In addition, their account was subtitled "Preservation without Gentrification." A 1988 article in Historic Preservation magazine highlights the successes of Lee Adler and others in providing low- to moderate-income housing in Savannah’s Victorian District, but opens by saying that at first glance one wonders if their efforts are not "[a]nother
gentrification project for the poor?" (6)

While such connections have decreased as accomplishments in combining preservation and lower-income housing have increased, they have still been made in the 1990's. In a 1990 Preservation News column promoting the linkage of preservation and tax credits for affordable housing, J. Jackson Walter, then President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, speaks of responding to the charge that "historic preservation is often mislabeled 'gentrification.'" A 1992 Preservation News article brings up a National Park Service recommendation for the Service's managers and interpreters to improve ways of interpreting historical events from multiple points of view, and it says that this emphasis may be even more critical to the preservation movement than to national parks because "[e]thnic minorities generally associate historic preservation with gentrification and displacement." (7)

Moving from the national stage to Cabbagetown itself, one finds fewer but still prominent comments oriented towards this connection. In a 1981 student paper written at Georgia State University in Atlanta, Stuart Johnson emphasizes the need to avoid gentrification in Cabbagetown preservation efforts. Writing in a 1986 undergraduate history thesis at Emory University, student Scott Segal charges that Cabbagetown's gentrification is development "in the name of historical preservation." (8)
On the other hand, the author, in his own research, noted very few connections between the two phenomena. The most prominent ones came in an interview with the Reverend Craig Taylor, a crusader for lower-income housing in Cabbagetown and other Atlanta neighborhoods. Rev. Taylor strongly felt that there was a connection between preservation and gentrification, and that both preservationists and developers such as himself needed a "crash course" in understanding each others' approaches, because of what he saw as "a tension in values system [sic] and data fact." (9)

IB4. Definitions of Terms

The author has utilized five key terms in this thesis and they are defined here as follows:

IB4a. The author sees Historic Preservation as: "the process of keeping, upgrading and maintaining structures which are deemed to be historically important to a geographical area or culture."

IB4b. Gentrification is defined here as: "a process of financial reinvestment occurring primarily in urban neighborhoods, in residential and/or commercial areas, and containing at least two aspects:

1) the physical upgrading of a particular area's
structures by people who are in all instances new occupants, either residents and/or business tenants, and may also be developers and/or speculators; these people generally have either higher incomes or potentially higher incomes than those of the predominant or total population which has lived in the area (potentially higher incomes are based on factors such as economic background and level of formal education); and

"2) the two related consequences from this physical upgrading of a rise in property values and a rise in rental amounts charged to residents and/or commercial tenants in the area."

Often, a third factor is involved in gentrification as a consequence of the two above: the geographical displacement to other areas of residents and/or commercial tenants who cannot pay the increased property taxes and rental amounts (to widely varying degrees in different situations). (10)

IB4c and IB4d. "Oldtimers" and "Newcomers" An "oldtimer," generally speaking, as used herein, is a person who has resided in a neighborhood since before the beginning of that neighborhood's gentrification. A "newcomer" is a gentrifier. These terms are utilized frequently in this thesis, along with variants such as "long-standing resident," "newer resident," or "gentrifier." The author has used them in the course of his effort to explain real or perceived differences
(especially attitudinal ones) between groups of neighborhood residents. In that sense, he sees these terms as part of a natural sociological exercise in categorization. (11)

At the same time, the author would acknowledge the clear limitations that are attached to these terms. An "oldtimer," for example, may not have resided in a neighborhood since before its gentrification. Still, he or she may be seen as representative of that neighborhood's overall socioeconomic character prior to its gentrifying period, because of personal aspects such as a working-class background and limited formal education. Speaking of "newcomers," it is inappropriate to attach that label to some residents who in long-gentrified areas such as Philadelphia's Spring Garden (see pp. 196 and 204), have resided in their neighborhood for over 20 years. In such an instance, one could only say that such people are representative of the area's changing socioeconomic character in the latest one or two generations of that section's evolution.

IB4e. Cultural Preservation is here seen as: "an effort or efforts to recognize, maintain and/or revitalize activities or products of a particular group or groups of people;

"products or activities include, but are not limited to, artistic expressions (such as paintings or songs) or religious expressions (such as prayers or ornament in houses of worship);"
"a group or groups of people is identified by ethnic, racial and/or geographical background. These groups are tremendously diverse; geographically, as an example, they can range from people in a specific neighborhood of one city to a group of nations, as in 'Western Culture.'"

Cultural preservation is undoubtedly the largest concept of the three above, and it includes historic preservation. However, because historic preservation has become a separate, and separated concern in its own right, the focus here will be on built components of the environment. In the pages that follow, "cultural preservation" will be used as a broad label whose chief aspects for Cabbagetown are the geographical background and social and artistic expressions of a number of Cabbagetowners over the years; these facets will be touched upon in chapters 2 and 3 (pp. 41-139). (12)

IC. A Note on the Author's Interests and Biases

In his thesis, the author has brought together three interests: a methodological one (in demonstrating the usefulness of his attitudinal survey to planning), a sociological one (regarding relationships between preservation and gentrification) and an interest in local history and
character (in profiling and utilizing one neighborhood for his findings). This triple combination can be said to provide three different uses for the thesis, and to support its length.

Methodological issues are primarily discussed in chapters 1 and 4, and Appendices 1A through 3 (pp. 29-40, 140-150 and 244-303). Sociological concerns are highlighted in Part II's Section C (pp. 195-221). As to the results of questionnaire interviews, readers may wish to simply peruse the chapters which cover them (5-8, on pp. 152-193), since they are largely anecdotal, with the exception of the summary of questionnaire outcomes in chapter 5 (pp. 152-163). If the author were to direct the reader to the one particularly significant and useful portion of the thesis, it would be - quite logically - the Conclusion (pp. 223-242) and especially the subsection on "Uses of the Author's Results" (pp. 230-237).

Besides having a strong preservation ethic, the author brings three intertwined cultural biases to this study. First, he has been opposed to socioeconomic displacement caused by neighborhood gentrification, while his opposition in this regard has greatly decreased in recent years. Secondly, he has been sensitive to the "guilt-by-association" acquired by the field of preservation, in the sense of preservation being blamed for gentrification, or, more to the point, displacement.

The author's third bias may require some explanation as
it relates to Cabbagetown. Basically, he strongly believes that long-time residents of socioeconomically upgrading communities should be assisted to remain in their communities, as long as they clearly demonstrate their own willingness to work towards that end, at least in a volunteer sense. The author sees many Cabbagetowners, both owners and renters, as fitting the description of long-time residents.

Underscoring both this assessment of Cabbagetown and this third bias, the author would counter an argument which some may make in response to Cabbagetown’s history. This Atlanta neighborhood, as the reader will see, has long been identified as a "milltown" or "mill village." Like all such communities, its industrial facilities (specifically the giant, now unused Fulton Mill introduced here on p. 5) and many of its residences were erected largely on the basis of a transient labor pool. With the loss of the Mill as the original economic magnet for many people who moved there, various observers may say that efforts at "human" or "social" preservation in a place like Cabbagetown are both artificial and anti-historical.

The author would respectfully reject this argument. First, he feels that people who have lived in Cabbagetown for several decades after they themselves or their forebears came to work in the neighborhood and/or the wider economy of Atlanta, are indeed "long-timers." Their presence increases, as opposed to merely paralleling, the worth of the
neighborhood for preservation. By actively supporting long-time residents in communities whose buildings they strive to keep, preservationists can truly work to preserve the "spirit of a place" and to strengthen fragile centers of continuity in a still fluid, late 20th-century society. (13)
Chapter 1. Introduction to Thesis Research

1A. A Summary of Research Phases

Research for this thesis consisted of the following steps:

1) Preliminary investigations: readings and inquiries on Cabbagetown and neighborhood walks (June and July, 1989)

2) Development of an attitudinal questionnaire for neighborhood residents (July 1989)

3) Presentation of the questionnaire to residents (August, 1989)

4) Interviews with "active observers" of Cabbagetown in Atlanta, including preservationists, planners, community leaders and others (August, 1989 - Spring, 1990)

5) Evaluation of questionnaire responses (September, 1989 - Spring 1992)

6) Contextual research on interviewing methodologies and attitudes towards preservation (during 1989-1993 research)

The two most involved steps above - concerning the development and presentation of the questionnaire, will be described in chapter 4. Here, three other steps - of preliminary investigations, interviews with observers and contextual research - all of which form the background of the
questionnaire, will be described.

1B. Preliminary Investigations

In June, 1989, the author "discovered" Cabbagetown for himself while working as an intern at the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation in Atlanta, and read the Trust’s file on the neighborhood. In July, the author began to walk through Cabbagetown. A major reason for this was to make himself familiar to the residents of a neighborhood he already thought of as "insulated." From the start, the author had decided that having a sense of rapport with residents outweighed any bias - in later questionnaire responses - that might result from greater familiarity.

During this preliminary period, the author also established or strengthened contact with professionals who would advise him on the questionnaire. These included Joyce Brookshire and Starling Sutton of CRAFT, and Catherine Horsey of the Georgia Trust.

1C. Interviews with observers

Besides the advisors above, the author contacted other Atlantans to serve as professional interviewees who he felt
would offer valuable observations of Cabbagetown and its preservation. As with questionnaire advisors, the author wanted these interviewees to be representative of the "leading players," locally, in historic preservation and other issues relevant to Cabbagetown. People interviewed in an in-depth manner ranged from the Reverend Craig Taylor, with his major emphasis on a more generic rehabilitation and on new construction, to Franklin Garrett, a well-known scholar on Atlanta history. (The Bibliography contains a complete list of professional interviewees in Atlanta on pp. 348-349.)

The variety of interviewees was linked by several common questions, the foremost being the opening one: "What is your definition of 'historic preservation'?" The author felt that one's description of the field would very well shed light on attitudes towards it. (1)

While this question and its placement constituted the one constant in interviews, a few other questions were nearly always asked. The author, seeing cultural preservation as a major concern in Cabbagetown, would ask observers if they felt there was "a culture worth preserving in Cabbagetown." On a related note regarding values, preferences and the "uses" of preservation, the author asked interviewees what types of re-uses they favored for the Mill.

From the very first sessions with observers in August, 1989, some dissimilarities in questions seemed necessary. A question on justifications of design controls, for example,
was asked to Susan Gwinner of the Urban Design Commission alone. The three people most closely connected with the land trust effort (the Reverend Taylor, Joyce Brookshire and Starling Sutton), were allowed to answer criticisms about it.

1D. A Note on the Evaluation of Questionnaire Responses

Because of the simplicity or vagueness of many of the author’s questionnaire responses, it would be more appropriate to speak of "evaluating" rather than interpreting them. This evaluation is presented in chapters 5-8 on pp. 152-193.

Prior to that presentation, the author would acknowledge two biases that are likely to have effected his judgements and categorizations of answers to a modest extent.

First, the author feels he may have slightly exaggerated his valid point that the physical and material interests of newcomers were greater than those of oldtimers. Because of this, he may have not noticed these interests in oldtimers as keenly.

Secondly, his related presumptions that oldtimers had lower levels of formal education and that they would therefore be more subjective than objective in their answers, led to at least one instance of initially overlooking an answer by a newcomer. This occurred in an area of answers where oldtimers seemed to base their feelings largely if not wholly on
situations very close to their homes, a basis which the author saw as subjective. The author realized upon reconsideration that this "proximity factor" was likely to have also applied to an answer by newcomer Fred Hillerman, in which Hillerman may have been greatly influenced by two plainly gutted shotgun homes besides his home when he emphasized demolishing homes "beyond repair." [8/12-2.]

(Throughout the presentation of results and elsewhere, questionnaires will be identified in brackets, as Fred Hillerman's has been; they are cited first by their dates of occurrence - in Hillerman's case, August 12, 1989 - and then by their numerical order within questionnaires completed on the same day.)

1E. Case Study Interviews within the Context of Interviewing Approaches and Methods

Just as the thesis attempts to integrate both methodological and sociological concerns (especially in analyzing its experimental questionnaire and in discussing the social aspects of neighborhood preservation), it is also a hybrid between scientifically designed questionnaires and surveys on the one hand and informal interviews on the other. Ultimately, as will be seen below, it bears more resemblance to the latter.
To gain a sense of widely-accepted principles and approaches in creating and utilizing questionnaires and surveys, the author relied primarily on one of the most respected writings in this area of social studies, Earl Babbie’s *Survey Research Methods*. First published in 1973, Babbie’s textbook presents many components which he sees as either requirements or as strongly suggested in doing surveys. Some of the most important ones, and/or those which are most relevant to the case study, are summarized below. If any overarching idea unites all of them, it is that there is no exact science to these methods, but that at every step, very careful consideration must be given to the meanings of the concept or concepts being researched.

The first major step, indeed, is "conceptualization." This involves taking ideas which are often very vague, specifically defining them, and choosing the specific means of communicating them to people. A major initial requirement here, in Babbie’s mind, consists of two exhaustive lists: one containing every possible aspect of the concept being studied and the second one showing every element which is clearly not part of the concept. Here and elsewhere, Babbie states that there are no "right" or "wrong" definitions or choices, but utility, or the usefulness of specific elements in increasing scholarly understanding, should be the guiding factor.

Two additional principles which are significant at every stage of the total process are **reliability** and **validity**.
Reliability, in simplest terms, measures the extent to which a particular approach, utilized in a duplication or later repetition of a survey, will yield the same results. Validity deals with the extent to which an empirical measure reflects the real meaning of a concept. Babbie and others point out that these basic measurements will always be in conflict. As an abstract example, the "richness of meaning" inherent in many concepts, as Babbie puts it, cannot easily be converted into useable survey language, but it must be in order to increase the reliability of research. (3)

Once in the field, there are at least two principles, namely, rapport and probing. Here, one may easily cite the explanations in Herbert Hyman's book Interviewing in Social Research, first published in 1954 and still in use today. (4) Hyman comments that rapport is "almost universally accepted as essential to a good interview," based largely on the assumptions "that people talk better in a warm, friendly atmosphere" and that "attitudes are somehow complex . . . and a lot of talking is essential before the attitude is elicited." Probing, somewhat similarly, is seen as a "desirable trait" in interviewers because of the view of attitudes as "many-faceted, equivocal [and] subject to qualification and shading" and the conclusion that simple initial answers do not reflect a person's total attitude structure.

While underscoring the critical nature of these two
components, Hyman points out that they do have limits. Too much rapport, for its part, may make an interviewee just as uneasy as a clearly unfriendly interviewer would. And although he would agree that thin answers present a serious deficiency, he says "we may distort the situation just as much if we forget that there are some people in this world with no hidden depths and only superficial attitudes on certain issues." (5)

One chief way to begin to uncover "hidden depths" which do exist, and to determine how much to emphasize rapport, probing and a variety of other aspects, is to carefully pretest questionnaires and surveys. In a very real sense, a different type of interview - one that is informal and may even be completely unstructured, may also be seen as a pretesting of an issue and an area.

Earl Babbie, to offer one fleeting example seen in his Survey Research Methods, speaks in a footnote about "exploratory" studies. He describes them as exercises where interviewers should obtain an outline of topics to cover and possibly a set of questions. A counterpart to such an activity, termed an "informal consultation," is found in a 1990 book by Bernie Jones, Neighborhood Planning: A Guide for Citizens and Planners. Jones writes of this consultation as contact with residents, but without a predetermined set of questions. He describes this interaction as more of a conversation than an interview, and says it might be more
suitable near the beginning of a planning process, when specific issues have not yet been identified and "you are just trying to get a general sense of how people see their neighborhood." (6)

The aforementioned 1988 text of Anthony Catanese and J. C. Snyder, Urban Planning (see p. 12), presents the approach of "qualitative interviews," in a chapter on "Qualitative Methods" in planning written by Hemalata C. Dandekar. Dandekar emphasizes that researchers gathering qualitative information do so not from "subjects" or "respondents," as they would be labeled in survey methodology, but from informants, as they are described in anthropology. She writes that while an interviewer will be directing conversation towards previously identified themes of interest, informants are allowed and encouraged to both tell the story in their own ways and to bring up what they see as relevant to the general issue.

Much of what results, to Dandekar, is anecdotal, and supplemented by inferential observations. Because of these qualities, success depends largely on the experience and aptitude of an interviewer, including his or her ability to establish rapport. Analysis of informant interviews is directed towards identifying and compiling the major themes. Dandekar feels that the aim, or at least the attempt of such interviews is to identify linkages and processes in the human and social systems under study. (7)
Having presented insights into both informal and highly developed interviews, the author would reemphasize his earlier observation that the attempt utilized in this thesis is more akin to those of informal interviews. At the same time, it incorporates the following elements found in more rigorous interviews:

First, in designing the questionnaire, the author focused on a number of details, including specific words, primarily on the basis of whether or not they would lead to both neutrality and clarity. Secondly, he began all interviews with a predetermined set of questions. Finally, he used the same questions throughout several dozen interviews, even though he did not stick to them, as in Earl Babbie’s analogy, like an "actor reading his lines." (8)

One could say that one reason for the author’s case study being exploratory or informal was that he did not deeply read between his lines in considering their potential effect on his audience. Two points of Earl Babbie, both stressing the need for clarity, have special relevance here.

Babbie’s first point is that researchers often become so involved in the topic under consideration that perspectives will be clear to them but not to their respondents, "many of whom will have given little or no attention to the topic." (The author is not sure that these last words would accurately depict his interviewees, but feels that this is quite likely.)

The author does see a strong resonance in a second point
by the veteran researcher, when he introduces a category of inquiry which he calls "double-barreled questions." He says that very frequently, a researcher asks interviewees for a single answer to a combination of questions, and that the situation occurs most often when he or she has personally identified with a complex position. (9) Looking back, the author would affix this description to two key questions in his interview. The first and foremost example is question B5, inspired by the intertwining of both cultural and physical preservation. A lesser example is question C3B, based on the author's own conscious connection between the overlapping phenomena of historic preservation and gentrification. (Further comments on these questions are presented on pp. 268 and 278-279 in Appendix 2, "A Detailed Explanation of Questionnaire Components."

As a whole, the author would indeed describe the results of his questionnaire as "anecdotal [and] augmented with inferential observations," to recall a point of Dandekar cited above. He feels that the multitude of anecdotes which he will present, as opposed to more thoughtful insights which he had hoped his questionnaire would elicit, is largely due to his limited experience in informal interviewing, let alone standardized surveys. That level of familiarity, in turn, was one reason why his work may be echoed by another description of Dandekar, that "[v]alidation and contextual information can be obtained from secondary sources of data," a label the
The author would certainly apply to the articles and other materials he studied outside of his questionnaire findings.

(10)

1F. **Contextual Research on Attitudes Towards Preservation**

To help determine how typical and/or atypical the attitudes and occurrences he came across were of low- to moderate- income, socioeconomically upgrading sections in other American cities, the author collected information regarding particular neighborhoods in other cities and from national overviews on lower-income housing preservation and gentrification. Through these sources, the author could better assess the relevance and importance of Cabbagetown attitudes to ones elsewhere. The author’s major results in this area of research can be seen in Section C of Part II, "A Context for the Case Study."

2A. Reasons for Choice of Atlanta’s Cabbagetown Neighborhood for Research

As stated on page 2, the author chose Cabbagetown as the focus of his master’s thesis during a 1989 internship with the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation in Atlanta. Cabbagetown interested the author for two reasons related to preservation attitudes. The first was its gentrifying as well as historic nature. The second was the anticipated awareness of neighborhood history and historic preservation on the part of many of its residents. This consciousness was thought to exist because of the long-lasting connection of many families to Cabbagetown through previous employment in the adjacent Fulton Mill (see p. 5).

2B. A Geographical and Visual Introduction to Cabbagetown

This section describes the visual characteristics of Cabbagetown, and is supported by the photographs of Cabbagetown’s landmarks, streetscapes and environs found on pp. 48-83.
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Cabbagetown is an 18-square block neighborhood located 1-1/2 miles east of downtown Atlanta in the southeastern portion of the city. (See figures 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, pp. 48-50.)

Cabbagetown is bounded on the west by Boulevard, a main street which also marks the Eastern edge of the city's most historic burial ground - Oakland Cemetery. (See photo 2.1 on p. 51.) For this and all subsequent boundary and street references, please refer to the Cabbagetown street map in figure 2.3, page 50.) On the south, its boundary is Memorial Drive, one of the widest and longest streets in Atlanta's eastern half (photo 2.2, p. 52). Pearl Street, a side street, marks its eastern edge (photo 2.3, p. 53). To the north lie the Georgia Railroad and associated transportation facilities (photo 2.4, p. 54).

Just below the Georgia Railroad, on the northwestern edge of Cabbagetown, is the large, abandoned complex known as the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mills. Technically, it does not belong to any one neighborhood, but psychologically, as indicated below, it is very much a part of Cabbagetown and Cabbagetown's history. "Fulton Bag," as it is often called, was built mostly over a thirty-year period from the 1880's to World War I. Its first structure was built in 1881 in a simple neo-Romanesque style on Boulevard Street (photo 2.5, p. 55). (1) It is sandwiched between two much larger turn-of-the-century factories (photo 2.6, p. 56). Its neighboring building to the south is distinctive primarily for its long southern exposure,
half of which appears to be a wall of multiple balconies and much of which, sadly, is taken up by broken windows, as on other sides of other Mill structures (photo 2.7, p. 57). This elevation also includes a railroad siding by which raw cotton and cotton products were taken into and out of the Mill over the years (photo 2.8, p. 58). (2)

To the south of Fulton Bag are three groupings of tenements, on Reinhardt, Boulevard and Carroll Streets, remaining from the six blocks of quadriplexes built by the Fulton Mills to house its workers during the three decades starting in 1881. Among the oldest of the existing tenements are two on Boulevard Street built in 1892 (photo 2.9, p. 59). The most distinctive group, however, is that of the six tenements on Carroll Street, whose two-story height and flat roofs make them remindful of housing in New England mill villages (photo 2.10, p. 60). (3)

Both sides of Carroll Street, indeed, may seem more familiar than many other Atlanta streetscapes to "Northern" eyes such as the author's. On the east side of Carroll, across from the flat-roofed units, is a row of two-story, commercial/residential buildings, with second-story balconies and narrow service alleys between them (photo 2.11, p. 61). One of these structures contains Little's, one of the very last long-time neighborhood convenience stores in Cabbagetown as of 1993 (photo 2.12, p. 62). At that time, it was still managed by Leon Little, whose parents opened it in 1929.
The mixed-use row containing Little's is bordered on its southern end by the narrow and bucolic Pickett's Alley. Walking up the hill on this short thoroughfare (photo 2.13, p. 63), one sees Savannah Street on the left. This street's dominant feature, historically and aesthetically, has long been that of the "shotgun" houses which constitute its major residential type (photos 2.14 and 2.15, pp. 64 and 65). "Shotguns" are a common house type in Southern cities, while on Savannah Street, their narrowness and close spacing may, like the image of the apartment structures on Carroll Street, appear "Northern." This type of home is one room in width and generally two or three rooms in depth. It received its nickname from the long-standing allusion that, because it had a hallway built on a line with the front door, one could shoot a gun through it without touching anything or anyone.

While Savannah Street's old shotguns, ranging in age from 70 to 90 years, are still very much in evidence, the street's leading feature in recent years has been its six newest homes, starting just above Pickett's Alley and built by the Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust (CRAFT) in 1989, as the flagship element in its major neighborhood housing initiative. (See photos 2.16, 2.17 and 2.18, pp. 66-68, and, for further discussion of these "CRAFT" homes, pp. 98-99, 178-181 and 184-185.)

Berean Street, just east of Savannah, is similar in its unbroken length, but here, one begins to see a greater mixture
of housing types (photo 2.19, p. 69). Here, as on most of the remaining streets in Cabbagetown, various cottages, usually with two intersecting gabled roofs, are more in evidence than on more western blocks. The most common of these cottages is simply called a "worker’s cottage," largely because its almost complete lack of ornament identifies it as having been built for mill workers (and others) in general, as opposed to mill supervisors, for example. Two variants on the cottage are Victorian cottages, whose "gingerbread" detailing is quite rare in Cabbagetown, and L-Plan cottages, shaped like an "L" in relation to their street frontages (photo 2.20, p. 70). (4)

While it is hard to speak of dominant housing types in most of Cabbagetown’s northern tier of blocks east of Savannah Street, an area of two blocks in the southern third of the neighborhood, including parts of Iswald, Berean and Gaskill, is largely distinguished by the "one-and-a-half-story duplex" (as identified by Atlanta’s Urban Design Commission), a symmetrical model of around 1920 with a peaked roof (photo 2.21, p. 71). (5)

The overall integrity of Cabbagetown’s primary historic and aesthetic character of wood-frame, vernacular homes is interrupted and weakened in various ways, but especially by the sizeable number of abandoned homes, often burnt shells. (See photo 2.22, p. 72.) Based on a personal 1989 survey of Cabbagetown, the author estimates that such structures made up at least 10% of the section’s existing residential stock, not
counting vacant lots where homes once stood. Many visitors to Cabbagetown would also feel its historic integrity is weakened by the largely transportation-related businesses on both its northern and southern sides. To the north is the starkly modern "Piggyback Yard" (see photos 2.23 and 2.24 on pp. 73 and 74 and a discussion of the Yard on pp. 97-98), and to the south is a junkyard and an abandoned trucking depot (photos 2.25 and 2.26 on pp. 75 and 76).

Whether these spaces may be seen as visually jarring or as appropriate to what has always been a wholly or strongly working-class neighborhood, they do further separate Cabbagetown from at least two of its neighboring communities. Cabbagetown in large part has a physical and economic counterpart in the Reynoldstown neighborhood immediately to the east, which is almost entirely African-American, as opposed to Cabbagetown, with its Caucasian majority. The less-accessible neighborhoods of Grant Park, to the south, and Inman Park, to the north, are more well-to-do, but still socially diverse. (Please see figure 2.4, p. 77, showing Cabbagetown within the context of surrounding neighborhoods.)

Grant Park may be reached by crossing Memorial, and its central portion lies south of Interstate 20. That center contains the park which gives the area its name, and which was laid out in the 1880’s to provide an attractive nucleus for development (photo 2.27 on p. 78). The neighborhood’s homes (photos 2.28 and 2.29, pp. 79 and 80) are sometimes similar to
ones in Cabbagetown, but the influence of a greener and more middle-class atmosphere is certainly in evidence. Since the 1970’s, Grant Park has in large part reversed an earlier decline, with many of the long-time, mostly African-American residents, remaining there, and newcomers, often Caucasian and white-collar in their background, settling there. (6)

Inman Park, to the north of the Georgia Railroad, is both literally and sociologically on the "other side of the tracks" from Cabbagetown. It was first developed in 1889 by local businessman Joel Hurt as the city’s first "streetcar" suburb for Atlanta’s growing middle class. Before World War I, it attracted both downtown Atlanta professionals and the leading businessmen of the city; two of its most illustrious residents were Coca-Cola magnates Asa Candler and Ernest Woodruff. The neighborhood’s visual highpoint was and still is to be seen in its exuberantly Victorian mansions on Edgewood Avenue, the location of the one-time streetcar line, and elsewhere (photos 2.30 and 2.31, pp. 81 and 82). Aside from these impressive islands of homes, Inman Park is mostly graced by bungalows, and again, as with many of Grant Park’s residences, some of these could be envisioned standing in Cabbagetown (photo 2.32, p. 83). However, the strong resurgence of the neighborhood since the late 1960’s, after five decades as a declining and ultimately transient residential area, has placed it well apart from Cabbagetown, both in terms of prosperity and popularity. (7)
Figure 2.1. Cabbagetown (*) as seen within Metropolitan Atlanta. [Source: Official Highway and Transportation Map for Georgia, 1987-88, Georgia Department of Transportation.]
Figure 2.2. Cabbagetown (outlined) and its city surroundings; Downtown Atlanta lies within the boxed area just to Cabbagetown’s west. [Source: Atlanta Street Map, Gousha Company, 1987.]
Figure 2.3. The Streets of Cabbagetown [Source: Brown’s Guide to Georgia, July, 1981, p. 39; the map, as seen by its caption and legend, was made for a walking tour accompanying the issue’s article on Cabbagetown, "We Shall Not Be Moved...."]
Photo 2.1. Boulevard Street and Oakland Cemetery (All color photos of scenes in Atlanta were taken by the author in 1989 or January, 1990 unless otherwise noted).
Photo 2.2. Memorial Drive looking east from near Powell Street.
Photo 2.3. St. Luke’s Methodist Church, Pearl and Kirkwood Streets, 1989. This edifice, even in its ruined state, will help to visualize the importance of Pearl Street, as a boundary and through street, in lieu of a streetscape.
Photo 2.4. The Georgia Railroad, as seen from DeKalb Avenue at Boulevard Street, from underneath the MARTA (Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transportation Authority) railroad. The tower and smokestacks of the Fulton Mill can be seen in the background.
Photo 2.5. The original Fulton Mills factory and offices (1881) on Boulevard Street.
Photo 2.6. The Fulton Mills from the eastern end of Oakland Cemetery just across Boulevard Street.
Photo 2.7. The south elevation of the Fulton Mills from Oakland Cemetery.
Photo 2.8. The Fulton Mills from Boulevard Street; its railroad siding may be seen at the second-story level.
Photo 2.9. View from Oakland Cemetery, including mill workers’ housing on Boulevard Street to the right.
Photo 2.10. Carroll Street quadriplexes
Photo 2.11. Mixed-use row on east side of Carroll Street
Photo 2.12. Little’s store, 198 Carroll Street.
Photo 2.13. Pickett's Alley from Carroll Street.
Photo 2.14. Savannah Street shotguns looking north towards Tennelle Street.
Photo 2.15. Shotguns, east side of Savannah Street near Tennelle.
Photo 2.16. CRAFT homes on Savannah Street, looking north.
Photo 2.17. CRAFT homes on Savannah Street, looking south.
Photo 2.18. One of Savannah Street CRAFT homes.
Photo 2.19. West side of Berean Street above Pickett’s Alley
Photo 2.20. Worker's cottages on Tye Street just north of Gaskill.
Photo 2.21. One-and-a-half-story duplexes as seen from the corner of Gaskill and Berean Streets. (In the foreground are the remains of Mac’s, a once-popular Cabbagetown corner store which burned in the Fall of 1989.)
Photo 2.22. An abandoned home on Pearl Street.
Photo 2.23. The Piggyback Yard from a MARTA train (refer to photo 2.4, p. 54); the Fulton Mill can be seen to the far right.
Photo 2.24. Sound barrier wall for the Piggyback Yard, extending along Tennelle and Wylie Streets on Cabbagetown’s north end.
Photo 2.25. Harris Salvage Yard on Memorial Drive between Tye, Gaskill and Estoria Streets, as seen from a rise on the east side of Estoria.
Photo 2.26. Scene in Dudley Trucking depot on Memorial Drive.
Figure 2.4. Cabbagetown and adjacent neighborhoods.
1. Cabbagetown  2. Grant Park  3. Inman Park
[Source: Atlanta Street Map, Gousha Company, 1987, and "Map of Atlanta / Neighborhood Data Collection Areas," Atlanta-Fulton County Joint Planning Board, June 1973.]
Photo 2.27. Grant Park
Photo 2.28. Cherokee Avenue, Grant Park. [Courtesy of Tommy Jones, Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, along with subsequent black-and-white photos of Grant Park and Inman Park.]
Photo 2.29. Broyles Street, Grant Park.
Photo 2.30. The King House, Edgewood Avenue, Inman Park.
Photo 2.32. Bungalows, Sinclair Avenue, Inman Park.
2C. A Brief History of Cabbagetown

While streetcars could be seen as the umbilical cord and lifeline for Inman Park, the Georgia Railroad might, without exaggeration, be said to be the first strand in the history of what became Cabbagetown, and is undoubtedly one of the earliest strands in the history of the city of Atlanta. Atlanta was deliberately intended as a railroad center from the time of its birth in 1837. By the eve of the Civil War, four railroads, including the Georgia, came into Atlanta (fig. 2.5, p. 85). The city's early industries and working-class neighborhoods naturally developed along these rail lines. One railside business was the Atlanta Rolling Mills, located at the Georgia Railroad and Boulevard Street and probably the first major example of growth within the present-day bounds of Cabbagetown. Though it stood for only one year during the Civil War, this iron manufactory remains famous as the forge for the Confederate gunboat the Merrimack. (8)

The single most dominant influence on Cabbagetown's physical and social development - the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill - began to arise on the Rolling Mill's land in 1881. The story of this giant among Southern textile mills actually began in 1868. In that year, Jacob Elsas, an enterprising 21-year old who had recently emigrated from Germany, noted how cotton was shipped through Atlanta - and other southern points - to the textile mills of the North.
Figure 2.5. Railroads entering Atlanta in 1860. [Source: James Russell, Atlanta 1847 - 1890 / City Building in the Old South and the New (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), p. 22.]
Elsas felt that the South too should have textile factories, and he opened a three-story bag manufactory near the heart of downtown Atlanta. The business expanded quickly, sharing in the rapid recovery of the post-Civil War city. Atlanta's success led to events of civic boosterism such as the International Cotton Exposition of 1881, and Elsas' good fortune led of course to his decision, in the same year, to build anew. The site he chose was still an open one, then lying beyond the eastern edge of the developed city. (9)

Elsas and his associates quickly embarked on two simultaneous tasks in the creation of a pool of workers, and with them, began the Mill's impact on the neighborhood's residential and social development. One of these efforts was recruitment, largely of farmers who worked their poor soil intermittently in hilly regions of North Georgia. A second step was the erection of workers' housing in the triangle of land between the Mill and Oakland Cemetery. (Refer back to the map of Cabbagetown in figure 2.3 on p. 50.)

This plot of land became known as the "Factory Lot." While its first, crudely-built rows of housing (seen in photo 2.33 on p. 87) did not last long, a dense, six-square block array of units (discussed above on p. 43) had sprouted on the lot by the turn of the century. All of these structures were constructed and owned by the Mill. Shortly after 1900, executives of the vigorously growing Mill opened satellite branches in several cities, including New York, Saint Louis,
Photo 2.33. Housing for workers on the Fulton Mill’s "Factory Lot" in the early 1880’s as seen from Oakland Cemetery. [Source: The Patch, Inc., Atlanta.]
Dallas and Los Angeles (photos 2.34 and 2.35 on pp. 89 and 90). (10)

While the company held all of the neighborhood properties west of Carroll Street, the situation east of that thoroughfare was markedly different. Here, homes were built and owned largely by individual families. Their occupants represented a range of professions, especially through the late 1920’s. (11) This population supported a variety of neighborhood businesses, concentrated on Carroll, the main business strip, and scattered throughout Cabbagetown. Among grocery stores, for example, there were four in addition to one which was a "company store," of sorts, because it accepted scrip that was redeemed by the Mill.

With the Depression, this variegated picture began to steadily disappear. As the Mill’s operation continued on a very large scale, and small neighborhood operations began to close, the community became increasingly dominated by and dependent on the Mill. Historian Steven Grable, writing in 1982, has pointed out the increase in the number of Mill workers living east of Carroll after 1929, while Scott Segal, documenting Cabbagetown in 1986 (see p. 19), made clear the shrinking number of businesses from the 1930’s onward. (12)

The Mill itself entered shaky economic times starting in the early 1950’s, though its historical highpoint had been reached only a few years earlier, during the post-World War II boom. It had to cope with the difficulties of many aging
Photo 2.34. Promotional view of the Fulton Mills, early 1900's. [Source: Photo collection of Leon Little, Cabbagetown (Atlanta).]
Photo 2.35. The Fulton Mill and satellite branches outside of Atlanta, early 1900's. [Source: Photo collection of Leon Little, Cabbagetown (Atlanta).]
American industries, the most serious among them being an inefficient, multi-story facility. Later, it was further weakened by the growing textile production of developing nations.

In 1957, the Elsas family sold not only the Mill itself but all of its houses in the neighborhood. Over the next 17 years, Cabbagetown became increasingly poorer as the Mill continued to diminish its economic presence there. Unable to survive the challenges already noted, the Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill all but closed its operations on October 11, 1974, dealing a damaging blow to the neighborhood’s people. (13)

Prior to this watershed in Cabbagetown’s history, activities had begun to shore up and maintain the neighborhood’s socioeconomic fabric. They were mostly centered around the Patch, a community center founded in 1971 under the energetic leadership of local activist Esther Lefever. (Ms. Lefever, while she did not become a neighborhood resident, was closely associated with Cabbagetown for over 20 years, from the late 1960’s until her death at age 60 in 1991.) (See photos 2.36 and 2.37 on pp. 92 and 93.) (14)

The programs of the Patch were first geared towards Cabbagetown youth, but it adopted a wider focus, centering around economic redevelopment, following the Mill’s closing. As part of this focus, the Patch sought to capitalize on the North Georgia roots of many Cabbagetowners by starting "cottage industries" which were inspired by Appalachian arts.
Photo 2.36. The Patch in the early 1970's. [Courtesy of the Patch, Inc., Atlanta.]
Photo 2.37. Esther Lefever at the Cabbagetown Pottery (the Patch's former home), August, 1989.
and crafts. By the late 1970's, there were three such businesses, each employing three to five neighborhood residents and consisting of furniture-refinishing, pottery and hand-screen printing. (15)

Parallel with the decline of old-line industries such as the Fulton Mill in the 1960's and 70's, Atlanta was undergoing a tremendous expansion of its professional workforce. A number of upwardly mobile people in this sector of the economy sought out inexpensive neighborhoods close to downtown Atlanta for new places of residence. Inman Park and Grant Park, described above (pp. 46-47), were among such areas. Cabbagetown, while not the first such neighborhood to feel this phenomenon, began to be touched by it as the 1970's came to a close.

A 1986 study of Cabbagetown and the adjacent Reynoldstown neighborhood done by planners affiliated with the Community Design Center of Atlanta concluded that there are "five separate pieces of evidence" which prove that gentrification happened in Cabbagetown during the first half of the 1980's; as to the fourth and fifth facts, the study's authors conclude that since there were no new housing units constructed in Cabbagetown during the years 1979 to 1986, that changes could have only taken place within the existing stock of housing:

"1. Long time residents' complaints and allegations.
"2. Increases in housing prices of 180.0% from 1975 to 1985.

[This placed Cabbagetown ahead of "known gentrifying
neighborhoods" in Atlanta such as Inman Park and Poncey-Highland.

3. A turnover rate of 98.4% between 1975 and 1985.
5. Increases in owned units of 22 between 1979 and 1986."

(16)

In the nearly 15 years since gentrification began in Cabbagetown, it has remained fairly modest. Mary Bankester, the best-known "newcomer" to Cabbagetown in the 1980's, estimated in a 1991 conversation with the author that more recent arrivals such as herself constituted only 8-10% of the population. In addition, this gentrification has clearly not involved an upper-middle class character, but has largely been undertaken by entry-level white-collar professionals. One example was that of Dan Vallone (since deceased), who identified himself in 1987 as an administrative assistant at a local company, and who came, according to his comments for a newspaper article, "not to run out poor people but partly because he was poor himself." (17)

Notwithstanding such viewpoints, the attitudes of "neighborhood" people to gentrification and gentrifiers - as will be seen in articles noted below (pp. 153-154) - were often unfavorable. Concrete responses basically stressed housing rehabilitation which would allow long-time residents to remain. One of the earliest such programs was presented in
a 1980 study on "Cabbagetown Housing" put out by the Patch. Its highlights included a breakdown of renovation costs for different types of Cabbagetown homes. (18)

One of the most famous, and certainly the most infamous, of efforts to stabilize the section’s population, was that of the Fulton Cooperative Village, or "the Co-op." This organization, as the name implies, was based on cooperatively held shares for the upgrading and ultimate ownership of housing by its members. It began in 1981, when the City of Atlanta loaned it $400,000 to purchase 49 units of housing from Thomas West, Cabbagetown’s major absentee landlord.

The Co-op’s active program ceased in 1986, and its fatal shortcoming was a lack of money to rehabilitate the houses which had been bought - a mutual source of frustration for both it and the City. In the Co-op’s five years of efforts, only a few of the houses bought with the City’s loan had been renovated and occupied, five of these through the generosity of one long-time supporter. The rest lay vacant and had quickly deteriorated. The Co-op’s lack of resources was caused by various misfortunes, such as the difficulty of obtaining lower-income housing loans, as well as the inexperience of its leadership in financial matters.

This organization was also brought down by fierce opposition from the Cabbagetown Restoration Society (CRS), an organization made up mainly of neighborhood gentrifiers which had been founded in 1981. Many in the CRS felt that what they
saw as the Co-op's lack of professionalism and its emphasis on lower-income housing would greatly limit Cabbagetown's attractiveness as an improving central-city neighborhood. In 1986, sixteen individuals who were closely connected with the CRS sued the City to abolish the Co-op and dispose of its properties. Their challenge finally led to the City's 1988 repossession of 24 of the 49 properties. (19)

While the Co-op and its properties languished during the 1980's, another development, which many felt would be an economic boon for the neighborhood, took shape. In 1982, CSX, a national transportation corporation, first proposed a 75-acre freight yard to be built on land between Cabbagetown and neighboring Reynoldstown to the south and the Georgia Railroad to the north. (See fig. 2.4 on p. 77.) The proposed facility came to be known as the "Piggyback Yard," because freight containers were to be unloaded from rail cars and carried in a "piggyback" fashion on top of diesel truck trailers (or the reverse). It attracted the support of Esther Lefever and others, who, with the Yard's site and one of its key entry locations right next to the Fulton Mill, saw CSX as a major tenant, and thus a linchpin, of the Mill's redevelopment.

Despite the virtue of this and other claims regarding economic development for the southeast side of Atlanta, both CSX and its advocates faced a protracted struggle from people with two key concerns: first, environmental hazards of such a facility, including the risk of chemical spills, and second,
the harm they felt the operation might do to the socioeconomic revitalization of surrounding neighborhoods. The Yard was only approved in 1985 after two court cases and concessions to those who would be living beside it. For Cabbagetown, those benefits included CSX’s purchase of the Mill - wth hopes that this would spur its re-use - and the establishment of an "impact fund" to which 50 cents would be contributed for each of the many trucks using the Yard annually, and whose monies would be divided between redevelopment efforts in both Cabbagetown and Reynoldstown. (20)

This fund proved to be critical in starting Cabbagetown’s next affordable housing organization - the Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust (CRAFT), founded in April, 1988. Like the Fulton Cooperative Village, it has created low- to moderate-income housing, especially for long-time residents, but under what has been an innovative concept in recent years. Land trusts, of which CRAFT is one, hold land "in trust" for purposes determined by their members. CRAFT’s primary purpose is to preserve the affordability of home ownership for the homes which stand on its parcels. (21)

Since its inception, CRAFT has purchased 56 parcels in Cabbagetown, or approximately 12% of the neighborhood’s total parcels. Its most notable accomplishment has been the construction and sale of six adjacent houses on Savannah Street, built in a style meant to correspond with their neighbors, and completed in June, 1989. (See p. 44 for
reference to the "Savannah Street homes."

By early 1993, CRAFT had constructed four other homes and rehabilitated fourteen residences. (22)

In 1989, Cabbagetown also received new housing through the efforts of the internationally-known, Georgia-based group "Habitat for Humanity." As it has done elsewhere, Habitat involved all of the occupants and owners of its homes largely by having them donate labor to assist in the homes' construction; in the case of Cabbagetown, each owner or pair of owners worked for 125 hours on their respective residences. The neighborhood saw a total of nine Habitat structures erected over a brief period in the Fall of 1989, with five of them concentrated in the block between Carroll, Gaskill, Berean and Pickett's Alley (See photos 2.38-2.40 on pp. 101-103.) (23)

Parallel with housing programs such as those of CRAFT and Habitat for Humanity have been various efforts to keep alive Cabbagetown's Appalachian roots. The arts-and-crafts businesses mentioned above (pp. 91 and 94), while they were short-lived, were one instance of this effort. Another special example of this came in 1978 with the Atlanta production of a play, "Three Women," covering the lives of three actual Cabbagetown women from their youth in the Georgia mountains through their working years in the Mill (photos 2.41 and 2.42 on pp. 104 and 105). (24) Today, the neighborhood's culture and community feeling continues to be celebrated
through such events as "Cabbagetown Christmases" and the annual Cabbagetown Festival each Spring.

For a further sense of Cabbagetown’s atmosphere, the reader is introduced to the following section, "The People of Cabbagetown in Photographs," and directed to Appendix 4, "A Profile of Cabbagetown," on pp. 304-313.
Photo 2.38. Habitat homes on Gaskill Street just east of Carroll.
Photo 2.39. Habitat homes on Tye Street just below Wylie.
Photo 2.40. Porch post, Habitat home on Tye Street.
Photo 2.41. The Cabbagetown women portrayed in the 1978 drama "Three Women"; from left to right: Beatrice Dalton, Lila Brookshire and Effie Gray, photographed at the time of the play's first production.
Photo 2.42. Beatrice Dalton in 1989 on the porch of her apartment building.
2E.

The People of Cabbagetown in Photographs
Photo 2.43
Photo 2.50. Selected debtors at Leon Little’s Grocery Store on Carroll Street.
Photo 2.51
Photo 2.53
Photo 2.54
Photo 2.55
Chapter 3. Historic Preservation in Cabbagetown

3A. Introduction: Comments on Cabbagetown's significance

To many preservationists, the most important fact about Cabbagetown has been its "total ensemble" - the continued existence of both a Mill and much of the housing where its workers lived. (1) Because of the association of "mill villages" with small-town surroundings, and the rural background or roots of many Cabbagetowners, their "mill village" has been seen as all the more special within its larger physical context - lying so close to the center of a booming metropolis. In speaking to the author, Donald Rooney, Curator of the General Museum Collections at the Atlanta Historical Society, gave the neighborhood a state-wide level of significance, "because it is unusual to find a mill right in the urban center." Partly for that same oft-cited observation on Cabbagetown, Eileen Rhea Brown, the founder of the Atlanta Preservation Center - the city's leading preservation group - placed its significance at the national level, speaking of it as being in "the shadows of the skyscrapers." (See photo no. 3.1 on p. 122.) (2)

The total group of the author's professional interviewees in Atlanta largely seconded the theme of Cabbagetown's
Photo 3.1. The Fulton Mill smokestacks as seen against the Atlanta skyline, from Chester Avenue in the Reynoldstown section east of Cabbagetown.
atypical location, but to some extent also downplayed its significance by stressing the large number of mill-based settlements that grew up in the Nineteenth and early-Twentieth century South. Franklin Garrett, Atlanta’s official city historian, noted that "Georgia was probably the second biggest textile-producing state after Texas, so there were a lot of textile mills." Darlene Roth, the Atlanta Historical Society’s Director of Education, gave the most restrained evaluation of Cabbagetown’s significance. Aside from the two-story, flat-roofed duplexes on Reinhardt and Carroll Street, remaining from the neighborhood’s original "Factory Lot," and, which are, according to her, "very rare in the South," Cabbagetown – with special reference to its aesthetics – is "very typical" among Southern mill villages. (3)

Interwoven with Cabbagetown’s physical dimensions is its cultural and human aspect as an urban, largely Appalachian-based concentration. Most professional observers readily stated that Cabbagetown had a culture, as well as buildings worthy of preservation, while their stresses on this varied. Fernando Costa, Atlanta’s city planning director, said that the neighborhood’s Appalachian-descended culture was "equally important if not more [so] than any architectural importance" and that its "thread . . . must be protected and enhanced in connection with economic status-raising." Anne Farrisee, the executive director of the Atlanta Preservation Center (and Eileen Brown’s successor in that role) responded with an
immediate sense of the neighborhood's having an important culture, saying that it is both "a culture of where [Cabbagetowners] came from, and of them there." (4)

None of these observers of Cabbagetown touted its cultural significance as highly as Esther Lefever, who as the leader of Cabbagetown's Patch organization may be said to have had a vested interest in highlighting the neighborhood to the outside world. A broad-brush introduction to her 1980 report on re-use of the Fulton Mill describes Cabbagetown with a particular emphasis on culture and a sense of community among its people. It says, in part, that Cabbagetown is:

"an inner-city community made up of people - of southern mountain heritage - who left the land generations ago and came to the city through economic necessity. They came in 1881 to work at the Fulton Mill and brought with them their music, religion, folklore, crafts, food, remedies, strength and moral courage." (5)

As distinctive as Cabbagetown is, both culturally and physically, the author would again underscore the point that it is not unique. Among the South's numerous textile-mill settlements, another Atlanta example will help to put Cabbagetown's relative importance into clearer focus. The Whittier Mill Village, located in an isolated part of Northwest Atlanta (fig. 3.1 on p. 125), offers a somewhat similar history.

Like Cabbagetown, the site of the Whittier industrial development contained a community prior to its founding, which occurred in 1900 when a New England family, the Whittiers, set
Figure 3.1. The Whittier Mill neighborhood of Northwest Atlanta (*), in relation to downtown Atlanta (D) and Cabbagetown (C). [Source: Atlanta Street Map, Gousha Company, 1987.]
up a mill there. (6) Similarly, the neighborhood's mill-owned housing was finally sold, in 1956, just months before the residential divestment of the Fulton Mill. The Whittier Mill closed in the same era as well, in 1971. Though a coalition of residents sought to save the Mill in 1987 and 1988, only its tower remains today (Photo 3.2, p. 127). Despite this loss, people in the neighborhood have continued to work for a National Register listing for the neighborhood and its inclusion as a city historic district (Photo 3.3, p. 128). (7)

In another interesting parallel with Cabbagetown, the Whittier neighborhood, despite its relative isolation, has also seen gentrification. Donald Rooney of the Atlanta Historical Society, quoted just above (p. 121), has happened to be one of its newcomers. In a 1991 conversation with the author, he estimated that 40% of its residents were gentrifiers. While his views were not corroborated with other residents, he felt there was no sense of "yuppies . . . pushing out" the oldtimers, who he saw as well-rooted in the neighborhood. He stated that the section's transition "is a very comfortable one." (8)
Photo 3.2. Whittier Mill tower with the Chattahoochee River Valley in the distance, 1989.
Photo 3.3. Homes in the Whittier Mill section. [Source: Donald Rooney, Atlanta]
3B. **Cabbagetown as a Combination of Milltown Heritage and Gentrification within the Urban Southeast**

The author was surprised to find that both Cabbagetown and the Whittier Mill Village neighborhood may very well have offered unique combinations of mill village legacies (in a sociological sense) and gentrifying atmosphere, within the context of the urban Southeast in the early 1990's. The author reached this conclusion after a fruitless search for another urban, Southeastern community, outside of Atlanta, that would offer this sociological combination and would thus present a worthwhile example to include in his contextual chapter (pp. 194-221).

One of the authorities reached in this inquiry, Professor Richard Blaustein of Eastern Tennessee State University, who has concentrated largely on urban communities in Appalachia, commented that among large Southeastern cities, Atlanta's explosive growth during the last three decades made it much likelier that change would permeate more isolated neighborhoods like Cabbagetown (or the Whittier section), whereas such areas would remain "backwaters" in many other cities.

The author expected that another Southern "boomtown" - Charlotte, North Carolina - noted for its growth in the 1980's and labeled as a onetime "preeminent example of [a] setting made up of . . . mill villages" in a major textile industry
history (9), would easily offer a "Cabbagetown counterpart." However, various North Carolina historians and preservationists could not recommend a neighborhood, in Charlotte, or throughout the state, which was quite like Cabbagetown, while one of them did cite the beginnings of gentrification in the North Charlotte section of that metropolis.

More broadly speaking, Susan Kidd, the director of the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Southeastern Regional Office, said that the "stigma" attached to Mill communities, "as well as what the housing is," in terms of its plainness and small size, has not drawn newcomers to such areas to any noticeable extent.

[Readers wanting to know those who were contacted regarding other Southeastern "milltown" neighborhoods are referred primarily to the Bibliography list "Interviewees - Cabbagetown Counterparts" (pp. 359-360) and also to listings of various individual interviewees elsewhere in the Bibliography whose names are followed by the notation "(CC)" for "Cabbagetown Counterparts."]
3C. Official Recognitions of Cabbagetown’s Historical and Architectural Significance

In comparison with the Whittier Mill Village, Cabbagetown has received greater prominence and official protection largely because of its location near the heart of Atlanta and the tremendous historical stature of the Fulton Mills within the Southern textile industry. Preservation in an official sense first became a part of the neighborhood with its listing on the National Register in 1976. The Register’s "statement of significance" for Cabbagetown describes it as "one of the oldest and largest industrial concerns and settlements in Atlanta . . . significant for being the site of the first cotton processing mill to manufacture cotton bags standardized in size and as site of one of the longest (sic) factory-supported villages in the South." (10)

In 1977, the city of Atlanta made Cabbagetown one of a handful of Historic Zoning districts. This local designation brought it under the supervision of the Atlanta Urban Design Commission, established in 1966 as the official protector of Atlanta’s cityscape and heritage. Since 1977, the Urban Design Commission (UDC) has reviewed any proposals which would visibly alter Cabbagetown, including construction, remodeling and demolition, and determined their appropriateness in terms of specific buildings involved and the overall character of the district. (11)
Municipal controls for Cabbagetown’s preservation received heightened attention when it became one of several Historic and Cultural Conservation (HC) Districts throughout the City in 1982. Each HC District had specially designed standards for its various elements or geographical sub-districts. Cabbagetown was divided into five occasionally overlapping sub-districts. (See fig. 3.2 on p. 133.)

The first portion was the Mill complex. Secondly came the one remaining block of homes from the old "Factory Lot." The third section for review took in all of Cabbagetown’s remaining homes, including several residential types. Among them are "shotgun" homes and various cottages usually with hipped and shingled roofs but less consistency of shape than Cabbagetown’s shotguns or bungalows. (See pp. 44-45 for references to these housing types.) Sub-area 4 was delineated "Neighborhood Commercial Services" and includes the east side of Carroll Street and Cabbagetown’s corner stores. Finally, the Commission would oversee evolutions in a "Transitional commercial/industrial area," largely composed of the transportation-related businesses mentioned earlier (p. 46) on both the north and south side of the District. (12)

In 1989, the neighborhood, then one of seven Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts in Atlanta, joined areas of equal rank as a "landmark district." While little was changed in the standards followed by the Design Commission, it is important to note that this nominal replacement came with a
Figure 3.2. Sub-Districts in City Historic District for Cabbagetown [Source: AUDC, Cabbagetown Historic District/Design Guidelines, Atlanta: AUDC, 1985, first page. Kirkwood Avenue, in Cabbagetown's northeastern section, is misidentified as "Kirkland."]
general heightening of preservation's role in the City. In June, 1989, with then-Mayor Andrew Young's signature, Atlanta received a new Preservation Ordinance, including tighter controls on real estate speculation, owners' claims of economic hardship and other preservation concerns. (13)

3D. Housing Preservation

Residential preservation in Cabbagetown has included both the products of lower-income groups and those of gentrification. In terms of discussing rehabilitations for lower-income housing, a key question is whether they can be labeled "historic preservation." Such a remark may seem elitist, and one might see all acts of rehabilitation as preservation in a National Register district like Cabbagetown. Still, it will be recalled that residential gentrification is often automatically viewed as historic preservation whereas lower-income housing rehabilitation may not be seen as historically-minded, or attentive to historic detail, but as having a concern only for present economic "necessities."

Having stated a consciousness of a structure's historical importance as part of historic preservation's operating definition herein, it can be seen that lower-income housing programs for Cabbagetown have often though not always shown such a consciousness, plus a self-identification as an act of
"historic preservation" or their place within an "historic district."

For example, one of the earliest affordable housing proposals, put forth by the City of Atlanta in a September, 1979 report, speaks in its first sentence of the "restoration" of Cabbagetown, at the very least setting a tone of historic preservation. Its first section, "Who Are We? History of Cabbagetown Housing" actually gives a general sense of Cabbagetown's history. Following that, Section 2, "What do we Want to Do? Goals of the Cabbagetown Housing Program" speaks at the outset of "integrat(ing) historic preservation into the rehabilitation of Cabbagetown housing" and the use of "historic preservation as a vehicle for community development." (14)

The Co-op's program, shortly thereafter, was seen as historic preservation, certainly by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which provided seed money to it as one of the earliest acts in its Inner-City Ventures Fund. With the Co-op continuing in 1982, Virginia Wadsley, its head, stressed the theme of its "experiment in preservation" - because of its unusual lower-income nature - in an article at the time. (15)

Recently, CRAFT has allied itself with historic preservation, while to a lesser extent than the Co-op. Although its major accomplishment so far, the Savannah Street homes, constitute a piece of new construction, they clearly
have involved traditional emphases of historic preservation such as aesthetics and context. In 1989, CRAFT produced a "Main Street" plan for Carroll Street, inspired largely by the National Trust program of the same name. (16)

2D. Redevelopment of the Mill

Just as a fully revitalized Carroll Street remains a dream, so too does the largest-mixed use complex for the neighborhood by far - the Mill. Since its closing in 1974, a myriad of uses has been discussed for the Mill structures, in which potentially one million square feet could be utilized. Two plans in particular have been advocated.

The first was that of Esther Lefever, the founder of the Patch. Her proposal, formally unveiled in 1980, had as its two major emphases tourism and jobs for the neighborhood. Tourist attractions - in which job creation would be a built-in component - were called for in over 40% of the 762,000-plus square feet envisioned for use. They would take the form of restaurants and entertainment spaces, a "Museum of the South," showing off the cultural heritage of the neighborhood, city and region, and various shops. (Fig. 3.3, p. 137.)

In the Lefever plan, the Mill as a renewed center of neighborhood employment would be directly manifested through 170,000 square feet devoted to "light manufacturing" and a
flea market of over 50,000 square feet. These purposes had achieved modest and temporary fruition just prior to the publication of Ms. Lefever’s proposal, when the cottage industries mentioned earlier herein (pp. 91 and 94) shared space in the original 1881 Mill building with the offices of the Patch. This, however, has so far marked the highpoint of new uses for the factory since its large-scale shutdown. (17)

In 1987, Atlanta architect John Reagan reawakened local interest in the Mill with his plan, which included housing, office and retail space and entertainment facilities. (Photo 3.4, p. 139.) Quantitatively, housing was to be the foremost component, with 300 units of approximately 1000 square feet apiece. As of early 1989, the Reagan plan had evolved to include 350 apartments and a special emphasis on spaces which would present the diversity and color of Southern culture, the latter certainly echoing Ms. Lefever’s notions. (18)

Despite Reagan’s enthusiasm for the Mill’s potential, he did not find the money to sustain his vision. In 1990, the option he had for redevelopment with the Mill’s owner, the CSX Corporation, expired. (19) (See pp. 97-98 in regards to CSX and the Mill.) As of this writing, in 1993, the Mill complex still lies empty, following occasional discussions throughout the early 1990’s regarding its reuse.
Chapter 4. Development of an Attitudinal Questionnaire and its Presentation to Residents

4A. Purposes of the Questionnaire

While obvious changes occurred between the author’s preliminary and final questionnaires, in both format and tone (see appendices 1A and 1B on pp. 243-256), four common questionnaire purposes remained. Listed in order of importance, the author wanted to obtain from the total body of responses an understanding of the following:

1. attitudes towards older physical fabric and its preservation;

2. attitudes towards gentrification;

3. attitudes on several important neighborhood issues, having varying degrees of relevance to historic preservation, as a necessary context for better understanding of attitudes towards preservation and gentrification;

4. general feelings towards the neighborhood, in terms of what residents thought it was like and what they would want it to be like.

Only one major purpose was added to the final questionnaire, this being to find out residents’ feelings
about cultural preservation. The author saw this matter as coming between gentrification and neighborhood issues in terms of its importance within the research.

4B. Sources of Advice

Local advisors (acknowledged on p. 30 and in the bibliography), played an important role in the questionnaire’s evolution. From the beginning, the author sought professional "critics" from a diversity of backgrounds who would be familiar with both the local context of Atlanta and the ways in which issues relevant to the questionnaire were, or might be perceived.

Especially with reference to the latter qualification, the author communicated to advisors his chief interest in two areas of the questionnaire: the respective levels of bias and clarity. As to the former, the author wanted to avoid as much as possible his personal biases, for example, towards preservation or against gentrification. With regards to clarity, the author wanted the final document geared towards people with as little as an elementary school education, in terms of sentence structure and vocabulary.

In addition to advisors, one written source which helped to shape the final questionnaire was a methodology for a 1989 telephone survey on historic preservation in three Georgia
cities, coordinated by Kip Wright, a student in the University of Georgia's Historic Preservation program, as the centerpiece of his master's thesis. This project is further described here on pp. 298-300, in Appendix 3, "Studies Relating to Attitudes Towards Preservation.")

4C. **Major Bases for Questions and other Questionnaire Components**

In general, the author made his choices of questions, wordings and other questionnaire components on the basis of the "purposes" cited in section 4A and his emphases on bias and clarity brought out above in section 4B. Regarding "oldtimers," an underlying reason for the nature of the author's questions was his curiosity to see if people who were relatively uneducated in a formal sense, would still intellectualize issues to any extent. (Please see Appendix 2 on pp. 265 for further comments on this intellectual basis of the questionnaire.)

Due to inexperience, the author did not create his questionnaire with the meticulous attention to detail found in true survey methodology as discussed here on pp. 34-35. Because of this, he felt it would be appropriate to simply summarize the chief bases for the questionnaire at this point, prior to presenting the questionnaire results. The brief list
that follows begins and ends respectively with comments on the questionnaire's introductory section and its concluding background questions. Between these two framing elements, the five key factors in constructing the questionnaire are brought up in order of decreasing importance. The summaries here are directly adapted from Appendix 2, "A Detailed Explanation of Questionnaire Components," on pp. 257-288.

4C1. **The Introduction: Reassuring the Respondent**

The primary purpose of the introduction was to put interviewees at ease. It consisted of both a brief set of "instructions," with which the author formally began the questionnaire, and two questions, A1 and A2, on what respondents liked and disliked respectively about Cabbagetown.

One example of the "primary purpose" here was the author's explanation in the instructions that some of his questions related to neighborhood history "because history is one of the major topics in my classes right now." Here, he hoped to allay any suspicions as to the plurality of his questions being about history and historic preservation. The author saw his questions on neighborhood likes and dislikes as easy and enjoyable to answer, largely because their broadness gave respondents maximum flexibility to express their feelings.
4C2. The Importance of Issues

The first major group of questions - B1 through B7 - concerned matters of preservation, and they were followed by four sets of questions (from C1 through C4) which dealt with neighborhood issues. The author carried his interest in preservation into these questions as well, most obviously in the first group of inquiries, on redeveloping the Fulton Mill.

At least a few sub-questions mirrored the very general structure of raising matters in decreasing order of importance to both the author's purposes and to neighborhood concerns. One joint example is that of questions C1A and C4A, each of which ask about job-creation for neighborhood inhabitants, starting off their respective segments on the Mill and the Piggyback Yard; with these two issues, the author felt that jobs were the most important priority for Cabbagetown residents.

Alongside questions such as these, whose placement is conscious of a certain, rough order, there are others which do not follow that pattern. The first two questions, of course, do not, on the surface, deal with history or preservation, but were used to relax the respondents. B3, as another example, dealt with cultural preservation, asking people if they thought neighborhood residents should "keep their old customs and traditions." It was used partly to break up the flow of questions just on physical preservation, because the author thought - in line with his earlier "instruction" regarding
questions on history - that a block purely of such questions would tend to bias interviewees either for or against historic preservation.

4C3. The Avoidance of Bias

Just as the importance of different issues played the major role in the author’s determining what he would ask about, the aim of minimizing bias was the leading determinant of how the questionnaire was worded. The author felt that asking questions in the simplest and broadest terms was the safest way to avoid bias.

An excellent example of this view can be seen by contrasting the author’s rudimentary question on housing preservation with a question suggested by one of his advisors, the Reverend Craig Taylor. The author chose to ask: "Do you think that the old homes still standing here should be kept?"

Reverend Taylor recommended the question: "If preserving the older houses or building duplicates of them means that they will cost more than present residents can afford, which is more important, historic preservation or providing houses to lower-income residents?" (1) While the Reverend’s question clearly raised the conflict of values between preservation in a traditional sense and the broader cause of lower-income housing, the author thought it was not balanced. Still, it also brought up the challenge of formulating questions which would be both incisive and unbiased.
4C4. **A Context for Preservation Attitudes**

The author used a number of questions simply or mainly because he thought they would provide a useful context for attitudes on preservation. With the questions on neighborhood likes and dislikes, for example, he knew he would get at least a basic sense of what residents valued in the neighborhood; he also hoped to find out how much historic preservation or related elements (such as an appreciation of history and one for general rehabilitation), were or were not part of their values. Other subjects did not generally involve preservation but were asked about as parts of the neighborhood puzzle, such as the Piggyback Yard and the housing program of Habitat for Humanity.

4C5. **Affirmative and Negative Sub-questions**

These questions were used in the "Neighborhood Issues" section, once the author had received a person’s basic response to an initial question, in order to get a more specific idea of that person’s position on an issue. If a respondent was more ambivalent than either affirmative or negative, generally speaking, the author would use his judgement in combining affirmative and negative follow-up questions.
4C6. **Clear Language**

Going into his interviews, the author felt he had achieved clarity of language through simple vocabulary and the aforementioned factor of broadly-worded questions. In finalizing the questionnaire, a few words or phrases were dropped for simpler ones. The instance which most readily comes to mind concerns a question (C3C) which asks "Would you say that lower-income people have had to move out because of new residents?" on the page devoted to gentrification. At first, the author spoke in this question of "economic displacement," but several advisors recommended replacing this wording.

4C7. **Background Questions**

Background questions were included for two reasons. The first was the author’s hope that they would help to determine or suggest influences on people’s viewpoints. Secondly, he felt that answers to them would offer him a meaningful reminder of each respondent which would help make their expressions more than just words on paper when he analyzed those words after leaving Cabbagetown.

Through question D11, the author initially hoped to receive and use the names of interviewees in the thesis. He has ultimately chosen to use pseudonyms to avoid embarrassing any Cabbagetowners with whom he subsequently would share his
results. (Pseudonyms are used with material aside from questionnaire results as well, except in cases of Cabbagetown’s best-known citizens such as Mary Bankester or Joyce Brookshire.)

4D. The Presentation of the Questionnaire to Respondents

At the outset, the author decided to present the questionnaire to respondents orally, primarily for two reasons. The first was to have some degree of control and consistency in the way questions were communicated to interviewees. The second was the author’s perception that a lower-income area such as Cabbagetown would have a fairly high degree of illiteracy.

The final questionnaire was done mainly from August 5-29, 1989, during which time 62 resident interviews were conducted. Two more resident interviews were conducted in a second visit to Atlanta during December, 1989 and January, 1990, bringing the total number of questionnaires to 64. This was out of a neighborhood population of 1241, as listed in the 1990 Census for Cabbagetown’s census tract. (In addition, the author’s interview sources include three August, 1989 interviews which could not be completed.) (2) Interviews were initiated in an impromptu manner because the author thought this would lead to respondents speaking more freely than if he had set up times
for interviewing them.

A conscious and ongoing effort was made to get a diverse sample of Cabbagetowners in terms of age, socioeconomic group and race; it should be stressed, however, that statistical accuracy was not attempted, and the author did not use census figures in determining percentages of different types of interviewees. His own initial estimate of proportional amounts for different categories of people in the neighborhood was as follows:

Lower-income Whites 65-70%
Lower-income African-Americans 10-15%
Newcomers/Gentrifiers 15-20%

Ultimately, the author would break down the total body of respondents in this manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-income Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children (up to age 18)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young adults (ages 19-34)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle-aged adults (ages 35-64)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior citizens</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-income African-Americans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomers/Gentrifiers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149
4E. Writing of Responses

4E1. Recording of a Majority of Comments   The author did not write every communication of each respondent, but sought to accurately convey their essential replies. He did not consider taping interviews, because he thought this would inhibit respondents.

4E2. Paraphrasing   The author estimates that he paraphrased 90% of what interviewees said. The remaining 10%, often including colorful comments which the author wished to record in their entirety, were quoted either exactly or nearly exactly.

4E3. Annotation   Following every 2 or 3 questionnaire interviews the author would pause to write down comments at various points in the margins of just completed questionnaires. With them, he would clarify, as much as possible, passages which had been vaguely stated or incompletely or hastily recorded.
Chapter 5. General Preservation Attitudes in Cabbagetown

5A. A Framework for Attitudes on Preservation

Various sources gave the author some suggestion as to what attitudes Cabbagetowners might hold on preservation, against the backdrop of the social needs and social changes there in recent years. The United States Census of 1980, for one, offered a preview of some of Cabbagetown's social priorities. At that time, Cabbagetown was still mostly a poor White neighborhood. 483 of its 1,156 people (39.5% of its population) were recorded as living below the poverty level; at that time, that figure was $7,412 in annual income for a four-person family. (For Atlanta as a whole, 27.5% of the population lived in poverty.) Cabbagetown's unemployment rate was 20.1%, compared with 8.1% for the City of Atlanta. The neighborhood's adult population, specifically those 25 and older, was dominated by people with only a grade-school education or less: 61.1% in this age category. (1)

A study on Cabbagetown and the neighboring section of Reynoldstown done six years after the Census uses and reinforces its figures. Major needs expressed by Cabbagetown residents included human services programs and "employment programs ... targeted to the many local residents in need of
job opportunities." Housing was also greatly emphasized. Indeed, coming much closer to this report’s emphasis was the general consensus of residents that substandard housing should not be torn down. At the same time, there was great disagreement on what types of programs to pursue for its rehabilitation, the still controversial Fulton Co-op’s lack of progress being one reason. (2)

One basis for disagreement, of course - on more than just the Co-op - has been gentrification. Articles on Cabbagetown since 1979, especially those in Atlanta’s largest newspapers - the Constitution and the Journal - have raised the gentrifying process, often in terms of the confrontational opinions and actions related to it. A number of pieces could be held up as examples. (3)

One early one, of May, 1980, is titled "'We’re Gonna Fight Them.'" It stresses the agitation of Cabbagetown residents at recent rent increases by outside developer-owners, and their counter-actions, including the formation of the neighborhood’s first housing cooperative (a predecessor of the Fulton Co-op) for "long-time dwellers of the southeast Atlanta neighborhood rooted in Appalachian heritage." The organization, according to the article, "grew from fears that low-income people would be driven out by a group of small developers buying up property to renovate and resell in Cabbagetown." (4)

An April 1987 article again sums up the prickly
Cabbagetown situation. In "Failed rehab effort fuels Cabbagetown feud," the history of the Fulton Co-op, and the friction between gentrifiers and many other residents, is summarized. Speaking of the first "influx" of speculators and prospective higher-income residents, the article states that the attitudes of Cabbagetowners could be conveyed by a clay tile which community activist Joyce Brookshire had made; the tile, captioned "Urban pioneers," showed an octopus with its tentacles wrapped around land deeds. (5)

Side by side with the above "framework" - in short, the implication that greater "necessities" and strong anti-gentrification feeling might lead to an uncaring or hostile attitude towards preservation - an opposite implication or argument can and should be recognized. Pointing to various articles on Cabbagetown, one can see the possibility of a strong pro-preservation stance among the section's lower-income residents. One such article comes from 1982. It is datelined "WASHINGTON" on the heels of the Trust's announcement that its Inner-City Ventures Fund (ICVF) would disburse money to 11 neighborhood organizations across the country, including a combination loan/grant of $70,000 to the Fulton Co-op.

At the time, Michael Ainslie, then-President of the Trust, said it wanted to "eliminate the idea that preservation means the displacement of longtime neighborhood residents." (6) Returning to 1987, and the "feud" account, Jennifer
Blake, who had coordinated ICVF aid to Cabbagetown, commented that "(w)e’d still like the co-op to work for the same reason we became involved in the first place. Historic neighborhoods aren’t just for high-income people." (7)

Through both of these observations (while they originate in a criticism of historic preservation), and through others, preservation can be seen as a positive factor in Cabbagetown. One instance noted earlier (p. 135) was the 1979 City housing report on the neighborhood, with its emphasis on preservation. Well before that, in 1974, Esther Lefever of the Patch began her successful initiative to place Cabbagetown on the National Register. Today, one may see "FOR SALE" signs on rehabilitated CRAFT homes announcing the "Cabbagetown Historic District."

5B. What do lower-income Cabbagetowners think of historic preservation? The answers and suppositions of "active observers"

The very first opinion the author received on the above question came from Mary Bankester, cited earlier as Cabbagetown’s most noted newcomer (p. 95). (8) It was freely offered, prior to any official surveying or observer interviews, but emphatically reinforced by her in a later interview. Of the observers directly reached on the matter,
Ms. Bankester is the only one who has lived in Cabbagetown, which might well give her opinions more weight.

Speaking to the author, Ms. Bankester observed: "I’m not sure you’re going to get a lot of information on historic preservation (in the neighborhood)." She commented that the National Register listing spurred by Esther Lefever happened "unbeknownst to most people here" and they "didn’t really care about it." In a subsequent discussion, Ms. Bankester said that lower-income Cabbagetowners "don’t have a consciousness about historic preservation at all." They do have a concern for exterior appearance, but with an accompanying feeling, as she depicts it, that "(I’m going to) slap vinyl siding on every chance I get." (9)

A negative or neutral sense of attitudes was also received from Reverend Taylor and Professor Larry Keating. Speaking of all four neighborhoods in which he has assisted land trusts, including Cabbagetown, Reverend Taylor observed that people "are not too concerned with building back housing as it may have looked," but more with attractiveness and affordability. He does not think Cabbagetown residents "really care about the intricacies of preservation." Larry Keating guessed only that lower-income people in Cabbagetown, as well as elsewhere, would be "skeptical" about preservation, as a manifestation of "their alienation from dominant societal institutions." (10)

Moving to a more concrete realm, interviews herein also
brought up the matter of economic "necessities" displacing preservation in terms of support or merely awareness. To Reverend Taylor, "poor people are savvy enough to realize ... limitations" that often exist in older homes with regards to energy use and other concerns. Offering general comparisons of higher- and lower-income sections of Atlanta, city planning director Fernando Costa stated that "in many lower-income neighborhoods, the issue of historic preservation is not as prominent, (and) more basic issues capture their attention [emphasis by Mr. Costa]." (11)

Oraien Catledge, who has known and photographed the people of Cabbagetown since 1980, feels that its lower-income residents would naturally favor preservation in terms of the aesthetic and physical improvement it brings, but that many would not realize the displacement to which it contributes. It is in large part because of higher, more immediate priorities that Catledge does not know whether many inhabitants "would see the long-run problem of when these homes are fixed up (through gentrification) and they won't be able to rent them. I'm not saying they're dummies, but it's just such a slow process." (12)

Even the strongest critic of preservation in connection with neighborhood redevelopment - Reverend Taylor - at least suggested a possible basis of pro-preservation sentiment. Comparing Cabbagetown with the three other Atlanta communities whose land trusts he had assisted, he saw that "the ability to
answer the question of what made Cabbagetown unique is greater. There is a more active sense of history in Cabbagetown." Professor Timothy Crimmins, head of Georgia State University's Heritage Preservation program, felt that Cabbagetowners' interest in preservation would be based on their "pride of place and sense of belonging both to: 1) a Mill Village tradition, and 2) a North Georgia group, as well as there being generations of families in the neighborhood."

(13)

5C. Summary of Questionnaire Results

5C1. Positive Preservation or Preservation-related Feelings Among Oldtimers

5C1a. A support of preservation in an overall sense Based on questionnaire responses, residents support keeping Cabbagetown's physical heritage. These responses are to questions including those as to whether people want to see Cabbagetown's "old homes" and its Mill saved (Questions B4 and C1).

5C1b. A sense of place and of history Here, a number of responses were emphatic, especially as seen through question B7, "Should new homes be designed to look like the old homes?"
The author feels that those who answered "yes" did so largely because of the sense of place that gave them a consciousness and appreciation of Cabbagetown's appearance.

A sense of history was noticed in senior citizens more than others. Several of them, for example, volunteered their birthdate. (14) One older, long-time resident of Cabbagetown brought up the geography of his past in two separate discussions with the author: "I was born in Gainesville (Georgia), in Downie's Hospital, as far as from here to that house (as he pointed across the street) from the Square in Gainesville." In the second meeting, he noted that he lived in that North Georgia city in 1936, when it was hit by a storm, and "250 people died."

5C1c. General interest in the neighborhood At times, the author could definitely see that people were stimulated to talk with him because they appreciated an outsider's interest in their neighborhood. In two separate instances, individuals who were life-long Cabbagetowners asked the author: "Why do so many people study this neighborhood?" The author responded that while Cabbagetown's houses may have been very similar to those in other sections of Atlanta, it was special because, as he saw it, "many of the people or the families [were] still the same" as they were generations earlier. (15)
5C1-d. Little or no Overt Hostility to Preservation

This broad conclusion is made partially with the author's conscious connection between preservation and gentrification in mind. While a number of residents expressed sharp feelings about "newcomers" and economic displacement, none of them took that opportunity to speak critically of historic preservation.

Elsewhere in the questionnaire, hostility towards the field could only be asserted, if that, for the tiny minority of residents who favored demolition of the Fulton Mill. There, as with other issues, negative sentiment was confined to the particulars at hand; with the Mill, there was disappointment that such a large structure had remained virtually unused for 15 years.

Prior to undertaking the questionnaire, the author heard the strong sentiment of one lady in her 70's that the whole neighborhood should be destroyed. Here, too, it would not be wholly accurate to brand the resident as "anti-preservation." Her comment was framed by expressions of social and sociological dissatisfaction with the neighborhood as compared with earlier, and for her, better days. The author came across another somewhat similar comment in an article on the Fulton Co-op which again must be seen in context; here, ruing the failure of the Co-op to populate its vacant and deteriorating houses, Cabbagetown native Irwin Sewell said that what Cabbagetown needs is "three good bulldozers."
5C2. Differences in Responses Between Oldtimers and Newcomers

5C2a. A More Visible Consciousness of the Physical and Historical Environment among Newcomers

Many oldtime residents of Cabbagetown lacked significant awareness or concern regarding the history and preservation of their neighborhood. Levels of "awareness," "appreciation," and "concern" are hard to assess, in part because of the broad impressions gained by this research. In addition, these qualities may only be manifested in times of crisis, as when the Fulton Mill shut down in October, 1974, and residents quickly gathered to support and discuss its reuse. What is definite from these results is a much more visible consciousness of Cabbagetown's historical environment from its newcomers.

A major demonstration of this contrast in consciousness comes from comparing the answers of newcomers and of older residents to the questions of what they liked and disliked about the neighborhood (questions A1 and A2). While five out of thirteen newer people spoke of historical atmosphere or older structures as favorable neighborhood elements, none of the "oldtimers" did so.

A response which was typical of what was appreciated about the neighborhood by a lower-income resident would be the following:

"This neighborhood, to be in a large city, is more or less a family-oriented one . . . (People are) not
necessarily kin to each other, but . . . if you’re down and out your neighbor’ll help you . . . People care for each other."

Here, the respondent, a 35-year resident of Cabbagetown in his late 50’s, especially cherished the small-town closeness of the section. [Jimmy Delton, 8/27-3.]

With the following newcomer the focus was more on tangible matters:

"Basically, I just like it because it has historical markings and stuff, and because homes are reasonable to re-do . . . for the price range, this close to downtown, not to mention the characters of the homes . . . ." (Davey Johnson, 8/13-2.)

5C2-b. Cultural and Socioeconomic Preservation These forms of preservation imply a positive regard for the people of an area, and in Cabbagetown for a generally working-class population which is noted for the Appalachian background held by many residents. With cultural preservation, the author would not argue, as with physical preservation, that newcomers had a higher consciousness, but simply a more visible and articulate one.

Where the two forms of preservation intersect, he again felt that newcomers conveyed both greater articulation and awareness. One display is found in the response of 45-year old Barry Enrico to the question combining these two elements: "I don’t think you can have one without the other . . . you [can’t] put these people in a housing project and expect the
culture to stay the same." [8/25-1.] In another response to the same question, 30-year old historical renovator Oscar Urdman said:

"I think customs and traditions and not gentrifying the neighborhood is far more important than keeping the buildings, but if you do the buildings and keep the people, you really got something, don't you?" (8/5-3.) (17)
Chapter 6. Views on Cabbagetown’s Historical Significance

6A. Opening Comments

Cabbagetown inhabitants offered a number of responses as to what they believed made their neighborhood historically important or unimportant. The author sees the primary value of these reactions as shedding light on how non-historians view the subject of history and the idea of "historical significance," or what makes a place historically important. Unfortunately, beyond that, it is difficult to interpret these answers because many of them are vague and/or general.

Overall, the answers are inconclusive, especially among long-time residents, twenty-three of whom were either negative, mixed, did not know, or weak in their positive responses. Fourteen more were positive but could not be grouped in terms of why they felt their neighborhood was historic. The remaining sixteen were positive. Among long-standing residents, a significant reason for the general nature of answers was a lack of awareness of historical matters (and preservation-related matters in general): fourteen out of fifty-three of them expressed some form of uncertainty in considering whether Cabbagetown was
historically important: six did not know, five were unsure, two placed some reliance on the judgements of others and one person did not understand the question.

6B. Aspects of Historic Significance for Residents

Here, components of historic importance supplied by residents, such as "age" and "distinctiveness," will be described in order of their prominence within questionnaire responses. In all cases, the replies reproduced as examples were given for either question B1, as to whether people thought Cabbagetown was historically important, or B2, as to whether they thought it was historically important to its part of town, to Atlanta, or to a larger area.

6B1. Age The most frequently given reason for Cabbagetown's historical importance was its age. To 18-year old Perry Loomis, Cabbagetown was historically important "since it's been here since the cotton mill - for years on top of years." [8/5-4.] 74-year-old Lawrence Simpson said "it's just an old neighborhood, I don't know how to describe it," and added that "I just don't wanna live anyplace else." [8/8-1.]

An interesting sidelight of the factor of age was found in the responses of two middle-aged men, both long-timers,
who felt that they were not old enough to give qualified 
judgements on the significance of the neighborhood’s 
history. One of them, a proud, lifelong Cabbagetowner, 
said:

"Well . . . I’m only 42, so I’m not sure what you call 
historic. You probably get a better answer out of 
some of the older folks around here, maybe 70 or 80." 
(8/15-3.)

Another man besides these two offered a humorous reflection 
on "historical importance" when he commented that "a lot of 
things [make Cabbagetown historic] - me, for one," saying 
"yes" when I asked him if he was referring to his age, 
though he too was just in his 40’s. [Tommy Gilford, 8/15-1.]

6B2. The Neighborhood’s Present Situation Ten 
respondents, including one newer resident, made connections 
between Cabbagetown’s present situation and the importance 
of its past. The one generalization the author would make 
about all of them is that people who were positive about the 
neighborhood at present made positive assessments of its 
past, and those who were negative about Cabbagetown 
currently spoke negatively of its historic importance. 
Based on such responses, the author would say that a 
positive concern for, and interest in a neighborhood’s past 
can best be stimulated by improvements in its present 
situation, including housing rehabilitation. He echoes this 
view in a sub-section of his Conclusion - "Present-
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The author sees six respondents out of the ten cited above as associating an important history with the neighborhood’s transition from its former status. Three of the six felt that the neighborhood was no longer historic because of a decline from this former state, while the other three expressed the thought that it would be historic, or had the potential to have an historic image, by renovating its older structures.

In large part, of course, the neighborhood’s earlier situation meant an operating textile mill, and the disuse of the Fulton Mill complex was the apparent reason that one long-time respondent, a female in her early 30’s, had an emphatically negative response to question B1:

"[NO] - with a shaking of her head / You think that building (pointing to the Mill) looks good like that? They could have fixed that building up . . . " (8/27-5.)

One lady near 60, who had lived in Cabbagetown most of her life and clearly longed for better days, responded sharply when asked if the neighborhood was historic:

"Nope, sure don’t, cause everything through here’s been changed. I don’t believe there’s any houses that was the way they were when they hollered ‘historic.’ "

Later, during her response to the issue of whether new homes should be built to look like old homes, she pointed out that "the Mill (-owned) houses used to all be white." [Phyllis Riley, 8/16-1.]

One positive view of historical importance in
connection with "former affairs" came from 21-year old Freddy Ingram, who when asked about Cabbagetown's historical significance responded "Yeah, well with houses and all being rebuilt like it used to makes it look better." [8/19-1.]

Three long-time interviewees may have felt that a sense of movement and activity in the present was what made their neighborhood historically important. One of them, Terry Thomas (a man in his late 30's), said when asked about Cabbagetown's past importance that "It's buildin' up, goin' all over the world," and as an example of that building, pointed across the road from his home on Powell Street to a Habitat home site, saying "they're gonna put a house over there." In a nearby statement, he reinforced this sense of activity, perhaps with some humor, saying Cabbagetown was "pretty wild sometimes." [8/15-U(unfinished).]

While the writer felt the nine long-timers' responses brought up here might be indicative of less consciousness of history on the part of low- to moderate income people who were less educated, he also saw a kind of present-mindedness from one of the newer residents when he responded to question B2:

"I think it could be a plus for Atlanta . . . we need more people coming in here re-doing these homes / right now, it's not a plus." (Davey Johnson, 8/13-2.)

One interviewee, Eileen Rhea Brown, one of the author's "professional observers," did not go so far as to say that the area's historical importance had vanished simply because
of great changes there, but did see Cabbagetown as "less significant" because the Mill was no longer active. During her interview, she said that if Fulton Bag's factories "could have kept on being a Mill," the result - "an operating Mill village in downtown Atlanta in 1990," would be special indeed. (1)

6B3. **Distinctiveness and Rarity.** These two overlapping characteristics, especially when coupled with comments on Cabbagetown's unusual status as a mill village, assume some prominence in assessments of Cabbagetown's historical importance. To one newer resident, the section was significant because "you don't find many other neighborhoods like this in the city;" he added that "there may be one on the Northwest side," in an apparent reference to the Whittier Mill Village neighborhood (pp. 114-118). In response to a question on the historical significance of the Mill, another newcomer emphatically stated: "I know for a fact that all over the South, textile mills are being demolished as fast as people can [do it]." [8/25-1 & 8/25-2.]

Perhaps the most distinctive element of Cabbagetown is the neighborhood's name itself. This came up in the answers of two residents as a factor - or a suggested component - of the section's historical significance. One response is that of 88-year old Pannella Jeffries, to the question of
Cabbagetown's importance in history:

"Well, exactly what do you mean by that [the question]? I don't think it was, but I could be wrong. Do you know how come it's named Cabbagetown? [A truck carrying cabbages] turned over. (She recounted the most famous of the name's ascribed origins.) That's what I heard." (8/27-1.)

Three lesser bases for historic importance round off this group of resident observations:

6B4. A Reliance on Outside Judgements   Six respondents, two in particular and four in part, seemed to base their affirmative or tentative answers on the assessments of outsiders, perhaps historians or public officials. 55-year old Ora Callin, for example, said only that "they say they gonna put it on historic." [8/7-2.]

6B5. Prominence   50-year old Gerald Cairns, in responding to whether he thought Cabbagetown was important to the city "or to a larger area," thought it was both, " . . . cause people can come through here - out of California and places - and they wants to know where Cabbagetown is and where the Mill is and I think it should be left alone." [8/19-3.] He was joined in his response by four additional long-time interviewees, including a 43-year old neighborhood native who said that Cabbagetown has "been named in all different sorts of places and it's been on the news quite a
"bit," in expressing his strong feeling of Cabbagetown's historical importance to the Atlanta area. [8/7-6.]

6B6. **Continuity.** This quality came up in three responses to Cabbagetown's historic nature, two of them as a primary reason and one as a secondary reason. One example was that of 16-year old Johnny Fanshaw, in his reply to question B1:

"Mm-hmm. It's been here awhile - I've had great-aunts and great uncles that's lived here and it's never changed." (8/22-2)

On the same note of continuity elsewhere in the questionnaire, another interviewee, in responding to what he liked about the neighborhood, said that "everything's still the same as it was when I was a kid," though he did go on to qualify that. [Sammy Unwin, 8/15-4.]

6C. **A Comparative Note on Responses by Newcomers and Oldtimers**

Responses to questions B1 and B2 reinforce the point made in chapter 5 (on pp. 161-162) of a much more visible preservation-related consciousness on the part of newcomers. Among answers to question B1, the author sees as many as nine - and certainly six - out of the thirteen more recent residents as strong in their affirmations of the neighborhood's significance, as contrasted with the much
lower proportion of four out of fifty-three low- to moderate-income people who were undoubtedly strong in giving positive answers. Responses to the question of whether Cabbagetown was important to the city or to a larger area, showed both greater clarity and stronger assessments from newer people. Only two of their responses were "miscellaneous" (that is, outside of any one category such as "city" or "larger area") as opposed to twenty-eight out of the fifty-two long-time peoples' responses.
Chapter 7. Housing Preservation

7A. Summary

Generally speaking, respondents were supportive of the idea of saving Cabbagetown's stock of old homes, with forty-seven out of fifty-two longstanding residents saying, to paraphrase, that they would like "to save those that were in good shape," and twelve out of the thirteen newer residents feeling likewise. While the author could see themes being suggested in these answers, as presented below, he did not test the depth of peoples' support for housing preservation, especially in terms of defining what "good shape" or condition meant to individuals.

In views regarding housing preservation, as with other categories of preservation attitudes discussed here, the author would reinforce his impression that residents more often than not, as in other categories, did not display tremendous concerns. A typical reaction was that of 88-year old Pannella Jeffries, a 16-year resident of Cabbagetown (quoted on pp. 169-170 regarding its history), who, when asked if new homes should be made to look like the old said: "Well, I don't think it'd hurt nothin', do you?" [8/27-1.]

In summary, attitudes related to housing preservation
bring up the following points:

1) a noticeable emphasis on practical considerations in a house, as opposed to subjective valuations of old or new;

2) questions as to pure objectivity on the part of CRAFT leaders or of traditional historic preservationists in Cabbagetown regarding the issue of demolitions to make way for CRAFT’s Savannah Street homes;

3) an approach of attention to context within a flexible framework by the Atlanta Urban Design Commission;

4) negative reactions to CRAFT’s design solution in its Savannah Street residences by a wide cross-section of residents;

5) strong objections to municipal design controls from a few residents, based on one or both of two aspects: first, feelings that the requested changes, while denied, would be in harmony with the past appearance of the neighborhood, and secondly, an opposition to city government held by some Cabbagetowners;

6) Finally, recalling the author’s hypothesis that negative attitudes towards preservation would be caused by negative attitudes towards gentrification (p. 6), the area of housing preservation gave no solid indication to support this supposition. Regarding his hypothesis, the author can only point to one suggestion that Mary Bankester, as the acknowledged leader among Cabbagetown’s gentrifiers (see p. 155 and accompanying endnote), had sought to impose her
aesthetic vision on the neighborhood. This idea of gentrifiers pushing their aesthetic tastes and other views onto fellow neighbors, whether true or false, was to be echoed a number of times in later, contextual research on gentrifying neighborhoods elsewhere.

7B. Practicality as the major influence on answers

In eighteen of the fifty-two oldtimers’ answers, and seven of the thirteen newcomers’ answers, practicality, or the condition of particular houses in decisions to save or demolish them, was brought up. Given these numbers, it was the largest single theme to be noted in the questionnaire with regards to housing preservation. One major reason for this was that the problem of abandoned and often burned houses has been very serious in Cabbagetown over the years (due largely to its mostly wooden structures), as mentioned above on p. 45.

Interestingly, when viewed within their respective groups, there was a noticeably higher proportion of newcomers stressing practicality than oldtimers. This outcome does not neatly correspond with the great emphasis on practical considerations and "necessities" by lower-income people suggested in comments like those of Rev. Taylor and Fernando Costa (p. 156-157). The author would strongly suggest that a chief reason for this result was simply that newcomers were
more articulate than oldtimers in expressing their feelings.

Of the eighteen "practically-minded" oldtime interviewees, nine, for example, basically felt homes should generally be saved but be torn down if in bad shape. Four others said "yes" to question B4 but added that homes should be fixed or remodeled, and two others (who were among the five long-standing residents the author saw as negative respondents) said that homes "should be torn down or remodeled." [Nellie Danforth, 8/10-1.]

These responses reflect a practical concern not for "old" or "new," but for "good," i.e., well-built and well-maintained housing. The author, in fact, was fully prepared for more statements from low-income people which could be taken to exemplify the intelligent choices they have to make, given their limited funds, but such expressions were virtually absent from his results. (1) Likewise, the comment by land trust leader Craig Taylor that poor people have great savvy regarding the economic limitations of older homes (brought up on p. 157), was not reflected - at all - in questionnaire responses.

As an indirect echo of Taylor's statement, however, one could cite two positive comments on better construction in older homes. Both responses, incidentally, came up in the context of the subject of design controls, namely in question B7, "Should new homes here be built to look like the old homes?" Wilma Davis, a 25-year resident of Cabbagetown in her
60's, expressed a preference for old homes "cause they would last longer than these new houses they're puttin' up." Sammy Unwin, who was in his early 40's, and had lived in Cabbagetown since birth, said of new homes that "they just throwin' em together . . . our [old] houses use better lumber. They're shootin' those nails, just bustin' the lumber; but they [new homes] should be built as good as the old homes." [8/17-2 and 8/15-4.]

In the total group of questionnaire responses, the relative "economic limitations" of older homes seemed to have been the provenance of land trust representatives. A specific example was found in the observations of Starling Sutton, the economic consultant for CRAFT. When asked if CRAFT had a preference for newer or older homes, Sutton quickly responded, "No, none whatsoever." Seeing his perspective as an accurate reflection on the thoughts of CRAFT employees and volunteers as a whole, he explained that "our attitude is that homes should be decent, safe, comfortable and affordable for people who live there . . . . If that can be done with older structures, then that's wonderful." (2)

7C. Practicality Mixed with Sentiment

Despite the objective tone of Starling Sutton's words, there has been at least a hint of subjective sentiment, both
for and against preservation, in dialogues on the subject in Cabbagetown. One example, coming from CRAFT and its brief history as of 1989, was in regards to the six houses on Savannah Street which became the organization’s most visible product. The small, but clear sense of opposing feelings here included the questioning of CRAFT’s intelligence in demolishing rather than rehabilitating, and secondly, the mixed aesthetic review of the six structures, to be covered in a subsequent section.

In the author’s discussions with people, two newcomers, both of whom saw themselves as ardent preservationists, were disappointed that the Savannah Street homes were demolished. Both emphasized their strong conceptual support for CRAFT, while maintaining that the homes were renewable. One of them was professional restorationist and Cabbagetown resident Bill Reitven. (3) Reitven personally made a survey for the Cabbagetown Restoration Society (see pp. 96-97 on the CRS and the Fulton Co-op) of the six houses to be demolished, finding five of them to have had perfect sillbeams and other components. He felt, at that time and in retrospect, that they were "90% perfect structures in (totality) and could have been re-done."

While observations such as these must be considered in evaluating CRAFT’s objectivity, there is also the matter of objective judgement on the part of individuals such as Reitven and Mary Bankester, the latter a driving force behind the
Cabbagetown Restoration Society and the direct initiator of Reitven's investigation. Reitven reinforced his information to the author with the sharp words that CRAFT "destroyed... authentic shotguns and put up 'cutesy Victorians.'... I would like you to publish every word of that!... (It) is the perfect illustration of the ignorance of CRAFT, not only of statute, but of the fact that they would tear down structurally sound houses." (4)

7D. Design Controls in Cabbagetown

Apart from the persuasiveness of Reitven as a professional, it is a statute-created body - the Atlanta Urban Design Commission - which has been the final arbiter on statutory matters in the case of the Savannah Street houses and many other proposals in Cabbagetown. A November, 1988 meeting in which it considered and approved the group of six CRAFT homes may serve as a kind of counter-response to expressions not only by Reitven but of other Cabbagetown residents.

To deal first with technical factors, Starling Sutton told the Urban Design Commission (UDC) that "our engineers," independent consultants utilized by CRAFT, had concluded that the old shotgun houses on that section of Savannah were not easily redeemable from a structural aspect. Later, this point
was reiterated to the author by CRAFT's Joyce Brookshire as the basis for the land trust's non-preservation decision.

In terms of aesthetics, the response of the UDC seems, in this instance and in Cabbagetown in general, to be one of attention to context within a flexible framework. This attitude is exemplified by the comments of Commission member Barbara Faga at the late 1988 hearing:

"In this area . . . I don't feel like it's important to actually replicate the building that has been demolished . . . a new building should be within the same character, but there should be some difference between (it) and an older building that still remains in the district. . . " (5)

In comments at the Savannah Street hearing, both Sutton and CRAFT architect Rick Thompson shared the Commission's approach to the subject. They were, on the one hand, attentive to the new homes' context, Thompson, for example, testifying that the roof pitch, masonite siding, porch design and several other aspects met the city's aesthetic regulations. (6) As an example of attention to the historic district's "compatibility rule," Sutton explained that the height each new house was to have was based largely on that of the houses to be replaced. The old house at 199 Savannah, as a case in point, was 22.5 feet high from the sidewalk to the peak of its roof while story-and-a-half models such as the one to be built in its lot would be 25.5 feet tall.

In addition, CRAFT's approach was flexible, most obviously to some critics and admirers alike in the final
products, but also in the changes the group was willing to make beforehand. Leaders of the land trust were amenable to several UDC-suggested compromises for design elements. As an example, CRAFT had originally planned to utilize sliding glass doors along the sides of particular houses and Commissioners suggested French doors instead. In response, Sutton said:

"That will cost a little more, and we're trying to save costs for low-income families, but I think that the difference in cost is well worth that. I think it would enhance the house and make it more compatible . . . I know that - I was afraid the staff [OF THE UDC] would forget that point." (7)

7E. Aesthetic Reactions by Residents

In reacting to the matter of designing new homes similarly to existing homes, long-term residents were about evenly divided, with twenty-four giving positive feelings, twenty-three offering negative responses and five giving miscellaneous ones. Newcomers were very positive, with twelve of the thirteen interviewed supporting a need for similar designs and nine of these twelve responding "fairly or very strongly" in the author's interpretation.

Of the twenty-four positive answerers to the question, the author saw twelve as fairly or very strong in their reactions. Out of these twelve, six showed a desire for general visual compatibility, two showed an identification with Cabbagetown and the final four offered other reasons.
Two of the six "compatibility" respondents mentioned Cabbagetown being an historic district, and three interviewees who the author did not group with the twelve "strong" respondents brought up the need for the neighborhood to maintain an historical appearance. Ronny Yates, who was 37, gave one example of the close identification with Cabbagetown felt by many there, when he responded: "Really, I think they should - because . . . we was raised up in 'em - they should look no different than what we got." [8/5-5.] A long-time resident in her 50's, Diane Lincoln, didn't think the appearances of homes should be changed because "it really wouldn't be Cabbagetown" [8/29-1]; this strong sense of a distinctive Cabbagetown appearance was echoed by one non-interviewee, a resident in his 20's who listened in on another interview.

Of the twenty-three oldtimers who did not favor similar appearances, the largest single reason was that of seven residents who felt people should have the freedom to do what they want. The feelings of 67-year old Carter Jennings, one of the strongest opponents of design controls, are typified in his response to what he disliked about the neighborhood - in only the second question of the interview:

"What I dislike - if a person wants to remodel a house out here . . . they stop you from doing it - a person oughta do what they want to do . . ." [8/18-1.]

Mr. Jennings later stated that a person "ought to . . . not be ruled by the city," when he responded to the author's question
on design controls. His opposition was echoed by 69-year old Louis Irwin, who thought that "anybody ought to be able to change the color when they want to," in reaction to his sense that "they won't even let us paint it any other way, they want us to keep it the same color." [8/8-3.]

With regards to the UDC mission of keeping a neighborhood's historic visual character, or an appearance deemed harmonious with that, these criticisms raised an interesting point along the way. At least one resident critic, Carter Jennings, who had lived in Cabbagetown for 36 years, voiced the idea that a particular addition sought by a neighbor was, if not exactly "historic," still representative of the neighborhood's past. In that instance, a house that had stood at 118 Tye until recently was denied the addition of a deck. Mr. Jennings observed that while he told the City it once had a deck, 30 years earlier, officials didn't want it back. He made the point to the author that to him, the deck "was the way it was in the past." [8/18-1.] Another respondent, 88-year-old Grace Rogers, may have implied that the design guidelines were historically inaccurate, when she brought up the point that sometimes, fences (or screened porches) were not allowed, even though there were cases like hers where she had a fence from years past when she was raising her children. [12/29/89 - 1.] (8)

As the author sees it, and it is plain from Carter Jennings' statements, negative feelings towards UDC actions
are only partially "aesthetic," being based also in a general
distaste for government regulations. While that can be found
in any community, the author would suspect it is somewhat
greater in a neighborhood such as Cabbagetown, with its fierce
pride (at times) and the socioeconomic isolation many of its
residents feel in a city whose population is mostly African-
American and whose government is at least perceived by many
low- to moderate income whites as being dominated by Blacks.

On another anti-government note, one of the newcomers
stood out from the rest in repeatedly clarifying his lack of
concern for preservation-related matters, and vented his chief
opposition towards design controls, as in the following
statement:

"I don’t think there’s any point in preserving the way
people were in the past just because it’s historic - I
don’t want stricter zoning laws [or] having to get
approval from city boards for changes to my house.... I
prefer the neighborhood would just progress the way it
would naturally." (Mark Jarrell, 8/6-2.)

The Savannah Street houses of CRAFT loomed large among
areas of aesthetic sentiment brought up by residents.
Comments on them ranged from the architectural/historical
consciousness of Bill Reitven, quoted above, to remarks such
as one by Cabagetown native Terry Elmore that "it’s like
having a sore thumb." [8/15-2.] Surprisingly to the author,
longstanding inhabitants were proportionally more vocal than
their newer neighbors in feeling that the CRAFT homes were not
compatible with the old homes around them. Besides Mr.
Elmore, seven of them made comments in this vein. 27-year old Ella Nixon, for example, in a remark which may have offered a misconception on the effects of gentrification, said that the new homes' portion of Savannah Street "looks outta place / all these outsiders that come in now - they do things different." [8/10-3.] Three "newcomer" respondents, in contrast, including historic renovator Oscar Urdman [8/5-3], made a point of voicing appreciation with their appearance as they answered the question on design controls for new homes.

7F. Correlations Between Gentrification and Housing Preservation

As stated in the Introduction (p. 6), the author wanted to know if longtime residents in a neighborhood such as Cabbagetown would make any negative connections between preservation and gentrification. In the area of housing preservation, as in general, the author's hypothesis that there would be clear, negative connections was found to be virtually inapplicable, at least in the case of his particular research. This result was confirmed largely by an exercise in which the author sought any possible links or correlations between three key questions: B4, on saving the old homes, B7, on designing new homes in relation to old ones, and C3B, on whether or not residents favored "new people" fixing up old
homes.

In all of the individual sets of answers to this trio of questions by "oldtimers," the author was unable to make any major connection between responses, largely because 25 sets of answers, or nearly half of all answers in this case, showed no correlation of any kind. Among the remaining 26 longtime interviewees, the largest single correlation was one in which at least two answers from each of nine respondents could be said to show an interest in keeping Cabbagetown's sociological and/or physical character. Jimmy Delton, for example, was positive in B4 with regards to saving old homes, criticized CRAFT's new Savannah Street homes in B7 as being unlike any homes in Cabbagetown during his lifetime, and said he did approve of newcomers fixing up old homes (C3B), "if they will not disrupt the style of living in the neighborhood." [8/27-3.] (9)

The only broad correlation within this three-answer group came from newcomers who tended to simply amplify the positive connections which can be made between gentrification and preservation. Ten of them, not surprisingly, answered yes to all the questions, and two of the remaining three could also be seen as "all-affirmative"; one of these two residents, for instance, was both positive and negative in responding to C3B saying: "I got real mixed opinions on that. Not really 'upper' - they can go somewhere else. . . " [Oscar Urdman, 8/5-3.]

186
Returning to oldtime residents, 67-year old Wilma Davis, a noted citizen-activist in Cabbagetown, did provide one small suggestion of negative connections between preservation and gentrification in one of many biting comments. She recalled that at one time, noted resident Mary Bankester wanted everybody in Cabbagetown to use white picket fences and other quaint residential touches which Ms. Bankester herself favored, but that, to quote Ms. Davis, "I told her we’re not like that!" The author, knowing both of these rival leaders even slightly, would explain that such a comment is likely to reflect neighborhood politics and personality clashes as much as it does the different aesthetic tastes of various segments of the neighborhood. (10)

Against a broader canvas of connections between the phenomena of gentrification and preservation, the author has earlier noted (on p. 20) that housing activist the Reverend Craig Taylor responded affirmatively to the author’s question of connections between the two subjects. One of his major points was the observation that Atlanta's Urban Design Commission should absolutely have a policy to mitigate displacement which was caused by preservation. He referred pointedly to a recently-adopted policy in Fulton County (of which Atlanta is the seat) that developers should replace a particular number of trees for every acre, or the like, which they converted for new construction, and rhetorically asked "Aren’t people just as important as trees?" (11)
Chapter 8. The Mill

8A. Opening Comments

From all of the reactions received, one can see that the Mill and its redevelopment is very important to most residents, and to nearly all observers of Cabbagetown. One theme reinforced by the questionnaire interviews is the great impact of the Mill’s operations on the lives of Cabbagetowners. In addition, the author noted contrasting conceptions of the Mill’s reuse between newcomers and oldtimers, and these contrasts could hint at opposition to certain preservation plans from either side, or both groups, as the Mill’s redevelopment continues to be discussed in the 1990’s.

8B. Impact on Peoples’ Lives

In terms of questions of historic significance, both the first one on Cabbagetown in general and the later one on the Mill, the responses of long-time residents reflected the Mill’s influence on the life of the community. The Mill provided a noticeable reason for affirmative answers regarding
Cabbagetown’s history, with four oldtime interviewees clearly giving it as their primary basis and seven more arguably making the factory the major aspect of the neighborhood’s historical value to them. In answering the question on the Mill as historically important (C1C), twelve of the fifty-one long-standing respondents said it was because of various impacts on peoples’ lives while only two of the thirteen newer residents brought up this impact as their reason for the Mill’s historical worth. Among various "impacts on peoples’ lives" for lower-income residents, as brought up in replies to C1C, the author includes such aspects as personal remembrances of the Mill from three people and recollections by three people of their having worked there.

References to work in the Mill were fairly prominent throughout the questionnaire. Ten respondents spoke of their own periods of work there, including 75-year old Tilly Jaycox, who served as a spinner. She commented that she "loved to work over there, but I couldn’t work no more." [8/14-1.] Five of these ten people (including Ms. Jaycox), and five additional interviewees, spoke of family members who had been employed at Fulton Bag. One of these ten, Frank Elden, was a newcomer. Speaking of his first years in Atlanta - the early 1960’s - two decades before he settled in Cabbagetown, he said the Mill was the largest employer in the city, and an aunt and cousins of his "drove from other counties" to work there. [8/19-2.] Five more respondents, including one who had
identified himself as a one-time Mill-worker, referred generally to peoples' employment in the factory. 21-year old Freddy Ingram said "they been around here ever since I was little," and that "a lot of people have had hard times in there, really worked to survive and get by." [8/19-1.]

Along these lines, 73-year old Frank Vernon, remembering his arrival in the neighborhood in 1937, said that "[w]hen I first came - F.B. & C.M.[Fulton Bag & Coton Mill] - lot of people said that meant "Feel Bad & Can't Make It." [8/6-1.] Dora Jillette, who was 52, observed that the complex had "always looked that way" since her family moved to 119 Berean Avenue "when I was little - 1943. It's always looked this way." [8/5-1.] Paul Randall, a lifelong Cabbagetowner in his early 30's, said that in returning to Atlanta on his few occasions away from Cabbagetown, from the military service or other travels, said "first thing I looked for was the smokestacks, cause ... once you seen them, you knew you home." [8/22-1.]

8C. Varied Ideas for the Mill's Reuse

Responses to the author's inquiry of ideas for how to reuse the Mill showed one clear, while not overpowering difference between oldtimers and newer residents. Basically, the former group had more utilitarian concepts of how the Mill
could again be used. Out of fifty-one interviewed, fourteen offered a "shopping center or food store" (the author's umbrella term) as their initial or only response, as opposed to one newer resident. Nine longstanding interviewees first suggested industrial and/or blue collar uses, a thought which only came as a second answer from one of the newcomers. 37-year old Ronny Yates, one of five people whose responses suggested a return to the Mill's use as a factory, observed that the Mill "used to have them looms in there - and you can put machinery back in there." [8/5-5.]

Generally speaking, newer inhabitants conceived of the Mill as having a tremendous potential for a wide variety of new uses. Four of them essentially suggested the plan which architect John Reagan has promoted in recent years, three of them referring to him by name, an aspect which was not found in responses by longtime people.

One reason for the differences in ideas expressed between newcomers and older residents was a pervasive theme from newer people of the problems in stimulating employment among lower-income Cabbagetowners. Eight of the thirteen gentrifiers had doubts that a revitalized Mill could provide jobs for neighborhood people, including four who basically felt that it could but were concerned about either the desire of residents to work or the very low skill levels that they felt many of them had. Frank Elden, for example, advocated a combination of housing, entertainment and retail as his first hope for the
Mill, with light industry as his second choice; he commented that with a lot of neighborhood residents being unskilled and uneducated, his first choice, he felt, would provide more jobs. [8/19-2.] In terms of citing peoples’ desire to work, that aspect is not completely a negative judgement from more-educated and affluent residents, because a handful of low- to moderate income interviewees raised the issue as well, including Phyllis Riley, who was very skeptical that the Mill could again become a major source of jobs:

"[H]alf of 'em [residents] don’t even want to work... that was the whole thing with the Piggyback . . . only ten [neighborhood] people worked on it . . . " [8/16-1.]

8D. Concerns about the Mill’s redevelopment

In regards to the Mill, this was the only area where potential problems which could be connected to gentrification - and then only coming from two of the 64 interviewees - were brought up. Ernie Nelindez, a 25-year old newcomer, felt that large-scale redevelopment, including stores and living places, "would be kinda gross," with a lot of people coming around, and, as he saw it, damaging the neighborhood’s quiet, laid-back character. [8/29-2.] Phyllis Riley, quoted just above, felt that a renovated Mill "wouldn’t benefit anyone around here, cause they’re talking about putting in Italian restaurants, and Mexican restaurants," which she felt, along
with "high-class" shops being discussed, would be financially out-of-reach for many area inhabitants. [8/16-1.]
IIC1. Introductory Comments

As both a background and supplement for understanding attitudes revealed or suggested by the study of Atlanta's Cabbagetown, the author researched three neighborhoods in three cities besides Atlanta. In this segment, attitudes in these neighborhoods will be described, and they will then be compared to Cabbagetown in terms of resident outlooks and the meaningfulness of the varied results from all four instances combined. The descriptions will begin with brief highlights of each community's history and redevelopment. This section, because of its smaller scale, will focus on the attitudes of low-to-moderate income citizens, or "oldtimers" in these neighborhoods.

The three communities explored here are, from west to east, the Soulard neighborhood of St. Louis, the Tremont area of Cleveland and Philadelphia's Spring Garden section. All share the commonality of gentrification as an element in their evolution in recent years, though the levels of such redevelopment vary tremendously among the three neighborhoods. Tremont, on the one hand, has only an extremely small contingent of residents who could be seen as gentrifiers, even by the author's broad definition, but their arrival and activities have begun to reshape the area's appearance, relations between community leaders and other aspects of life. Soulard lies at the middle of this three-part spectrum, having
developed a substantial minority of gentrifiers within its population. Spring Garden, at the other extreme, has changed in a massive way, both physically and socioeconomically, since the early 1960’s, and while its gentrification has declined and even been partially reversed in the late 1980’s and early 90’s, its population is probably about 80-90% professional in its composition, based on interviews by the author, as opposed to the neighborhood having a wholly working-class nature before the 1960’s.

IIC2. A Note on Sources

Just as he has basically limited himself to attitudes among "oldtimers" in this contextual portion, the author also limited his sources primarily to a few representative citizens in each community to gain a sense of attitudes towards preservation. In the three neighborhoods combined, there are nineteen of these representatives, and they are joined by four "auxiliary" interviewees who did not necessarily have positions of leadership or influence within the respective neighborhoods but were close observers of the area in question. The nineteen representative interviewees were chosen mainly with an eye towards their affiliations over the years - at least in many others’ views - with either low- to moderate-income or "oldtime" residents or a newer generation
of generally more affluent residents.

IIC3. Summary of Results

Based primarily on interviews with representative citizens, the author would first of all say that there was no hostility to the idea of preservation itself, and indeed some positive words for its pursuit, in each of the three neighborhoods. What has been negative, to varying degrees in these places, has been the aspect of tools designed to foster preservation and redevelopment; in Soulard and Tremont, there has been significant opposition to historic district regulations and in Spring Garden there were suggestions that people negatively viewed National Register certification.

Another major theme of interviewees, and one which strongly shows differences in the ways "oldtimers" and "newcomers" view neighborhood redevelopment, is the emphasis, mostly from representatives of "newcomers," that low- to moderate income people do not have strong feelings about preservation in either direction. In short, they were typically considered to lack awareness, understanding and/or concern, in regards to the field. Underscoring this point, in a handful of responses during the author's twenty-three interviews, was the observation that "preservation" and "gentrification" were subtleties for low- to moderate income
people, and especially in terms of the question of "connections" between them raised by the author.

Some interviewees - in this case, all of them coming from the newer generations of these communities - strongly felt that negative responses given to both preservation and gentrification were largely a fabrication of lower-income activists, often fervently pursuing strongly-held ideologies and/or political purposes. They discount many of the criticisms made about either newcomers such as themselves or of intentions and details underlying historic protections.

In general, the results of contextual research amplify points sometimes brought out in fragmentary ways in research on Cabbagetown. A major reason for that greater strength of viewpoints among the contextual examples is that Cabbagetown has not had the kind of unsettling fights over historic districting seen in Tremont and Soulard, while passions against and for gentrification have at times been heightened there as they have been in Spring Garden and Soulard. Another reason, methodologically, was the case study's emphasis, as stated, on residents who could not, and/or did not, incisively articulate their views.
IIC4. **Descriptions of the Three Neighborhoods**

IIC4a. **SOULARD**

**History** St. Louis’s oldest existing neighborhood is located just to the southwest of the city’s downtown. Though it was first settled in the 1760’s, when St. Louis itself was a village, its greatest period of growth came between the 1830’s and the 1890’s. In these decades it took on its primary historical significance as a haven and entry-level neighborhood for a tremendous array of immigrants. Its dominant group, mirroring the city as a whole, was that of the Germans, but they were joined throughout the century by Czechs, Croatians, Syrians and others. The early German settlers often built dense rows of housing which have been seen as a Midwestern reminder of the European scale which they had left. (1) (Photo IIC-1 on p. 200.)

Beginning around the turn of the century, Soulard began to steadily decline, having fulfilled its purpose as a steppingstone to a better life for many of its first immigrant groups. Still, it continued to serve as a gateway to the city for other immigrants. The neighborhood’s major arrivals in this century, from the Depression through the 1970’s, were rural Whites, especially from the Ozark region of Southern Missouri and Northern Arkansas. (2)

**Redevelopment** In the late 1960’s, the neighborhood embarked
Photo IIc-1. A Soulard streetscape (Source: The Landmarks Association of St. Louis, Inc.)
on a continuing period of physical and social upgrading. An early sign of this was the founding, in 1969, of the Soulard Neighborhood Improvement Association. Along with the organization Youth Education & Health in Soulard (established in 1972), it has been especially dedicated to housing rehabilitation. In the early and mid-1970's, long-time Soulardites and newly-arrived gentrifiers twice pooled their efforts to make Soulard an historic district: first, by putting it on the National Register, and secondly, by making it a city historic district in 1975. (3)

Before the latter effort, however, "oldtimers" and "newcomers" had already begun to diverge. (4) Gentrifiers, largely because of their greater emphasis on Soulard's historical richness, founded the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG) in 1974. The clashes of the SNIA and the SRG since then have been a major factor in shaping neighborhood preservation attitudes, as will be seen in the discussion below. (5)

IIC4b. TREMONT

History  Tremont is separated from downtown Cleveland by the Cuyahoga River Valley, the historical center of Cleveland's industries. When the Valley first attracted manufacturing after the Civil War, bucolic areas such as Tremont were quickly transformed. Over the next 50 years, the
neighborhood, much like Soulard in Saint Louis, was a magnet for a diverse array of immigrants.

The forces which depleted Tremont included the pullout of manufacturing after World War II and highways which destroyed large swaths of the section from the 1950's through the 70's. The neighborhood may have reached its lowest point in the late 1970's when arson fires decimated other portions of its fabric. (6)

Redevelopment In the last 15 years, Tremont's rebuilding has included the efforts of the Tremont West Development Corporation, founded in 1979 and known as one of Cleveland's most successful Community Development Corporations, or CDC's. The area has also seen a slow, often counter-cultural gentrification, composed especially of artists. They have been attracted largely by visual distinctions, including Tremont's panoramic views of Cleveland's skyline and industrial valley, and unusual churches such as those of Eastern Orthodox faiths who have resided in Tremont. (Photo IIC-2 on p. 203.) (7)

In 1988, both newcomers and oldtimers achieved the goal of making Tremont a city historic district, largely in response to fears of major redevelopment which had been proposed by a neighborhood hospital. Since that achievement, however, complaints about the district, which may be observed in the following discussion of results, have led to a tremendous reduction in its size. (8)
Photo IIC-2. A Tremont streetscape  (Source: The Cleveland Landmarks Commission)
History  Spring Garden is located just one mile northwest of Philadelphia's center. It is historically significant primarily as one of the city's preeminent middle-class neighborhoods during Philadelphia's greatest period of growth - the last half of the nineteenth century. During that time, its increasing popularity also attracted members of the city's upper class, who often transformed the facades of the section's mid-century townhomes in the eclectic styles of the era. (Photo IIC-3 on p. 205.)

Prior to World War I, these groups began to be replaced by successively poorer ones, starting with European immigrants. (9) For 20 years after World War II, Spring Garden emerged as Philadelphia's first and largest Puerto Rican neighborhood. The poverty of Spring Garden's residents, as a whole, made the 1950's and 60's the neighborhood's most difficult period, socially and in terms of physical deterioration. (10)

Redevelopment  Beginning in the mid-1960's, Spring Garden, as evidenced in the introduction above, began a general metamorphosis from a poor and working-class section back to a largely middle-class neighborhood. While it has seen a tiny handful of efforts, both proposed and realized) directed towards rehabilitation for its low- to moderate-income residents, its primary thrust has been towards the creation of
Photo IIC-3. A Spring Garden streetscape (The author, 1993)
a middle-class community which has saved much of the District's Victorian heritage. (11)

IIC5. Results

From both interviews and written sources in the three communities here, the author could not find any strong opposition to the idea of preservation itself. In addition, some people speaking on behalf of low- to moderate-income populations said that saving historic buildings received basic support. Joyce Sonn, the head of the advocacy group Youth Education and Health in Soulard, said that lower-income people were admittedly residing there because of practical factors, but that Soulard's "old world atmosphere" also kept them attached to it. In Tremont, Mary Ann Petry, who has been active in several neighborhood groups during her 24 years of residence there, spoke of two neighborhood landmarks in citing her support for historic buildings and added that "anybody that tears 'em down is insane." (12)

A few residents who represented middle-class reinvestment also spoke positively of low- to moderate income communities' views on preservation. In Tremont, Bob Holcepl said that people in the general population would not use words like "gentrification" or "preservation" but that they have "an innate sense of beauty." In Spring Garden, both Patricia
Freeland and Allen Rubin said low- to moderate income dwellers would be pleased to see renovation, and Rubin specifically gave the example of a man who has done a great deal of the rehabilitation, especially the brickwork, for the section's houses, saying that he may not have a sophisticated sense of preservation but is very pleased with the beauty of the houses and with his work. (13)

What have raised objections from lower-income groups in each neighborhood are what might be referred to as the uses or perceived misuses of preservation. As stated above, the chief problems of preservation in these three communities relate to historic district regulations debated in Soulard and Tremont and National Register historic certification in Spring Garden. Soulard provides the major example in this research of opposition to aspects of preservation, while the results of Tremont's debate over historic districting were in a sense more damaging to the movement for preservation in that neighborhood.

In Soulard and Tremont alike, the key basis for opposition to historic districting was that many regulations were seen as a major violation of individual freedoms, and particularly private property rights. This is clearly displayed in a 29-page sample of 231 comments received as part of a May 1990 survey on opinions about District revisions then proposed in Soulard. The largest aspect of these comments is based on feelings that the revisions disregarded property
rights; 76 of the statements, or more than one-third of the total sample of reactions, give a key emphasis to these perceived rights, and 29 of those 76 comments lay their sole stress on conceptions of private property, as in this reaction:

"I do not believe that home owners such as myself [that] take pride in keeping their home up should have to have a permit for every little thing. To me that's saying a home owner doesn't own his property if someone wants to dictate on everything [he] does to want his house looking nice and attractive." (14)

Besides the "property rights" reactions, the May 1990 Survey comments also show some residents railing against the idea of people imposing their preferences on other people, a theme emphasized in interviews with both Bob Brandhorst and Joyce Sonn. Sonn felt that opposition to the revisions was not so much a question of pure preservation as one of taste, with many low- to moderate-income residents feeling that higher income neighbors were "Johnny-come-latelys" telling them what their neighborhood should look like. Bob Brandhorst’s impassioned response to the question of low- to moderate income citizens’ preservation attitudes was that they felt "pure and total resentment!" with the view that the Revisions were forced through, in a process that he felt demonstrated the powerlessness of many residents. (15)

Tremont served as a smaller example of some of the above themes, but here, anti-district inhabitants, along with the city councilman who initially pushed historic districting,
were clearly not powerless in greatly decreasing the district's size. Two years after the neighborhood became a district (p. 202), controversy over the renovation of a prominent longtime citizen's house served as a lightning rod to bring out discontent over districting. When 60-year old Richard Dembowski, a Tremont native and the owner of the popular Tremont tavern and restaurant "Dempsey's," could not fully restore his house without being belatedly stopped for not getting permission from the local citizens' review board. His story quickly spread, petitions were circulated to stop what was seen as government interference, and eventually, the district was reduced to only a few blocks in the historic center of Tremont. (16) Dembowski himself, speaking to the author in 1991, said he supported the idea of preserving Tremont's heritage but stressed that he and others didn't like residents or the City "telling people what to do." He said that the city should assist people, perhaps with money for restoring houses. (17)

In Spring Garden, many residents were themselves assisted by federal tax benefits provided after the neighborhood became a National Register district. These benefits hastened the refowering of Spring Garden's Victorian beauty but they were also viewed critically at two levels - governmentally and among at least a few neighborhood citizens - as a major force leading to displacement.

An early instance of official criticism came within a
1977 meeting of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission where it reviewed the original proposal to place Spring Garden on the Register. Although it encouraged certification for the neighborhood’s western half, whose middle-class revival was well underway by the mid-70’s, it recommended against such an honor for the eastern half because Commissioners felt the incentive of tax breaks would accelerate displacement. (18)

There seems to have also been similarly-based opposition to certification among low- to moderate income citizens and their leaders, at least slightly. A 1979 rally against displacement, for example, partly involved complaints that newer, more affluent White homeowners were sitting inside the home of a fellow newcomer discussing the tax advantages of historic certification. (19)

In addition, the Reverend Roger Zeppelinick, a religious leader in the Hispanic community from 1969 to 1982, told the author that a number of citizens did view certification in a negative light. The major reason for this in his view was that it was part of a generally disruptive and finally destructive process of speculation. He also recalled that people saw proposals for certification as an instance of the Spring Garden Civic Association, with its membership base mostly in the section’s western end, presuming to speak for the whole neighborhood, including the mostly lower-income population in the eastern end. (20)

As true as this interpretation may be, and with respect
to Reverend Zeppernick, it offers an easy opportunity to turn the tables of dialogue. Just as the Reverend felt that members of the Civic Association were arrogantly communicating a neighborhood vision in disregard of others, Civic Association members (to judge from two highly active ones who were interviewed) feel that social activists including the Reverend have erroneously portrayed the feelings of their constituencies by exaggerating and politicizing the discontent of a few people. (21) Representative "new" people in Soulard and Tremont also see politics and biases very much at work in the way gentrification and preservation efforts have been portrayed.

Soulard, in direct connection with its district debate, offers the best example among these three instances of this political argument. Fred Andres, a veteran leader of the Soulard Restoration Group (SRG) observed to the author that the controversy over the revisions, which were originally put forth by the SRG, was due very much to one individual - Bob Brandhorst. Andres felt that Brandhorst saw the energetic move towards stronger historic districting as "a further fractioning of the neighborhood," in contrast with a now-distant period in the 1970's when Brandhorst's Soulard Neighborhood Improvement Association (SNIA) enjoyed a great degree of neighborhood domination. (22)

More concretely, Fred Andres and others have pointed out what they see as various distortions in the way the SNIA
leadership presented the district revisions to the public. As an example from his interview with the author, Andres went against a major claim that there was entirely insufficient input on the revisions from low- to moderate-income residents. He cited numerous small-scale block meetings to discuss the evolving proposals, saying that if someone could not attend one meeting, there were at least ten others in close proximity. (23)

While there was much less dialogue on the evolution, or deevolution, of historic districting in Tremont, and limited opportunity to react to actual gentrification, the author would point to at least one newer resident - Gary Grabowski - who felt that district regulations and other issues in Tremont have definitely been politicized. At one point, he reflected to the author that there are a lot of uneducated neighborhood residents who don’t understand, or don’t want to understand any need for district regulations, and added: "I hate to say it, but a lot of educated people look at this as an opportunity to provoke people." He said "[w]e’ve seen [activist leaders] turn almost half the community against us [he and his wife and other newcomers]." (24)

In speaking to the author, Grabowski's dominant theme, expressed in different ways, was not so much one of political distortion per se, but of the misperception and miscommunication found in the neighborhood. When asked if low- to moderate income residents made connections between
preservation and gentrification in their minds, he didn't see any major one, but he himself saw a connection between both subjects in terms of miscommunication based largely on perceptions of social justice. He semi-jokingly commented that images that people had to put stained-glass or the like in their homes were just not true, in regards to the district laws. (25)

A major basis for misconceptions about regulations, as seen by Grabowski and others, has been a lack of concern, and consequent unawareness and misunderstanding regarding preservation. Seven out of the nine representatives among newcomers made this point, in various ways. Two citizens in Soulard, and one in Tremont, said that lack of understanding was a major reason for opposition to new regulations. (26) One of the nine people representing low- to moderate-income residents and three auxiliary interviewees on that side of the coin also spoke of the absence of preservation in peoples' minds. Larry Bresler, a former Tremont resident and activist, observed that "the majority of Tremonters" probably were not even aware of preservation, because of their status as renters and their lack of capacity to renovate their house. (27)

Underscoring these observations are the thoughts of several interviewees that preservation, and more particularly, the author's question regarding connections between preservation and gentrification, are too subtle for many people to grasp. Soulard's Phyllis Young felt that low- to
moderate-income residents were well-aware of "gentrification," whatever they might call it, but that many would respond to preservation activities as "those fools fixing up derelict houses." Iris Pagan, the head of a neighborhood arts center in Spring Garden, said that many lower-income residents there viewed developments in a very simple way, as with the key question of whether change would affect them. (28)

Spring Garden’s Justino Navarro, in his response to the author’s question of connections, at first seemed to be one of at least four interviewees who themselves did not understand the question. Upon reinterpretation, the author feels that this Spring Garden native is likely to be providing a different, and unusual definition of gentrification. Navarro stated that "in the past," the neighborhood’s low- to moderate-income residents did not make a connection in their minds between preservation and gentrification, but since two successful low-income preservation projects of the late 1980’s, they did make one in terms of seeing that the two phenomena can "go hand-in-hand without the residents being displaced." (29) Navarro’s implication here was one of seeing gentrification as potentially more than just higher-income redevelopment, an idea to which the author was not accustomed. At the same time, against this study’s backdrop of real or possible differences between groups of people, this broader sense of gentrification provides a valuable reminder that nearly everyone concerned with historic preservation wants its
benefits to spread to a diversity of groups within an area.

IIC6. Conclusion: A Comparison of Case Study and Contextual Results

Here, the author will first highlight similarities between the results from Cabbagetown and the contextual examples. He will then present and attempt to explain the differences seen in the two sets of findings.

IIC6a. Similarities

As the author will elaborate below, most similarities which he came across appeared in small ways in Cabbagetown and in a larger sense in one or more of the three neighborhoods herein. In addition, there were five leading themes; the first three are common to all four neighborhoods, the fourth was prevalent everywhere but Spring Garden, and the fifth and final one has loomed large in all cases but that of Tremont: First, a basic support for the idea of historic preservation; Secondly, a lack of awareness of preservation; Thirdly, more basic concerns displacing preservation; Fourth, the pursuit of historic districting by low-income
communities because of fears of large-scale demolition and redevelopment; 

*Fifth*, debates regarding housing development.

As to a basic support for preservation, one can see this, among other instances, in the view of Soulard’s Joyce Sonn that residents generally appreciate that neighborhood’s "Old World" atmosphere (p. 206). In Cabbagetown, through articles, the questionnaire and other sources, the author felt a strong sense of place among Cabbagetowners. One specific application of this was the clear support among several questionnaire respondents for new house designs being compatible with the appearance of old ones.

The author’s conclusion that many Cabbagetowners lacked awareness of preservation was bolstered by the responses of observers who he interviewed in Atlanta and, indirectly, by the replies from representatives of the three neighborhoods studied here. In connection with this, the subtlety of preservation noted just above came out in Cabbagetown as well, particularly in Oraien Catledge’s surmise, quoted on p. 157, that many Cabbagetowners might not realize the long-run effects of a slow gentrification.

Interlocking with low awareness of preservation is the theme of more basic priorities for so many people. In reference to Cabbagetown, readers may recall the comment of Atlanta city planning director Fernando Costa, speaking of
low-income people generally (p. 157), that "more basic issues [than preservation] capture their attention." The author was reminded of these necessities many times - both in Cabbagetown and elsewhere - when he probed interviewees to elicit any preservation-minded attitudes low- to moderate-income residents might have. Speaking to the author from Savannah, Georgia, Lee Adler, widely known for his successful combinations of preservation and affordable housing, said in his aggressive style that essentially, while lower-income people can appreciate preservation, "all these people want is a god-damn good house." (30)

At respective points in Soulard, Cabbagetown and Tremont, another basic concern in the low-income community has been the fear that neighborhoods would fall to large-scale demolition and redevelopment of valuable real estate. In each case, historic districting, whether national and/or local, was pursued by low-income residents and those who represented them as a further shield from such a reality. (31)

In a fifth similarity, while it has not been fully brought out above, Soulard and Spring Garden, like Cabbagetown, have seen sharp debates about how to both preserve and build housing, in both physical and social senses. Spring Garden, in the early 1970’s, was the scene of arguments over cooperative housing (mostly planned to be in the section’s Victorian rowhouses). Predictably, lower-income leaders pushed for it as being desperately needed while
members of the small, fairly new gentrifying community were opposed to it on bases including their forecasts of lower property values and overcrowding due to the plan. A milestone— or millstone— of Soulard’s struggles was a debate in the early 1980’s on in-fill housing for low- and moderate-income inhabitants, contested on aesthetic and social grounds. (32) Cabbagetown, as discussed earlier (pp. 96-97) was shaken by arguments over the troubled experiment of the Fulton Co-op. More recently, the author’s questionnaire showed a wariness from at least some newcomers as to the social engineering undertaken by CRAFT to stabilize the neighborhood’s low-income population, largely in terms of a "permanent ghetto attitude" they felt that the land trust might solidify. (33)

IIC6b. Differences

Attitudes seen in Cabbagetown and ones just discussed here differ mainly in terms of the relative absence of two factors: first, opposition to historic district legislation, and secondly, connections between gentrification and preservation. The author will elaborate below on two likely areas of explanation for these differences. One concerns elements of communication and the second cites the differing situations between Cabbagetown and the other neighborhoods.
IIC6b-1. **Elements of Communication**  The author thinks that an easily evident difference in his research on Cabbagetown and on the three neighborhoods explains at least a small part of the contrasts here. In Cabbagetown, of course, he depended mainly on average citizens to gain a sense of attitudes, while in his contextual studies he focused on "citizen-leaders." If "average" Cabbagetowners had been just as articulate and aware as this latter group of interviewees, it is quite possible that they might have expressed similar reactions beyond the few hints and fragments of attitudes which appeared.

The author does think that neighborhood politics distorted and exaggerated peoples' attitudes at least somewhat, as Soulard's Fred Andres strongly felt. One example of the bias which can shape attitudes, to the author, was the introductory question of the 1990 survey (mentioned on pp. 207-208) on Soulard's historic district revisions. Instead of briefly presenting a balanced portrayal of the historic district debate prior to any questions, which the author feels would have been appropriate, the SNIA-sponsored document opens by asking whether interviewees think there should be an historic district. (34)

IIC6b-2. **Differing Situations**  Besides the ways in which situations were communicated and filtered, there were real differences between these situations. Put simply, Cabbagetown, as of the 1989 research by the author, had not
seen the friction over historic districting found in the examples of Soulard (in particular) and Tremont. Partly because of this, no group or groups, such as gentrifiers or city officials, had been blamed in a pronounced way with the charge of forcing aesthetic regulations upon the community.

The author would say that indications presented here, both in and outside of questionnaire interviews, certainly allow for the likelihood of Cabbagetown undergoing such problems in the future. In the first place, of course, the neighborhood in the early 1980’s at least briefly seemed to exemplify the clashes that often arise following the arrival of newcomers. (35) In terms of preservation itself, the questionnaire showed twenty-three out of fifty-one "oldtime" interviewees responding unfavorably to design controls. A handful of them, as seen on pp. 182-184, expressed an anti-government focus. The author would also recall the example of longtime inhabitant Wilma Davis expressing irritation that, according to her, newer resident Mary Bankester wanted everyone to adopt a certain residential appearance in the case of her statement on "white picket fences" (p. 187).

Other insights and facts brought out from the case study, however, show the largely positive or neutral response to preservation or preservation-mindedness in the Cabbagetown of the late 1980’s. These points make it easier to accept the relative absence of highly critical responses in the questionnaires. In 1989, specifically, CRAFT emphasized
rehabilitation for much of its program, and a willingness to work with the city's Design Commission on its new Savannah Street Houses (pp. 180-181). Habitat for Humanity built new houses, but ones which hearkened back to house types from Cabbagetown's past, with their full front porch, shallow eaves and simple ornament. (See pictures 2.38-2.40 on pp. 101-103.) In these and other ways, Cabbagetown at the end of the 1980's remained a place where preservation, and its spirit, were not controversial, but were seen to benefit different social groups.
PART III

CONCLUSION
Explanatory Note

The author has divided his conclusion into three parts: an evaluation of the questionnaire which he devised and utilized, recommendations for future questionnaires and closing comments lending both caution and encouragement to other attitudinal researchers. In many cases below, the author will refer the reader to portions which cover the points of these summaries in more detail.

IIIA. Evaluation of the Neighborhood Attitudinal Questionnaire

IIIA1. Shortcomings

As exemplified on a number of occasions in the presentation of responses, peoples' answers were frequently very broad and/or short, and the total body of responses is thus largely inconclusive and disappointing. One example of answers which were both short and incomplete - and the author does not fault respondents on this account - is that of 16-
year old Orrin Miller when asked if new homes should look like old homes. Orrin stated that new homes should be designed to be like [old homes], not just to look like 'em." [8/13-1.]

While this fragmentary answer seemed to reinforce this teenager's strong attachment to his native Cabbagetown, obvious from other answers, the author in retrospect, here and with other answers, would have simply asked: "What do you mean by that?"

Besides not probing as much as he could have, the author keenly feels that his often general questions were not deep enough, and thus have to be seen as at least one reason for his results. One reflection of the nature of questions asked in Cabbagetown is seen in the initial reaction of one of the newcomers to the question on people keeping their customs and traditions: "Certainly," Ernie Nelindez commented, "I think that sometimes could be said for anyone." [8/29-2.]

IIIA2. Areas of Contribution

IIIA2a. A Positive Assessment

The successes of the questionnaire, while modest, convince the author that it could be a useful model for future
neighborhood studies, especially with improvements to it. He feels he has contributed insights into preservation attitudes in three ways which will be elaborated upon in a list presented just after this assessment. The author thinks that his insights offer additions and reinforcements to our understanding of historic preservation and the sociology of neighborhood change.

In one sense, the author's major contribution to scholarship is that his research appears to be among an extremely small number of studies which even attempt to deal with attitudes towards preservation and/or gentrification, especially among low- to moderate-income people. He has recounted his lack of results in finding similar works on p. 290 in Appendix 3, "Studies Relating to Attitudes Towards Historic Preservation." The author would say his questionnaire was more successful in suggesting how to provide a framework for preservation attitudes in a neighborhood rather than attitudes themselves, because of his strong emphasis on questions which at first glance seem little related to preservation, such as those on neighborhood likes and dislikes and the Piggyback Yard.

In terms of the immediate context of the questionnaire and its limitations, the author would underscore it as a first-time experience. Indeed, he predicted to himself that a significant percentage of low-to moderate-income residents would be disinterested and/or hostile, based largely on the
stereotypes and the realities of low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. (1) While he would agree that he often erred in accepting quick, generalized responses, it was very much in the interests of maintaining the pacing of his interviews, and thereby the interest levels, among his respondents.

IIIA2b. A Summary of Research Contributions

IIIA2b-1. General Sense of Preservation Attitudes The author thought that one contribution of the questionnaire was that it gave at least an approximate idea of how his respondents, as a somewhat representative sample of one neighborhood’s population, thought about historic preservation and related subjects such as gentrification. Their major views can be summarized as being mildly positive or not very concerned about preservation, and feeling similarly about gentrification, with the addition of a noticeable minority of interviewees who were negative about gentrifiers and/or gentrification.

IIA2b-2. Differences in Consciousness of History and Preservation Between Different Groups of Residents The questionnaire clearly shows that newcomers, or gentrifiers in the neighborhood were more conscious of both the physical heritage and the primary cultural background which
characterized the neighborhood. While this is not surprising, it humanizes and enriches the linkages that have been made between gentrification and preservation. In addition, it underscores the feelings of most thesis interviewees outside of the questionnaire that low- to moderate-income residents in particular big-city neighborhoods or in American cities in general, would be only slightly aware, at the most, of their neighborhood from a preservation standpoint. This lack of consciousness was basically present even in Cabbagetown, which the author and other observers have seen as atypical of low- to moderate-income urban areas in having a larger concentration of residents who were fairly aware of their neighborhood's historical and cultural significance - because of personal or family-based connections to its industrial and social past. (See, for example, Professor Timothy Crimmins' point on p. 158.)

IIIA2b-3. Connections Between the Subjects of Preservation and Gentrification in attitudes expressed by non-gentrifiers

Originally, as stated in the thesis introduction (p. 6), the author had hypothesized that a significant minority of non-gentrifiers (referred to in this report as "longtime" residents, "oldtimers," or the like) would express negative connections between preservation and gentrification, as they viewed these two phenomena, in questionnaire responses. This, however, was not the case, except for a tiny handful of
instances which have been noted in the text. The author sees meaningfulness in this result in two respects: first, in connection with the findings in his contextual research, and secondly, from a methodological standpoint.

Based on his contextual findings, the author sees likely reasons why "oldtime" Cabbagetowners did not express, either consciously or unconsciously, the negative connections which he predicted that at least some of them would bring up. In summary, since these reasons are discussed on pp. 219-221, the author would simply say that as of 1989, Cabbagetown had never undergone the damaging debates on city historic districting which one can see in Tremont and Soulard, nor had the history of its redevelopment shown criticism of the financial effects of National Register certification, as in Spring Garden. The context within 1989, as the author stated on p. 221, would have tended to promote thoughts among longtimers that preservation and redevelopment were beneficial forces for them and not just for gentrifiers. Cabbagetown's situation vis-a-vis preservation at that time included rehabilitations by CRAFT and continuing discussion of the Fulton Mill's rebirth.

Methodologically, and in terms of differences in contextual research (such as an emphasis on more articulate interviewees outside of Cabbagetown), the author feels his questionnaire simply may not have been the right vehicle to uncover the connections he predicted, if indeed they did exist in Cabbagetowners' minds. It was of course, deliberately
simple in its language, as contrasted with reactions from a number of contextual interviewees (pp. 213-214) that such connections were a subtlety beyond the comprehensions or thoughts of most lower-income residents. In hindsight, the author would remove broad questions such as the one (C3B) attempting to combine both gentrification and historic preservation; in this regard, the reader is referred back to researcher Earl Babbie's criticism of "double-barreled" questions on p. 39. In place of such a question, the author would devote greater energy to separate questions on preservation and gentrification and then seek to note any connections between sentiments.

IIIB. Recommendations for Future Questionnaires

There are two major sections herein, "Uses of the Author's Results" and "Questionnaire Design and Procedure." Together, they can be seen as being directed towards the common goal of improving questionnaires and interviews as tools for city planning.
IIIB1. Uses of the Author’s Results

IIIB1a. Use of the Questionnaire Results without further Inquiries

In terms of the direct use of his results for city planning purposes, the author offers one idea to be explained below. Outside of uses for planning but perhaps parallel to them, he presents ones with regards to cultivating new leadership and to outreach on history and historic preservation. While these uses do not translate immediately into the physical developments of city planning, planners, in preservation and in general, should pay attention to them because they can pave the way for physical improvements.

IIIB1a-1. Redevelopment of the Fulton Mill The one use of the author’s results which can be directly linked with physical planning concerns resident reactions to the issue of the Fulton Mill’s reuse. At the very least, results in this regard could be presented to both city planners concerned with Cabbagetown and its surroundings and potential developers of the Mill complex. This communication would be a kind of update in the ongoing process of sensitizing these people to what "the people" want, and might even cause a modification in someone’s plans to make them more responsive to public
sentiment.

More publicly, questionnaire results could be a timely basis for a presentation to restart the impetus towards the giant complex's redevelopment. The interview results could be used to open a public meeting, both in terms of relating the numerical breakdown of support for various ideas and lively quotations on the Mill's potential and ideas for it.

IIIBla-2. **Identification of New Neighborhood Leaders** In addition to the natural process whereby a community selects its leaders, the author feels that a questionnaire such as his can assist in this regard. In the author's view, a small handful of his respondents had clear potential to be neighborhood leaders. These people did not speak of personal activities on behalf of the community but showed qualities including a deep commitment to their neighborhood and concern and articulation regarding its development.

One interviewee that comes to mind in terms of this is sixteen-year old Orrin Miller (cited above on p. 224 for his answer on saving old homes). Orrin, on the one hand, was not an exemplary student at nearby Roosevelt High School, as the author learned from a longtime neighborhood friend of his. Besides that, at least one younger boy, an eight-year old Cabbagetowner, implied a bullying tendency on the sixteen-year old's part. At the same time, Orrin's affection for Cabbagetown, as a fifth-generation inhabitant, and his
brightness, could clearly be seen in his discussion with the author.

IIIBla-3. Outreach and Education on History and Historic Preservation  The major finding of the author’s questionnaire was that long-term residents were either unsuccessful in articulating their consciousness of Cabbagetown’s past and/or lacked such a consciousness as compared with newer residents. Using this finding constructively, preservation educators and others may implement activities to increase the cumulative historical and preservation-minded awareness of the neighborhood by its residents.

The author would add three comments, all of which are meant to place the importance of historical consciousness in perspective. First, the absence of a visible historical consciousness is not necessarily bad; for many people, whether because of educational background, greater priorities or other reasons, a less obvious sense of history will remain a fact of life. Secondly, there should be no preaching or great expectations from historians, educators or others as to the fields they hold dear; greater consciousness of an area’s history, if it does happen, is something which will seep in in small ways, gradually. Finally, planners and other professionals may feel survey or questionnaire results which show a lack of historical consciousness, for all the psychological or sociological interest which they may display,
are not nearly as important as an emphasis on maintenance and upgrading of properties. Certainly, many, if not nearly all residents will appreciate adjacent structures more through physical improvements, whether or not they know that these structures are seen as historical properties.

IIIB1b. Possible Extensions and Improvements of the Questionnaire Results

If the author's results were the basis for an improved series of interviews, one could focus on one or more of the themes suggested or brought out in various clusters of responses within them, as shown in examples here.

IIIB1b-1. Visual Appropriateness of New Homes  As summarized on pp. 184-185, a cluster of residents expressed views on whether or not the Savannah Street Homes of CRAFT were visually appropriate to the neighborhood. An in-depth survey could raise this subject by presenting several photographs, each of two or possibly three of the CRAFT homes; besides that, it could ask interviewees to point out features they did and/or did not think were compatible within the neighborhood. The results of such an inquiry could be seriously considered for a project involving new design in the near future. If
that project included input from a committee, it would be valuable to have one or two residents on it, perhaps drawing them from the ranks of more articulate survey respondents. (2)

IIIB1b-2. Saving Homes if They are not in "Good Shape" A large group of residents said that Cabbagetown's old homes should be saved unless they were not in good shape (p. 173). One could move beyond this by replacing the author's question on simply saving the old homes with one which asks: "Should old homes here be fixed up if they are in bad shape?" Many researchers might feel a large group of negative responses are inevitable here, and indeed the author feels some residents would respond by saying "Depends what you mean by 'bad shape'."

At the same time, answers to this question can lead to more sensitive decision-making in neighborhood planning. A majority of residents, for example, might favor special efforts to preserve seriously deteriorated homes. (3) Among more specific responses is that residents favoring preservation may be concentrated on particular blocks with more visual distinction and/or physical cohesiveness than others, and preservation of "difficult" homes could be emphasized strategically on those blocks. Still more specifically, there may be strong support for keeping particularly noteworthy homes which are highly deteriorated. One possible example in Cabbagetown as of 1989 was an
abandoned home at the prominent intersection of Boulevard and Carroll Streets which had been occupied during World War I and the 1920’s by "Fiddlin’ John" Carson, a major early Country musician. (4)

IIIB1b-3. Land-ownership in connection with the CRAFT program

The largest cluster in categories of reaction to CRAFT’s innovative land trust effort was that of 12 residents who were largely or wholly opposed to CRAFT because it did not allow for individual land ownership. Despite the deeply-rooted American emphasis on private property, this response would be worth probing. By determining the reasons why people want completely private property, and by seeing how firm and widespread this view is within a neighborhood, planners, lawyers, neighborhood leaders and others may be able to modify the plan of CRAFT or a similar organization or communicate the organization’s principles more effectively.

IIIB1b-4. Present-mindedness regarding neighborhood history

One of the most interesting clusters of response (see pp. 166-169), was that of people who thought in terms of Cabbagetown’s present, either negatively or positively, when asked about the significance of its past. Some planners, on the one hand, in an echo of statements above on historical consciousness, may feel this result is merely fascinating fodder for further academic or theoretical studies. They may also point to a
deeply-rooted sense of the present to show that awareness of the past is not important in and of itself, but rather, that it will be fostered over time by positive, increasingly visible rehabilitation. Other planners may take the alternate view that more incisive interviews can seek to see the dominant reason or reasons for peoples’ present-mindedness when the past and history are brought up in conversation, and then harness those reasons as bases for preservation-minded improvements.

In the panel below, the first two reasons for present-mindedness were brought out very briefly in the author’s interviews. He feels that, along with other reasons, they would be more likely to appear in an improved questionnaire with a larger sample of interviewees. The "responses" listed here, as a whole, are not seen as novel approaches but as actions which could be chosen from a range of possible programs, depending on what residents are feeling and saying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS FOR PRESENT-MINDEDNESS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes in the neighborhood’s appearance</td>
<td>renewed attention to accuracy in historic renovations and to new designs which are considered sympathetic by people overseeing an historic and/or design review district; greater involvement of citizens on a review board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REASONS & RESPONSES.
CONTINUED

failed rehabilitation programs focus on steps to reorganize and speed up renewal efforts
positive leadership for redevelopment bolstering that leadership and its programs through funding, technical assistance, etc.
a particular group or groups feeling left out of the community because of ethnic discrimination and lack of recognition of their historical role in the community programs recognizing and involving the neglected group or groups, one example being the rehabilitation of a particular landmark related to a group

IIIB2. Questionnaire Design and Procedure

IIIB2a. Opening Comments

Based on his construction and execution of an initial, elementary questionnaire, the author would summarize the methodological part of his recommendations under just four headings. He sees all of these as reinforcements of essential elements for interviews such as his:
First, selectivity regarding questions;
Second, simple language;
Third, test surveys;
Fourth, probing.
Here, the author will limit his comments to the matters of selectively chosen questions and test surveys as they relate to his own questionnaire. In regards to simple interview language, he would direct the reader to p. 147 in Chapter 4, and, as to probing, to pp. 35-36 in Chapter 1's section on "Case Study Interviews within the Context of Interviewing Approaches and Methods."

IIIB2b. Selectivity Regarding Questions  In doing a questionnaire such as his in the future, the author would largely - though not wholly - remove three types of questions: those dealing with secondary preservation-related issues, secondary neighborhood issues and overly broad and complex inquiries. Many of his deliberately-posed questions would be adequately supplanted by two of the four elements here - test surveys and probing - and by the educated efforts of researchers to synthesize, as much as possible, peoples' answers to varied questions.

An excellent example of a "secondary preservation-related question," to the author, would be question B2, on the level of Cabbagetown's historic importance. Close attention and probing in regards to B1, on whether people thought Cabbagetown was historic, would be more useful here.

One illustration of a secondary neighborhood issues question would be C3D, on the quantity of neighborhood residents who were displaced due to gentrification. Here,
attention to the tone of responses to gentrification in general will allow a researcher to infer how much impact people generally feel such a problem has had.

As to "overly broad and complex" questions, a few inquiries which merit that label came to the author's mind as unnecessary, despite their interesting nature and direction towards crucial issues. One example is question B3, on whether "it is important for people ... to keep their old customs and traditions." Questions like this one should be dropped, largely because of their vagueness. One question which will go at least part of the way towards indicating the value a resident places on cultural preservation is B1, on Cabbagetown's historical importance. Here, someone may make comments such as: "Yeah, our past is important, but there's a living, breathing continuation of that we can keep alive, with all of the old families here, and so on:" a researcher can note such a remark as tending to display a high priority for cultural preservation.

While the author's obvious thrust here has been to eliminate many questions, in light of his experience, he would stress keeping two types of questions. First, a few background questions (including those on age, education and occupation) are essential for at least a rough idea of likely or definite influences on the responses of both individuals and different groups of people in a neighborhood. Secondly, in a situation such as his, where the primary, underlying
concern is with one field of activity, the author would still maintain a select number of questions (anywhere from one to four) on critical neighborhood issues, drug addiction being a major example in many neighborhoods. The author strongly believes that any holistically-oriented professional should have at least a minimal level of understanding how citizens feel about such dominant concerns.

IIIB2c. Test Surveys. The author did not perform a test survey, primarily because of apprehensiveness that it could prejudice a large number of potential respondents to his questionnaire by alerting people to it in a small, tight-knit neighborhood such as Cabbagetown. (5) In retrospect, the failings of the process here suggest that a test survey would help in preparing a final one. The author feels that one would only need to interview 15 to 20 people for an adequate "practice" document, largely due to the meaningful results he felt he received from just 13 newcomers.
IIIC. A Note of Both Caution and Encouragement on Studying Attitudes

In closing, the author would caution other researchers to one of the few certainties to be firmly reinforced by this study: namely, the uncertainty that will always accompany illuminations of what people think. This was found in this project in a variety of ways, beginning with the often suggested, as opposed to clearly articulated views, of the author’s Cabbagetown interviewees. Another example, in research on the three contextual neighborhoods, came with the strongly held biases of at least a few of the community leaders the author interviewed - one manifestation of that to him being the slanted construction of the historic district survey in the Soulard section (p. 219).

These real or potential obstacles should not keep planners from searching for peoples’ true attitudes or from implementing their plans despite the fact that biases and communication gaps will always complicate that search. As people continue to talk to other people to determine how they feel about their neighborhoods, they should keep in perspective that the revelation of attitudes is just one necessary building block towards the final result of improved physical and social environments. In addition, reactions to the tangible results of plans, whether they are rehabilitated homes or other projects, are more telling sources than survey
conversations for widely-held feelings. During both concentrated periods of development and in the interim, preservationists should keep up the process of understanding how citizens feel if we are to continue to better serve them.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1A

NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMER 1989 - FIRST VERSION
NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMER 1989

(Responses are kept confidential at the request of the respondent.)

1. Describe what kind of neighborhood you would like to see.

2. (Question A or B, based on response to question # 1.)
   
   A. Do you see historic preservation, or saving historic old buildings, as part of the neighborhood?
   
   B. In terms of historic preservation, or saving historic old buildings, can you offer an idea or examples of what you think is historic here?
Background of Respondents

Head of Household?

Years of Residence in the neighborhood?

If family members were here before you, how far back does your family go in the neighborhood?

Employed/unemployed?

Type of occupation(s)

Educational Background (both formal and informal)

Participation in neighborhood groups and/or activities (brief description)
NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE, P. 3

NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES - CABBAGETOWN

(Please give a short explanation of your answers; if the way you feel has changed over time, please indicate that if possible.)

1. Re-use of the Mill Buildings

2. Long-time residents staying in the neighborhood

3. New people moving into the neighborhood

4. The Land Trust (CRAFT, Inc.)

5. CSX Piggyback Facility
APPENDIX 1B

NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMER 1989 - FINAL VERSION
NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE – SUMMER 1989

INSTRUCTIONS

- Most questions may be answered with a "yes" or "no." You are encouraged to give reasons for your answers.

- Some of my questions relate to the history of the neighborhood because history is one of the major topics in my classes right now.

- Responses are kept confidential if you request this.

A. INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

A1. What do you like about your neighborhood?

A2. What do you dislike about your neighborhood?
B. NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

B1. Do you think this neighborhood is historically important?

B2. (IF YES) Do you think that it is historically important to the City of Atlanta, or for a larger area?

B3. Do you think that it is important for people in this neighborhood to keep their old customs and traditions?

B4. Do you think that the old homes still standing here should be kept?
B5. Between keeping customs and traditions and keeping old buildings, do you think one is more important than the other, or that they are just as important as each other?

B6. Whether it’s older or newer, would you want your home to still be standing 100 years from now?

B7. Should new homes here be built to look like the old homes?
C. NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES - CABBAGETOWN

[Please answer "yes" or "no" on a scale of 1 to 5 for some questions, "1" meaning you totally approve of an issue or activity and "5" meaning you totally disapprove of an issue or activity.]

Cl. Would you support reusing the old Mill buildings?

1 2 3 4 5

IF YES...

A. Do you think their reuse could provide jobs to the people in this neighborhood?

B. Can you offer any (other) ideas of how they can be used?

C. Do you think that they are historically important?

IF NO...

D. Do you think they should be replaced by something new? [If "3" or something similar is given above, the wording of this question may be adapted.]

If Yes...

E. Do you think the site should be used for industry?

F. Can you offer any other ideas of what this construction should be?

G. In any event, do you think the Mill buildings are historically important?

If No...

H. Do you think that they should continue to remain vacant for the time being?

I. Do you think the Mill buildings are historically important?
C2A. As you may know, this neighborhood has an organization called CRAFT, the Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust, Inc. CRAFT is a "land trust," which holds ownership for land on which houses stand to protect the homes from major price increases. It is renovating homes and building new ones, and would like to sell these to neighborhood residents.

From what you know about CRAFT at this point, do you support their efforts?

1 2 3 4 5

C2B. You may also be aware that a group called Habitat for Humanity is building 9 homes in the neighborhood in October and November. It is also giving first choice to people who live in this neighborhood. Among other things, successful applicants for homes are not charged interest on their monthly mortgage payments and they perform 125 hours of house-building work, which is equivalent to about 5 full days of work.

From what you know about Habitat's plans at this point, do you support their efforts?

1 2 3 4 5
NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE – p. 6

C3. On a scale of 1 to 5, again [re-explain if necessary], do you think this neighborhood needs new people moving into it?

1  2  3  4  5

IF YES...

C3A. Do you think the neighborhood should have people with different income levels?

If Yes...

C3B. Are you in favor of middle- or upper-income people restoring houses here and living in them?

IF NO [FOR "NO" IN EITHER C3, C3A, OR C3B.], and/or for answers which have not referred to the subject...

C3C. Would you say that lower-income people have had to move out because of new residents?

C3D. In terms of [lower-income people having to move out -or- this happening] would you say there has been:

___a little  ____some  ____a lot
C4. Were you in favor of the CSX Piggyback facility?

1 2 3 4 5

IF YES...

A. Did you see it as a way to bring jobs into the neighborhood?

B. Did you think that it would be a good way to begin reusing the Mill buildings?

C. Did you think that CSX built the facility with sensitivity to the neighborhood in terms of the way it looked, its noise level, and so on?

IF NO...

D. Did you feel that the facility would bring too much noise and pollution to the neighborhood?

E. Did you think that there was a risk of chemical spills or something similar from the facility?

F. Did you think that the facility’s being here would lower property values?

G. Did you think that CSX finally built the facility with sensitivity to the neighborhood in terms of the way it looked, its noise level, and so on?
D. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

D1. How long have you lived in the neighborhood?
D2. Did you have parents or grandparents here?
D3. Why do you live in this neighborhood?
D4. Are you involved in any neighborhood organizations or clubs?
   (D5.)____ churches in this part of town?
   (D6.)____ citywide groups?
D7. If so, could you please say which ones?

D8. Do you rent or own your home?
D9. What is your occupation?
D10. What school or schools have you attended/do you attend?
D11. I have four age groups listed here:
   children (up to age 18)
   young adults (up to age 35)
   middle-aged adults (up to age 65)
   senior citizens (above age 65)
   Would you be willing to give your age group or age?
D12. Would you care to say your name?

Thank you for participating in this survey!
APPENDIX 2

A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMPONENTS
Explanatory Note

This appendix presents the author’s questionnaire in separate pages or pairs of pages, followed by explanations. Because of this division, the author strongly suggests that readers first read the final questionnaire in its entirety as it appears in Appendix 1B, on pp. 249-256.
NEIGHBORHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE - SUMMER 1989

INSTRUCTIONS

- Most questions may be answered with a "yes" or "no." You are encouraged to give reasons for your answers.

- Some of my questions relate to the history of the neighborhood because history is one of the major topics in my classes right now.

- Responses are kept confidential if you request this.

A. INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

A1. What do you like about your neighborhood?

A2. What do you dislike about your neighborhood?
Introductory Greeting and "INSTRUCTIONS" to Respondents

While these three comments made up the first formal communication of the questionnaire, the author preceded them with an informal greeting, basically delivered as follows:

"Hi, my name is Josh Silver. I’m a college student studying the neighborhood, and I wondered if you would like to do a questionnaire I’m doing with neighborhood residents."

Once a potential respondent agreed to take part in the questionnaire, the author then conveyed the three comments given under the heading of "INSTRUCTIONS," saying them very much as they are typed. With them, he hoped to set his respondents at ease and by so doing, gain more information and insights from them.

Through the first comment (in a sense, two instructions which he saw in combination), the author wanted to assure interviewees that the questionnaire would not be a difficult one, but also gently prod them, from the outset, to give more meaningful answers than the simplest affirmative or negative ones.

The author saw the second comment as a necessary and suitable compromise between saying nothing at all on the interview’s historical emphasis, which he strongly felt would have made respondents uneasy and even suspicious regarding that, and, on the other hand, directly stating his particular interests in historic preservation, which he equally strongly thought would bias respondents either towards or against the
field, but most likely towards it.

With the third "instruction" the author hoped to assure residents that their privacy would be respected, especially if they were uncomfortable voicing negative thoughts. At the same time, he decided to leave the responsibility of securing confidentiality up to them, in hopes of using their real names - something he wanted to do at the time of these interviews because he felt it would add immediacy to their words. (See pp. 147-148 regarding the decision to use pseudonyms.)

A. INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

The author saw these first two questions within the general purpose of opening the interview in a reassuring, friendly manner. He felt they were both easy and enjoyable, for three reasons: First, their extremely simple wording; Second, their broad nature, giving respondents maximum flexibility to express their feelings; Third, two common and contradictory human tendencies - the urge of individuals, on the one hand, to share aspects of their life and/or surroundings that they are pleased with (especially in what seemed to be a neighborhood with many resident devotees such as Cabbagetown), and, on the other hand - and perhaps more readily - the tendency of people to complain, or simply vent their feelings!
B. NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

B1. Do you think this neighborhood is historically important?

B2. (IF YES) Do you think that it is historically important to the City of Atlanta, or for a larger area?

B3. Do you think that it is important for people in this neighborhood to keep their old customs and traditions?

B4. Do you think that the old homes still standing here should be kept?
B5. Between keeping customs and traditions and keeping old buildings, do you think one is more important than the other, or that they are just as important as each other?

B6. Whether it’s older or newer, would you want your home to still be standing 100 years from now?

B7. Should new homes here be built to look like the old homes?
Overall Comments

As will be seen in the discussion of questions here, the final questionnaire does not directly ask respondents for their attitudes on historic preservation, as does question 2A of the first version ("Do you see historic preservation, or saving historic old buildings, as part of the neighborhood?") Instead, the author hoped to glean and synthesize peoples' reactions to separate components of the field, such as historicity and the preservation of older residences.

These seven questions - and particularly the five which deal with historic preservation per se - were, in the author's eyes, the most important ones of the entire document. Had he not seen the questions on neighborhood likes and dislikes as contributing to a reassuring opening (see p. 261) he would have begun the interview with these questions.

One of the intentions in using these questions was to see if respondents would bring up gentrification when asked about preservation, given the author's aforementioned hypothesis on the two phenomena (p. 6). Short of any such stated or implied connections, he also wanted to see if there would be significant, enlightening differences in responses between oldtimers and newcomers, which also might be relevant to the
overlapping concerns of gentrification and preservation.

Regarding "oldtimers" in general, a deep underlying reason for these questions was the author's curiosity to see if people who were relatively uneducated, in a formal sense, would still intellectualize issues to any extent. In large part, many observations by professional interviewees for the thesis, especially the reverberant theme that lower-income people would probably "not be very aware" of the historical environment, tended to go against this notion.

The author ventured beyond such observations because of a strong feeling that in many people, from all walks of life, there have to be complex views on the world and one's physical surroundings - and bases for these views. Despite results which were often vague, and the view noted earlier that some people have "no hidden depths and only superficial attitudes on certain issues" (p. 36) the author still feels this way. He sees peoples' complex views as frequently buried underneath one or both of two elements: first, a lack of articulation, and secondly, a greater emphasis (in the lives of most human beings) on what many observers would view as popular culture, particularly centered around the mass media.
Questions

B1 & B2. The author saw these questions as the first ones preservationists ask themselves when they are determining whether or not to pursue preservation of a structure or structures. He wanted to see if residents valued the neighborhood in terms of its history, and if so, how much value they placed on it.

B3. Cultural preservation was not a part of the original version of the questionnaire, because the author was still considering how to include this topic, which to him was even more complex and intangible than historic preservation. He decided to make it part of the enlarged, final version, because upon first studying the neighborhood, one of his greatest concerns was that what he saw as the neighborhood’s largely Appalachian-based culture would be eliminated within the next one or two decades, primarily through gentrification. As with the matter of the neighborhood’s historical importance, he wanted to see if residents placed value on this form of preservation. (1)

The author considered directly asking about "Appalachian" customs and traditions, but did not do so primarily because he thought it would tend to make some people feel left out of the questionnaire. This feeling of separation would apply to anyone who could not claim an Appalachian background, but especially African-American Cabbagetowners, based on the
author's view of Cabbagetown's Appalachian roots as White. A second reason for not attaching any label to "customs . . ." was because he thought the geographical term, just like the neighborhood's name, would not be seen in a purely objective light, but in various ways both positive and negative. Two contrasting examples would be a nostalgic, idyllic view of the South's more rural past and, on the other hand, a perjorative image of Appalachian people as prejudiced and unsophisticated, or, in the common contemporary reference, "hicks."

In addition, an observer could indeed question the placement of this question, since physical preservation was the author's most important concern in the entire questionnaire, and he could have therefore placed questions dealing with it at the document's beginning. Viewing the matter from a different standpoint, the author felt that breaking up the flow of inquiries which were more clearly related to historic preservation would tend to decrease the potential unease or even suspicion as to his purposes (as mentioned under "Purposes of the Questionnaire" above), and therefore bias of residents, still further.

B4. The author saw this as a simple and direct way to deal with an obvious, primary concern of preservation. The major reason for the broadness of this question, besides a strong emphasis on very simple language throughout the document, was that the author felt unable to raise the matter of housing preservation in a deeper way while still remaining unbiased.
One suggested question which the author rejected, though it clearly raised the complexity of saving old homes, was that of the Reverend Craig Taylor. In an critique of the final, as yet-to-be utilized questionnaire, he wrote: "If preserving the older houses or building duplicates of them means they will cost more than present residents can afford, which is more important, historic preservation or providing housing to lower-income residents?" (2) While this potential question directly raised the conflict of values between traditional concerns of historic preservation, such as the maintenance of historic integrity, and lower-income housing, with its often less costly emphasis on adequate shelter, the author felt it was not balanced.

B5. This question was encouraged by neighborhood leaders Esther Lefever and Joyce Brookshire, but came about primarily because the author saw a kind of competition for survival between cultural and physical preservation, coming out of his concern, stated on p. 266, that gentrification would be likely to destroy the existing neighborhood culture. He was very curious to see if residents felt this way about the two forms of preservation, and, again, what their major values and appreciations were. He also felt that "gentrifiers" and "longtimers" would differ in their answers, and wanted to test that prediction.

B6. This question was seen by the author as an imaginative and enjoyable way to relieve the seriousness and broadness of
the questions around it. Also, in a hypothetical way, it was used to raise a major aim of all preservation efforts, which is to see structures preserved, if not for "forever," than for a very long time to come. The question was suggested by Dr. Timothy Crimmins of the Heritage Preservation program at Georgia State University.

B7. Here, the author wanted to gain a sense of peoples' views of the design controls which Cabbagetown had as a city historic district, to the extent that they placed any importance on the issue.
C. NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES - CABBAGETOWN

[Please answer "yes" or "no" on a scale of 1 to 5 for some questions, "1" meaning you totally approve of an issue or activity and "5" meaning you totally disapprove of an issue or activity.]

C1. Would you support reusing the old Mill buildings?

1 2 3 4 5

IF YES...

A. Do you think their reuse could provide jobs to the people in this neighborhood?

B. Can you offer any (other) ideas of how they can be used?

C. Do you think that they are historically important?

IF NO...

D. Do you think they should be replaced by something new? [If "3" or something similar is given above, the wording of this question may be adapted.]

If Yes...

E. Do you think the site should be used for industry?

F. Can you offer any other ideas of what this construction should be?

G. In any event, do you think the Mill buildings are historically important?

If No...

H. Do you think that they should continue to remain vacant for the time being?

I. Do you think the Mill buildings are historically important?
NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES - CABBAGETOWN

Introductory Comments

The author saw the series of questions on pages 4 through 7 as fulfilling two purposes:

First, providing an accurate reflection on the most important issues in Cabbagetown in recent years, including two concerns - the Mill and gentrification - which the author saw as essential elements in connection with his own emphases;

Second, providing a helpful context for understanding the neighborhood attitudes (again as brought up under "Purposes of the Questionnaire" above); the author assumed that he would analyze questionnaire answers when he was away from Cabbagetown, and felt he should have a readily available sense (and reminder) of the "puzzle" of neighborhood elements.

Common Elements

Continuum  The continuum, or scale going from 1 to 5, was used because the author had viewed it as a favorable element in many surveys over the years, both scholarly and more topical
ones. In taking the latter type of survey "on the street," this element had made surveys easier, and therefore more enjoyable for the author, and he thought this would prove to be the case with his Cabbagetown respondents.

"YES" and "NO" Questions While the author felt these would increase the clarity of peoples' feelings once he had determined their basic position on an issue, they were meant as guidelines from which he knew a mixture of questions might occasionally be appropriate in cases where a resident was clearly ambivalent or uncertain about an issue. Someone, for example, might have basically liked the Piggyback Yard, but still have been worried about its potential for negative effects such as noise or chemical spills.

The Mill

C1A. The author placed this question before other secondary ones because he thought the issue of whether or not a rejuvenated Mill could provide jobs to the people of the neighborhood was the most important one to ask, especially in a section of major unemployment such as Cabbagetown.

C1B. The first intent of this question was to get a sense of what types of preservation different people wanted. Secondly, overlapping with that, the author wanted at least a partial
answer as to whether or not there were strong ideas held in common for the Mill throughout Cabbagetown or if there were seriously clashing views as to purposes for the factory complex.

C1C. While a positive response to this question would be obvious for many people, including some Cabbagetown residents, the author wanted to allow for those residents who might perceive the complex in purely practical terms as either a huge physical resource or an impediment.

C1D - I. The author sees these questions as self-explanatory, except for the final three ones. With C1G and C1I, he thought that reasonable people might well think the Mill was highly significant to the development of both the neighborhood and the city, but that it had clearly outlived its usefulness. Regarding C1H, he felt there might be at least a handful of people who thought the Mill's time for redevelopment was still not at hand - and one could certainly argue that had already been the case for 15 years - but that it might be too valuable in the future to demolish it.
C2A. As you may know, this neighborhood has an organization called CRAFT, the Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust, Inc. CRAFT is a "land trust," which holds ownership for land on which houses stand to protect the homes from major price increases. It is renovating homes and building new ones, and would like to sell these to neighborhood residents.

From what you know about CRAFT at this point, do you support their efforts?

1 2 3 4 5

C2B. You may also be aware that a group called Habitat for Humanity is building 9 homes in the neighborhood in October and November. It is also giving first choice to people who live in this neighborhood. Among other things, successful applicants for homes are not charged interest on their monthly mortgage payments and they perform 125 hours of house-building work, which is equivalent to about 5 full days of work.

From what you know about Habitat’s plans at this point, do you support their efforts?

1 2 3 4 5
CRAFT and Habitat Programs

As of the Summer of 1989, the author objectively observed that the CRAFT and Habitat programs were certainly the most timely matters in Cabbagetown. In terms of significance, Habitat seemed relatively minor, as an effort consisting of nine structures. CRAFT, on the other hand, and how it handled its roles in fostering socioeconomic preservation and leadership, arguably made up the most important matter facing Cabbagetown as the neighborhood entered the 1990’s. In addition to asking these questions because of their issues’ respective significances, the author thought answers to them would clearly shed light on what type of housing preservation and construction residents wanted.

While a one-sentence question was initially considered on CRAFT alone (see p. 247) - the author ultimately used descriptive paragraphs (including one on Habitat as well) for two reasons:

1) the good chance that some residents might be unfamiliar with the programs, but especially Habitat, which was still discussing its housing plans with residents in mid-1989. (CRAFT, as stated in the thesis introduction, had only been founded in April, 1988.)

2) the author’s feeling that these paragraphs would provide a common basis on which to evaluate peoples’
The author felt he wrote easy-to-understand descriptions of both organizations' programs. On the slightly more involved matter of crafting objective explanations, the author would admit to a personal bias towards each of these efforts, but feels he has succeeded in this regard. He would note elements in each description which might be unappealing to some people, such as the communal ownership of land by CRAFT and the work obligation mandated by Habitat. In addition, at least with Habitat, its newness within Cabbagetown meant that its emphasis was weighted more towards intentions, which will naturally be positive, than towards products, which will usually get widely varying marks.
C3. On a scale of 1 to 5, again [re-explain if necessary], do you think this neighborhood needs new people moving into it?

1  2  3  4  5

IF YES...

C3A. Do you think the neighborhood should have people with different income levels?

If Yes...

C3B. Are you in favor of middle- or upper-income people restoring houses here and living in them?

IF NO... [FOR "NO" IN EITHER C3, C3A, OR C3B, and/or for answers which have not referred to the subject]

C3C. Would you say that lower-income people have had to move out because of new residents?

C3D. In terms of [lower-income people having to move out -or- this happening] would you say there has been: ___a little ___some ___a lot
"New People" / Gentrification

C3-C3B. The author felt these questions were justified in light of the powerful opposition which had been voiced against gentrification in Cabbagetown throughout the 1980's. He spoke of "new people" with the assumption that the term would direct respondents to think about the most prominent group of newcomers to Cabbagetown in recent years, specifically the younger, usually entry-level (and generally college-educated) professionals who came in as homeowners or with intentions to own homes very shortly. The two other groups of "newer" Cabbagetowners - Blacks and Hispanics, were, respectively, not as recent in their entry as residents, or not nearly as important in numbers and impact. While C3 would seem to have an obviously positive answer to many people (as with earlier questions here such as the one on the neighborhood's historical importance), the author felt its lack of any assumptions to that effect provided a clean slate upon which to determine the basic position of respondents. In a similar manner, with C3C's inquiry on economic displacement, where a negative answer would seem obvious to many observers, the author also wanted to shed any personal assumptions. From there, as one could see, he planned to ask either positive or negative questions.

The author posed question C3B because he was anxious to see if interviewees would indeed make a connection between
historic preservation and gentrification (as he had of course hypothesized they would) when the two subjects were deliberately brought up side by side. He used the word "restoring" as opposed to one like "fixing" because he thought it would at least implicitly call to mind the idea of historic preservation, and not simply renovation. In regards to his emphasis on simple language, he felt the word "restore" would be understood by his respondents. (Here, as elsewhere, the author would say that because he could not be sure of the meaning of a word or words to respondents, the implications of answers are more difficult to draw.)

With C3C, like C3 and C3A, one could also say that the answer - here, a negative one - would seem obvious to many observers, and just as with those first two questions, the author wanted to shed any assumptions and start, in essence, from the beginning. Also, and again relating to the importance of using simple vocabulary, was the author's choice of the phrase "...have had to move out..."; In the first version of the questionnaire, and a draft of the final one, the author used the term "economic displacement," until advisors pointed out that such a term would not be comprehensible to many people.

Through question C3D, the author hoped to get a better idea of how critical people felt displacement was. In addition, this inquiry was based on the view that resident perceptions are important, whether they underemphasize or
exaggerate a process or activity.
C4. Were you in favor of the CSX Piggyback facility?

1 2 3 4 5

IF YES...

A. Did you see it as a way to bring jobs into the neighborhood?

B. Did you think that it would be a good way to begin reusing the Mill buildings?

C. Did you think that CSX built the facility with sensitivity to the neighborhood in terms of the way it looked, its noise level, and so on?

IF NO...

D. Did you feel that the facility would bring too much noise and pollution to the neighborhood?

E. Did you think that there was a risk of chemical spills or something similar from the facility?

F. Did you think that the facility's being here would lower property values?

G. Did you think that CSX finally built the facility with sensitivity to the neighborhood in terms of the way it looked, its noise level, and so on?
The Piggyback Yard

Although the author would not suggest that this development constituted the most important issue for Cabbagetown on a long-range basis, it may well have been the most highly-publicized issue connected with the neighborhood during the 1980's. (See pp. 349-350 in the bibliography for a sampling of articles on the Piggyback debate.)

The author's wording of the "lead question" here was based on the assumption that most residents would have arrived in Cabbagetown as recently as 1986, just after the proposed project had finally been approved and construction began.

C4A, as with the earlier question on jobs and the Mill, was also in the first place among its fellow "subsidiary" questions because of the author's orientation to job creation being a crucial neighborhood issue.

In a like manner, C4B echoed the question on ideas for the Mill's reuse because it too was viewed as a way to probe peoples' preferences in preservation. It was also included because the argument that the Yard was an excellent way to stimulate the Mill's reuse had been a key point by Cabbagetown leaders who supported the Yard, especially the Patch's Esther Lefever.

C4C and G were based on the steps CSX took to gain community acceptance, chiefly the large wall bordering the Yard's southern end which has served as a noise and visual
barrier, along with its murals and the planting in front of it.

The trio of "negative" questions (C4D-F) was derived from the most frequently voiced arguments against the Piggyback plan as seen in newspaper articles. Basically these were environmental and economic. The former ones were led by the concern (or fear) of chemical spills. The latter centered on the idea that the facility would greatly discourage the rebirth of "intown" neighborhoods which opponents saw as so critical to Atlanta's future; through reference to "property values," in question F, the author felt that he at least touched on this large idea in a simple manner.
D. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

D1. How long have you lived in the neighborhood?

D2. Did you have parents or grandparents here?

D3. Why do you live in this neighborhood?

D4. Are you involved in any... neighborhood organizations or clubs?
   (D5.)____ churches in this part of town?
   (D6.)____ citywide groups?

D7. If so, could you please say which ones?

D8. Do you rent or own your home?

D9. What is your occupation?

D10. What school or schools have you attended/do you attend?

D11. I have four age groups listed here:
    children (up to age 18)
    young adults (up to age 35)
    middle-aged adults (up to age 65)
    senior citizens (above age 65)

    Would you be willing to give your age group or age?

D12. Would you care to say your name?

Thank you for participating in this survey!
Background Questions

Overall Comments

The initial justification which led to the inclusion of these questions was simply that the author had seen such inquiries in a positive light as a part of so many other attitudinal questionnaires and surveys, just as he noted above in regards to the well-known response scale or continuum. He would also observe that the primary reason, or at least one of the primary reasons that such inquiries are used elsewhere, was the major reason here, that reason being that such answers can determine or suggest influences on peoples' viewpoints.

Secondly, just as with the "Issues" questions (see p. 271), the author saw these inquiries as offering a kind of reminder when he analyzed his results after leaving Cabbagetown. He felt this last page would provide specific impressions to help his interviewees to remain more than just words on paper, and thus increase the meaningfulness of all of their words.

A final point concerns the placement of these questions. At first, the author saw them merely as a way to become acquainted with each respondent. In the end, their placement at the end was influenced by an observation in the methodology of the aforementioned thesis of Kip Wright (pp. 141-142);
Wright stated that such questions, being personal, often have a high rate of refusal.

Reasons for Particular Questions

D1. With both this question and D8, the author hoped to gain a strong impression of the commitment, or "stake," which Cabbagetowners had in their neighborhood.

D2. The author had heard that Cabbagetown had a strong core of long-term families, including a number who went back three or four generations, having been attracted there in the earliest decades of the Fulton Mill. Here, he hoped to either reinforce or contradict that sense of the neighborhood. [This impression was seconded to some extent, with 28 of the 51 "oldtime" respondents being in the second generation of their families to reside in Cabbagetown; 15 of these 28 were in at least the third such generation.]

D3. The author felt that answers to this question would offer a kind of summary of individuals’ thoughts about their neighborhood, encouraged partly by his having indicated that the questionnaire was coming to a close. He also felt that there was a possibility of an overlap, but just a small one, with the interview’s first questions on neighborhood likes and dislikes.

D4-7. These questions were seen as important because of the
two-way influence of group affiliation: while groups as a whole help to determine the balance of housing options, lifestyles, etc., in an area, as the Cabbagetown Neighborhood Association (with its co-op) and the Cabbagetown Restoration Society did in the early 80’s, individuals within these groups contribute to shaping common views within the group as with the case of the aggressive leadership of the Restoration Society’s Mary Bankester during the fight against the Piggyback proposal. (See note 8 on p. 328.) From what he knew about neighborhood associations, both before and after doing the questionnaires, the author thought knowledge of a respondent’s group affiliations could only add to the sense of influences on that person.

Another point, in reference just to D5, is that, like earlier and later inquiries, this might either reinforce or contradict another prevailing image of Cabbagetown, in this case, that of the perceived religiousness of many of its long-time inhabitants. (3)

D8. Besides the reason in common with D1 (please see above), the author was yet again seeking to confirm or deny a neighborhood image. Here, it was that Cabbagetown had many longstanding renters and very few oldtimers who were owners. [This image was confirmed, as based on the fact that only 16 of the 51 longtime interviewees were owners of their residences or part of families led by resident owners.]

D9-11. The author would basically echo reasons supplied in
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the "Introductory Comments" above, that these were seen as matter-of-fact questions about residents.

With D10, the author wanted to either reinforce or go against perceptions of gentrifiers or newcomers as much more educated than oldtimers and in general, get a sense of how formal and/or informal education may have influenced peoples' views. [On the former, and simpler matter, newcomers had received an average of 14.5 years of formal education, while oldtimers had averaged 9.5 years of education in an official sense.]

D12. Here, the author very much hoped to remove one final barrier to confidentiality and to aid his major initial emphasis of using actual Cabbagetowners' names in the thesis. (See pp. 147-148 in regards to his ultimate decision to use pseudonyms.)
APPENDIX 3

STUDIES RELATING TO ATTITUDES TOWARDS PRESERVATION
Opening Comments

Here, the author will first describe six writings or areas of research which he came across in his studies and which relate to attitudes towards preservation. These studies are presented in order of their similarities and relevance to the author's work. (For full citations, please see the bibliography under "Attitudinal Studies," on pp. 351-352.) Following these descriptions, the author comments on inquiries to fourteen authorities, in various fields, as part of his effort to find studies which could realistically be considered counterparts of his research. While unsuccessful in this search, here and during his researches as a whole, the author feels that his lack of success heightens the unusual nature, and hence, the addition to scholarship, of his study.

Among attitudinal researches which the author saw, the work of folklorist and preservationist Michael Ann Williams seemed to be most similar to his own in terms of her efforts and orientations to her subjects. Williams, for one, has emphasized the need for preservationists to study the intangible aspects of their field. Secondly, like the author, and like Kevin Lynch, below, she has grappled with rudimentary questions; a primary one underlying the essay discussed here (1) is whether or not the inhabitants of areas which she is studying even care about their historic surroundings in the first place. The fact that her studies have largely been set in the Appalachian South might assist in future explorations of areas with an urban Appalachian component such as Cabbagetown. (2)

In the essay here, Williams focuses in retrospect on fieldwork which she performed in the early 1980's in rural, lower-income areas of Western North Carolina. There, working on her dissertation, she was especially interested in
attitudes towards the abandonment and alterations of former family homesteads. She comments that on the surface, acts such as the disuse of these structures, and, in many cases, the use of them for firewood, would obviously be seen by many outsiders as hostile to preservation. Looking more deeply, however, she explains that these behaviors are not necessarily a "rejection of traditional aesthetics and lifestyles." (3)

Williams points out that one major reason for the abandonment of "old homeplaces," as she collectively labels these structures, is that inheritance patterns in the area did not generally allow for their reuse by the grown children of a family. In a psychological sense, many people who she interviewed feel that no single branch of their family should actually occupy the homeplace because, as the dwelling for an important forebear, it should instead be equally shared in a spiritual sense by all members of the family. More importantly, a home - or its walls, roofs, foundations and so on - is simply not as important as all of the memories attached to it. "Perhaps it is for this reason," Williams says, commenting on the people she studied, "that individuals preserve stories about old houses better than they preserve the structures themselves." (4)

Addressing fellow folklorists, and, to some extent, preservationists in general, Williams at one point summarizes her key proposals for the field of folk architectural preservation. Her concerns can, for the most part, be linked
by their common stress on the human side of physical conservation. Her first statement, for example, includes a need, as she sees it, to define the "rights of individuals and communities affected by the interventionist nature of preservation." She ends her presentation of proposals by saying that although "the object of our study is tangible, we need to question our own assumptions, as well as those of public programs that give priority to the physical entity, making its preservation and documentation an end in itself." (5)


Throughout his career, planner Kevin Lynch explored how city dwellers perceived their surroundings. *What Time Is This Place?*, a collection of essays, deals in particular with peoples' feelings about historic features of the cityscape. Lynch largely approaches this topic, as does Williams above, from the most basic question of whether or not people have any concern about historic features.

His chief conclusion is that people - at least those he has studied - have little concern or consciousness regarding historic structures, generally speaking, especially about these places as subjects in and of themselves. Older elements of communities do acquire importance in connection with the
most personally significant parts of individuals' pasts, such as highpoints in their own childhood, those of their parents' or closest friends' lives, or perhaps the lives of their grandparents. Lynch says that "[w]e are interested in a street on which our father may have lived as a boy [because] it helps to explain him to us and strengthens our own sense of identity. But our grandfather or great-grandfather, whom we never knew, is already in the remote past; his house is 'historical'" (6)

The findings of this esteemed thinker and those of Michael Ann Williams above may be seen as very similar, especially in both writers saying that people value the intangible aspects of their past much more than tangible ones. Lynch, however, perhaps largely because his primary focus was on major cities as opposed to the rural setting with which Williams has dealt, gave greater importance to peoples' physical attachments. At one point, he says that occasionally, a threat to the most symbolic and historic landmarks in a city will bring those buildings to the fore of citizens' consciousnesses as they fight to save them. In addition, on a much smaller scale, human beings do want to hold on to objects with strong personal connections, such as their own furniture or family mementos. And, like colonists from Classical times onwards, mobile Americans moving to new communities will often energetically seek out sections of cities which remind them of their childhood homes. (7)
In this study, an anthropologist - Setha Low, and an architect - William Ryan, collaborated in investigating a rural area in Southeastern Pennsylvania, the Oley Valley, located 50 miles northwest of Philadelphia. Their work contributed to a rural preservation project undertaken by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In a narrow sense, they wanted to find out what physical elements of the Valley’s farmhouses were seen as typical by residents. More broadly speaking, they wanted to provide a model for bridging a communication gap in environmental perceptions between professionals and nonprofessionals, and thereby work towards better community planning. (8)

The survey the two collaborators composed was centered on 11 sets of drawings that showed area farmhouses which were both real and imagined, but realistic. Each set focused implicitly on different physical elements such as windows, doors, and front steps, and each was accompanied by three questions:

1. Which of these drawings looks most like a farmstead/farmhouse that you would find in the Oley Valley?
2. Which of these drawings looks least like a farmstead/farmhouse that you would find in the Oley Valley?
3. Which of the remaining drawings look like farmstead/farmhouses that might be found in the Oley Valley?
(A set of drawings from the survey may be seen on p. 297.)

Here, similarities with the studies of Michael Ann Williams can again be brought up, in the sense that Low and Ryan, like her, emphasize that professionals give more attention to how laypeople perceive their environment. In a report on the Oley Valley project, they defend this not just as ethical, but as practical, saying that "the public's perception of the compatibility of historic images and new designs influences community participation, support, and acceptance of planning proposals." Low and Ryan feel that what they have proposed can structure discussion between professionals and the public that focuses on structural elements and concrete images, and that "there are no limits to the use of a similar methodology for working with community groups to determine visually acceptable change." (9)
Figure A3-1. Drawings used in Oley Image Study in regards to typical porch configurations for the area’s homes (1982)
A3A-4. Kip Wright, "Historic Preservation Polls: Purpose, Method and Application" (Master’s Thesis in Historic Preservation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1990)

At approximately the same time that the author began his thesis research in Atlanta, another graduate student in historic preservation - Kip Wright, at the University of Georgia in Athens, was completing his. Wright also began with a strong interest in public attitudes towards preservation, although his concerns and especially his approaches to his topic varied noticeably from those of the author.

Wright particularly emphasized the question of how to measure peoples' perceptions of the economic impact of historic preservation in their communities. He sought to grapple with views on the intangible economic benefits of preservation, including aesthetics and community pride, which could not be presented through economic data or statistics. (10) His questions included ones on whether residents thought historic structures were important facets of their communities and whether they thought they were useful to local tourism. (The first page of his survey is shown on p. 299.)

Wright’s poll was composed, executed and tabulated with close attention to widely accepted statistical and demographic principles, as contrasted with the author’s impressionistic questionnaire. Wright oversaw volunteers from the University of Georgia’s School of Environmental Design who randomly
Hello, my name is ______. I'm calling for the University of Georgia School of Environmental Design. We are conducting a telephone poll concerning historic preservation in (CITY). We would like to take a few minutes of your time to discuss some of the issues in your community. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential. (Pause)

Q1. We would like to ask you how you feel about the old, historic buildings of (CITY). In general, how important are these buildings to your city? Are they very important, important, somewhat important, or not important?

[1] 1. VERY IMPORTANT 98. DON'T KNOW
   2. IMPORTANT
   3. SOMewhat IMPORTANT
   4. NOT IMPORTANT

Q2. In your opinion, what makes a building historic? (DO NOT READ LIST. CIRCLE ALL THAT ARE GIVEN)

[2] 2. ASSOCIATED WITH HISTORIC PERSON [SKIP TO Q4.] 98. DON'T KNOW
   4. ASSOCIATED WITH HISTORIC EVENT [SKIP TO Q4.] 99. MISSING
   8. AGE [GO TO Q3.]
   16. ARCHITECTURAL STYLE OR DESIGN [SKIP TO Q4.] 32. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) [SKIP TO Q4.]

IF AGE

Q3. How old should a building be in order to be considered historic? _____ YEARS OLD 99. MISSING/NOT APPLICABLE

Q4. When you think of (CITY), what historic buildings, sites, or neighborhoods come to mind? [LIST RESPONSES]

[4-13]
   1. __________________________________________ 98. DON'T KNOW
   2. __________________________________________ 99. MISSING
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________

Q5. Some communities insure the preservation of their historic places by creating a historic preservation ordinance. A preservation ordinance protects historic homes and businesses by requiring the owners of such structures to receive permission for outside changes. If the owners want to tear down the historic structure or make an addition, they must first receive approval from a commission of local citizens appointed by the city government. Do you favor or oppose a preservation ordinance for (CITY)?

[14] 1. FAVOR 98. DON'T KNOW
   2. OPPOSE 99. MISSING

Q6. Does (CITY) have either a historic preservation ordinance or historic zoning?

[15] 1. YES 98. DON'T KNOW
   2. NO 99. MISSING

Q7. In general, which do you prefer: using historic buildings for new purposes, or demolishing them and constructing new buildings?

[16] 1. USING HISTORIC BUILDINGS FOR NEW PURPOSES 98. DON'T KNOW
   2. DEMOLISHING AND CONSTRUCTING NEW BUILDINGS 99. MISSING
   3. DEPENDS ON THE BUILDING

Figure A3-2. Opening page of historic preservation poll designed by University of Georgia graduate student Kip Wright and completed under his oversight in 1989.
telephoned groups of private citizens in the Georgia cities of Macon, Athens and Rome.

A3A-5. Soulard Committee for a Fair Historic Code, "Soulard Historic District Survey" (St. Louis, Missouri, 1990)

In 1990, the Soulard neighborhood of St. Louis, Missouri was in the midst of a major debate over what direction it would take as a historically protected neighborhood under city law. During this controversy, which is covered here in the author’s contextual chapter on pages 207-208 and 211-212, the temporarily established Soulard Committee for a Fair Historic Code developed and disseminated a survey on the matter. Their document was mailed to each of Soulard’s 1400 households and completed by 712 residents.

This 29-question survey may be described as having two sections. Its first seven questions are largely general, such as one which asked whether people thought the Soulard section needed a historical code at all and one which inquired as to whether respondents were familiar with the code in use at the time. Its remaining twenty-two questions, for the most part, were very specific; examples included one asking whether address plates should be regulated in any historic district code and another which asked whether certain materials should be allowed for new sidewalks. Despite the very local,
specific and sometimes dry feeling of the survey, it represents universal concerns regarding the clash of preservation-related values which has often taken place over historic district regulations.


The concept of "antiquarianism environment disposition" was coined and developed by social scientist G.E. McKechnie in the mid-1970's as a way to measure peoples' response to older aspects of their environment. In a 1977 article, McKechnie presented a 20-point scale asking questions about peoples' responses to old books, antiques, furniture, homes, historic landmarks and so on. (11)

In his research, the author first came across this idea as it was utilized by geographer Stephen Golant in his 1984 book A Place to Grow Old and articles which emanated from it. (12) Both the book and articles presented the results of a survey which sought to answer the question of how subjective responses to the quality of one's environment influence estimations of older peoples' overall satisfaction with life. In his study, Golant oversaw interviews of 400 senior citizens in Evanston, Illinois, a middle-class suburb of Chicago.

The preservation-related measurement highlighted here was
of course one of a number of ways to measure peoples' reactions to their surroundings. At the same time, it was more significant as a measure than many would expect. As a framework for his questions, Golant set up five categories relating to psychological and demographic differences between people. The first category contained three aspects of personality: "perceived locus of control," which deals with individuals' levels of control over their lives and their environments, "dominance-submission," used to gauge levels of strength and forcefulness in interpersonal relationships, and finally, the aspect of antiquarianism environment disposition. This component was seen as especially important for older people because of the prediction that if individuals were more positive towards older objects that they would be much more likely to have come to terms with their own oldness. Not surprisingly, Golant found that interviewees with the three qualities of seeing themselves as having greater control over their lives, having more dominant personalities and being "more favorably disposed toward old or historical aspects of their environment" were more satisfied with their lives. (13)
Section A3B. **Authorities Consulted in Efforts to Find Studies Similar to the Author’s Thesis**

As one phase in his search for studies on attitudes towards preservation, the author reached fifteen authorities who would be likely to know if any studies specifically like his own existed. These contacts came from a variety of fields, ranging from Lee Adler, with his national reknown for inner-city housing preservation in Savannah, Georgia, to Dennis Gale, a pioneer in studies on gentrification during the 1970’s and 1980’s. Two of them - Michael Ann Williams and Stephen Golant, came from the ranks of scholars discussed just above. All fifteen contacts here are listed in Part II of the Bibliography, under "Attitudinal Studies - Consultations" (pp. 352-353).
APPENDIX 4

A PROFILE OF CABBAGETOWN
One of the author's strongly positive impressions of Atlanta's Cabbagetown has been of the great diversity of Cabbagetown's people, which the author has felt privileged to explore and attempt to understand. Diversity, or the lack of a single unifying characteristic, may be the most important quality of Cabbagetown today. Furthermore, even an observer biased against gentrification would admit that that process has helped to make Cabbagetown more interestingly varied. The author fervently hopes that this diversity, along with Cabbagetown's physical stock, will be preserved.

It is true that Cabbagetown's people are still predominantly low-to-moderate income Whites. However, very few of them meet longstanding, 19th and 20th-century stereotypes of Southern whites, whether it be Bible-thumping Baptists, rigid Segregationists, "good 'ol boys," or, more particularly to Cabbagetown, Appalachian hillbillies. They can be divided into at least three groups: long-time homeowners, whose chief concentration is on three well-kept blocks in the southwestern corner of the neighborhood, long-time renters, more scattered in residence, and transients, more likely to be in the less-rehabilitated eastern section of Cabbagetown.

Cabbagetown's small group of gentrifiers is also
admittedly dominated by one group. Here, as in other transitional, "off-beat" neighborhoods, homosexuals have been among the first gentrifiers. Observers have estimated that they comprise about 75% of the neighborhood's gentrifying group. (1)

Both within and outside of the homosexual community, though, there is an economic diversity. The author's original expectation that at least one-third of the people in the gentrifying category would be among the "yuppies" (young urban professionals) whose stereotype became entrenched in the 1980's was clearly not met. One gentrifier, among a few others, might illustrate the type, as an information systems specialist in his late 20's who is most likely on a rising career track. Two others, however, reminded the author of the range of income levels present; one is a struggling historic renovator while the other, more surprisingly, is a lady in her late 50's who holds down two jobs, as a check-out worker in a Kroger's grocery store and as a hairdresser.

This diversity is a major contributor to a sense of liveliness, and at times, of tension, in Cabbagetown. In addition, it is easy to see the ferment of activity that has occurred there within the short lifespan of an older Cabbagetown teenager. The closing of the Mill, the coming and going of the controversial Co-op and the construction of the Piggyback Yard are only a few of the changes that have taken place.
Despite these events, and Cabbagetown not being a forgotten backwater, it is also, in part, still isolated and insulated, with both negative and positive results. Its isolation is most noticeable physically, at least on two sides of the neighborhood. To the west lies the stone wall of Oakland Cemetery, with the pastoral landscape of the burial ground beyond it (photo A4-1, p. 308). To the north is the larger concrete wall of the Piggyback Yard, followed by a bustling and sometimes noisy expanse of activity (photo A4-2, p. 309). Adjacent to the Yard is the elevated eastbound train line of "MARTA" (the Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transportation Authority), which is, in a way, a still higher barrier (photo A4-3, p. 310).

Cabbagetown’s traditional lower-income white community is isolated both socially and racially, perhaps more than it was 20 or 30 years ago. By the mid-1970’s, rapid White flight had occurred in large areas to the neighborhood’s south and east. Three miles to the southeast, for example, East Atlanta High School went from having a 71% White student majority to a 70% Black population in just two years, 1970 and 1971. Within the city as a whole, Cabbagetown is today practically the only lower-income white concentration. While 30% of Atlanta’s population is White, nearly all of these people are middle- or upper-class. Even as early as 1974, only 6% of the City’s poor were White, almost all of them confined to three neighborhoods including Cabbagetown. (2)
Photo A4-1. Oakland Cemetery from the east side of Boulevard just above Carroll.
Photo A4-2. Piggyback Yard unloaders as seen from Cabbagetown Park at Powell and Wylie Streets. (The Atlanta skyline is visible in the background.)
Photo A4-3. The MARTA line and the Georgia Railroad as seen from Boulevard Street above DeKalb Avenue.
It is largely because of this physical and demographic isolation that there is a well-developed sense of separateness and of pride in the neighborhood. Sometimes, this becomes defensive. One of only two or three unfriendly moments experienced by the author in this very friendly neighborhood came when he positioned himself to photograph a heap of rubble from a residence demolished to make way for a new Habitat for Humanity house (photo A4-4, p. 312). A young teenager, standing nearby with three younger friends, forcefully told the author not to take the picture, saying that photographers coming through Cabbagetown only show what is bad about it. (3)

Many times though, the pride in Cabbagetown is wonderful. During his time there, the author heard of five people who have claimed themselves to be "mayors" of Cabbagetown in recent years, and had the honor of meeting four of those individuals. Two of his interviewees, in responding to a question on whether Cabbagetown was historically important to the "city or a larger area," semi-seriously asserted that it should be internationally prominent. The author heard various expressions of love for the neighborhood; a common refrain was that "I wouldn't live anywhere else even if I was a millionaire!" People frequently stated, with enthusiasm, how friendly they felt their neighborhood was.

In addition, people clearly know where they live - but many in a different sense than an outsider might. Partly because of its name, some people see Cabbagetown as a town,
Photo A4-4. Demolition for new Habitat for Humanity houses, Tye Street below Wylie.
saying, for example, "You’ll not meet unfriendly people if you come in this town . . . ." [Parnell Ollison, 8/20-U(unfinished)]. One man in his late 50’s said "this city exists around us," thinking primarily of both Cabbagetown’s racial isolation and its special distinctiveness, historically and culturally. [Jimmy Delton, 8/27-3.] With the basic goal in preservation of maintaining a sense of place, the author hopes that positive feelings of a special location will remain a part of Cabbagetown for quite some time to come.
1. **ABBREVIATIONS**

1A. **Newspapers and Periodicals**

**Atlanta**

**AC** - *Atlanta Constitution*  
**AJ** - *Atlanta Journal*  
**AJ & C** - *Atlanta Journal & Constitution*  
**IX** - *Intown Extra* (community news and affairs supplement to the Journal and Constitution)

**National**

**HP** - *Historic Preservation* (the bi-monthly magazine of the National Trust for Historic Preservation)  
**PN** - *Historic Preservation News* (the monthly newspaper of the National Trust for Historic Preservation)

**Contextual Examples** (Part II, Section C.)

**PD** - *The Plain Dealer* (Cleveland)  
**PI** - *The Philadelphia Inquirer* (also used outside of Section IIC.)  
**SLPD** - *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

1B. **Organizations**

**AUDC, UDC** - Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
The Patch - a Cabbagetown community center from 1971-1990

2. **EXPLANATORY NOTES**

All titles are written exactly as they appear on sources, including instances of unusual capitalization.
3. INTERVIEWS

All interviews and telephone conversations involved the author as the interviewer unless otherwise stated.

References including "Atlanta" or the name of another city signify in-person, as opposed to telephone conversations or interviews.

Introduction

1. There are various accounts of how this neighborhood received its colorful name. The most common one which the author encountered concerns a produce truck which is said to have overturned on Boulevard Street, Cabbagetown's western boundary, in the 1920's. The cabbages it spilled were eagerly taken by the people of "Factory Town," as the section was then known, and for the next week, passersby catching the scent of cabbage from the chimneys of the area gave it a new name. Another story is much the same as this one, but begins with the element of an overturned boxcar on the Georgia Railroad, which passes Cabbagetown on the north.

Whatever the story, the neighborhood's label has mixed significance among long-time Cabbagetowners. In large part, they have grown attached to it, with the fierce pride that can be seen for the neighborhood in general. Many of them however, feel it has been used to put the section in a negative light, as a place whose people have been so poor and overworked that they have only had time for cabbage dinners. [Sources: "Cabbagetown: Atlanta’s Milltown," Great Speckled Bird (Atlanta), 1971 (no month or day), n.p.; Henry Woodhead, "Cabbagetown’s Own Patch," The Atlanta Journal & Constitution Magazine, Dec. 15, 1974, p. 6.]


7. J. Jackson Walter, "Keep Our Heritage Alive" (President’s Column), *PN*, May 1990, p. 5; Jerry L. Rogers, "The Park Service: Steward and Partner," *PN*, Feb., 1992, p. 4. Other thoughts voiced in recent years extend the idea of this negative linkage. From a Philadelphia context, but one which is applicable in other cities, the author would point to 1989 remarks by Dr. Richard Tyler, the historic preservation officer of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, to students including the author at the University of Pennsylvania. Speaking of the possibility of greater preservation efforts in an architecturally rich but socially poor section of the city, Dr. Tyler suggested that "the effort to preserve a physical fabric [may run] the risk of tearing a social fabric." [Dr. Richard Tyler, discussion with students in the University of Pennsylvania’s Preservation Studio class, Oct. 23, 1989.] Another authoritative reinforcement of the concept of linkage came in the author’s March, 1990 telephone interview with Jennifer Blake, a head of the National Trust’s Inner-City Ventures Fund since the early 1980’s. Ms. Blake said that there was still "absolutely [a] widespread feeling that preservation is closely linked with gentrification," despite research countering that notion. More recently, in a January, 1993 letter to the editor of *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, Robert Skaler, a local restoration architect, argued against the prevalence of this linkage. He ended by writing that "[i]t is about time our city and federal government leaders separated the words 'gentrification' from 'preservation' in their minds and got about rebuilding our inner cities." ["Preservation can Heal," *PI*, Jan. 14, 1993, p. A16.]

8. Stuart Johnson, [paper (title not received) written for an urban history class taught by Profs. Timothy Crimmins and Dana White, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Spring 1981], pp. 1-2, 6, 19 [hereinafter identified as Johnson, GSU]


10. Any definition of gentrification should note its complex nature. On the one hand, it has been broadly and simply defined, as for example by Shirley Laska and Daphne Spain in their 1980 text Back to the City: issues in neighborhood renovation. There, the authors refer to the "central aspects of the process - young middle-class professionals . . . buying homes in those lower-income neighborhoods that contain structurally sound or attractive housing" (p. xi).

On the other hand, many scholars, including Laska and Spain, and Neil Smith and Peter Williams in their book Gentrification of the City (1986) have emphasized the complexity of the word. Smith and Williams say they will not give it a firm definition because "we are concerned with a process much broader than residential rehabilitation," including a profound restructuring of the economy (pp. 1-3).

"Gentrification," through its origin in the word "gentry," brings to mind the British upper classes. Still further complicating its use is the fact that not all writers have applied it to rehabilitators who are solidly middle-class, let alone upper-class. Canadian researcher Damaris Rose, writing in 1984, offers one illustration in speaking of "marginal gentrifiers," saying they have only moderate incomes and predominate among newcomers in some neighborhoods during a "first wave" of gentrification. ["Rethinking gentrification: beyond the uneven development of Marxist urban theory," Environment and Planning D: Society and Space vol. 2, no. 1 (1984), pp. 57-58.]


12. Readers wishing to explore the intersection of cultural and historic preservation, and to further study resident attitudes towards historic preservation are directed to a 1988 essay by folklorist Michael Ann Williams, discussed herein on pp. 291-293 in Appendix 3, "Studies Relating to Attitudes Towards Preservation."
13. Examples from Cabbagetown's experience reinforce an emphasis on social preservation being pursued in tandem with physical preservation. One illustration is seen in comments in the early 1980's by Virginia Wadsley, then the chief organizer for the Cabbagetown Neighborhood Association. Wadsley and others saw their push for housing rehabilitation as a means to the end of preserving Cabbagetown sociologically. Talking to a journalist, Wadsley spoke of how her organization perceived Cabbagetown's historical value "as a mill town, and . . . a poor town," and conveyed her feeling that "if you try to change it into a middle-class, elite kind of community, than that's not what it was historically." [Bill Cutler, "We Shall Not Be Moved / Right, Friend, and we have not yet met Priscilla House, have we?" Brown's Guide to Georgia, July, 1981, p. 34.] [Hereinafter identified as Cutler, "We Shall Not Be Moved."]

Chapter 1. Introduction to Thesis Research

1. At least two definitions stick out in connection with this reasoning, and they suggest that atypical definitions of historic preservation could influence or be influenced by negative attitudes of gentrification.

Rev. Craig Taylor (quoted on p. 20 regarding gentrification) said on the one hand that there is a standard definition - including "an attempt to preserve structures deemed historic due to age, the fame of the designer, or some unique architectural or historical event that may have occurred." He went on, however, to acknowledge the "cynical view" that historic preservation is "an attempt to recreate an environment that probably never existed in that form in the first place." He gave Williamsburg as an example, but also had Cabbagetown in mind when he spoke of particular neighborhoods whose vernacular housing led to "25 or 30 [historic] designs," but in which certain designs - "what someone thinks should have been there" - were proscribed by an entity such as the Atlanta Urban Design Commission. [Interview, Jan. 2, 1990.]

Oraien Catledge, who was not as strongly critical of gentrification as Rev. Taylor, but was certainly sympathetic to the actual and potential loss of neighborhood culture because of socioeconomic change, gave an almost spiritual and largely non-structural definition of historic preservation. While he appreciated the homes which have inescapably been linked with Cabbagetown as an historic object, he spoke very much of people and lifestyles. When asked for his definition of the field he spoke of wanting "something that would be there continuously, that you personally could enjoy." In
part, he recalled one of the most colorful residents he had photographed in Cabbagetown - an older lady who still used a wood stove and arranged skillets on her wall in the shape of a train - and he said "that’s a good example of something special you want to preserve." [Telephone interview, Dec. 28, 1989.]

2. Babbie’s work has been called "one of the best basic references" on survey research by the authors of the 1988 city planning manual of the International City Management Association (p. 485).


4. This analysis and guide is highly recommended along with Babbie’s Survey Research Methods in the planning volume of the International City Management Association (p. 485).


8. Babbie, Methods, p. 190.


10. Dandekar, "Qualitative Methods," p. 84.


3. The author would estimate that these Carroll Street
quadriplexes were built roughly between 1892-1900, based on a reference in Cabbagetown’s 1975 National Register form which says that they are "probably the second oldest houses" in the neighborhood, after those on Reinhardt Street, which were built around 1890. [National Register Inventory-Nomination Form, "Cabbagetown District," first page of physical description.]


11. A brief overview of ownership and rental patterns in Cabbagetown since 1881 displays two points: first, the section has always had a predominant demographic quality as a neighborhood of renters, especially since World War II; secondly, however, as Atlanta historian Stephen Grable demonstrated in his 1982 article on Cabbagetown (cited just above in note 8) resident/owners, while a minority in Cabbagetown since its origins, were a sizeable one before the
Depression, especially in Cabbagetown’s eastern half, farther from the Mill. [Grable, "Other Side of the Tracks," pp. 56, 62-64.]

The five federal censuses from 1950 onward, with their block-by-block statistics for urban neighborhoods, show that a majority of Cabbagetowners have remained renters, to a greater percentage than in the City of Atlanta as a whole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cabbagetown</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reference to Cabbagetown’s percentage of renters in 1960, the author would guess that a major reason for a significant drop in that figure since 1950 was the sale of all Mill-owned houses, often to individual Cabbagetown families, in the late 1950’s. 1950’s extremely small group of owners, conversely, may be set in the context of the Fulton Mill’s economic highpoint and continuing powerful influence on the neighborhood just after World War II. While the author was at first surprised with the very low percentage of renters, relatively speaking, in 1990, he believes it is due to both low-income and gentrifying successes in home-ownership during the 1980’s, and would refer the reader to explanations offered here on pp. 94-95.


13. Ole Cotton Mill Project. . . ., pp. 5-10 (see note 1); Cutler, "We Shall Not Be Moved," p. 40.

14. According to Ms. Lefever, in an interview of Aug. 29,
1989, her center was originally known just as "the get-together house." Very early on, a neighborhood boy told his grandmother "I’m goin’ down to the Patch," as in a "cabbage patch," and everybody adopted the name. To the author, a humorous coincidence in this regard was learning that "cabbage patch dolls," a nationally famous toy during the 1980’s, were manufactured in Cleveland, Georgia, a community in the North Georgia foothills that have made up the home region of so many Cabbagetowners.


Chapter 3. Historic Preservation in Cabbagetown

1. Gregory Paxton, Executive Director of the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, was one preservationist who spoke of this "ensemble" aspect as Cabbagetown's most special quality in terms of historic significance. [Interview, Atlanta, Dec. 28, 1989.]


3. Interviews, both in Atlanta on Dec. 29, 1989: Franklin Garrett and Darlene Roth.


5. While the author would still assert the special human experiences, including the backgrounds of many Cabbagetowners, a sense of this neighborhood as a cohesive mill village having a rural flavor within the "big city" has been greatly modified or discredited on a number of fronts.

Stephen Grable is generally viewed as the first Atlanta historian to go against such images of Cabbagetown, while still a student at Emory University in 1977. At that time, in a paper which provided a primary basis for his 1982 Atlanta Historical Journal article (see chapter 2's endnote 8 on p. 321), Grable sought to show that Cabbagetown was by no means a pure Southern mill village. In actuality, it evolved as a socially diverse neighborhood, especially before the Depression and particularly in the portions east of Carroll Street and the "Factory Lot." When he expanded his findings in 1982, Grable would state that the neighborhood's "reputation as a homogeneous mill village is a product of the transformation that occurred during the 1930's when textile operatives began to dominate the community." [Stephen W. Grable, "The Reality of a New South Image: Building an Urban
Cotton Mill Over Time" (Class paper for ILA 431, Emory University, Atlanta, 1977); Grable, "Other Side of the Tracks," p. 65.]

The author did not see Mr. Grable’s 1977 work, but he did study a closely-related paper — the above-mentioned 1981 report at Georgia State University by Stuart Johnson (p.317). Based on Grable’s findings, his own research, the physical similarity of Cabbagetown with adjacent neighborhoods, and other factors, Johnson concluded that Cabbagetown’s "mill-town" heritage had been overplayed in the 1970’s and into the 1980’s. In one of a number of incisive comments, he observed that the Patch had built upon the myth of Cabbagetown as a complete mill village "in order to better sell its rehabilitation proposals." [Johnson, GSU paper, pp. 10-12.]

Coming from another angle, Cabbagetown’s Mary Bankester discredited the emphasis on Cabbagetown’s rural and mill village background in her interview with the author. (Jan. 5, 1990.) Questionnaire respondent Tommy Gilford observed that "not everybody’s from North Georgia." He added semi-jokingly that "Joyce just put that in her song," referring to a 1975 song called "The Cabbagetown Ballad," written by the neighborhood’s Joyce Brookshire. [8/15-1.]

6. The poet John Greenleaf Whittier (1807-1892) was this family’s most famous relative.


10. U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form, "Cabbagetown District" (Atlanta, June 18, 1975), Statement of Significance (Section 8), first page.


Chapter 4. Development of an Attitudinal Questionnaire and its Presentation to Residents


2. Besides the 64 residents who agreed to do interviews, 22 people were unsuccessfully asked to participate as interviewees.

3. In presenting his group of respondents, the author is
reminded of an earlier study of Cabbagetown which used a much smaller sample of respondents to supplement its findings. In a 1981 Master’s of Architecture thesis at Atlanta’s Georgia Institute of Technology, Timothy Gibbons noted findings from informal interviews with six people, both Cabbagetowners and non-residents, completed as one component of his research.

Gibbons commented that while "six people are an insufficient data base from which to draw conclusions ... they did represent a large demographic cross-section of the Cabbagetown community." He went on to say that "while the six would obviously be statistically too small a sample to endorse as representative of community attitudes, they offered concerns and perceptions typical of the entire community." [Timothy Gibbons, "Citizen Participation in planning: applications for the Cabbagetown mill" (Master’s of Architecture thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 1981), pp. 120-121.]

Chapter 5. General Preservation Attitudes in Cabbagetown


6. Ann Woolner (of the "Journal Washington Bureau"), "Elderly Widow can go back to home she had 57 years," AJ,
March 2, 1982, pp. 1 & 11A.

This article's chief focus is the news that Emma Patterson, a beloved senior citizen in the neighborhood generally known by her friends as "Mama Lee," could return to her long-time home from which she had been evicted in 1981 by a major absentee landlord in Cabbagetown.

7. Auchmutey, "(F)eud."

8. As of January, 1993, Mary Bankester ended her celebrated and controversial thirteen-year residence in Cabbagetown due to unexpected commitments elsewhere. Several articles over the years stand as records of her high profile and energy in advancing her ideas for Cabbagetown, including these three examples: Gayle White, "Cabbagetown’s Future pits old against the new," AC or AJ, May 21, 1984, pp. 1A and 7A (here, Ms. Bankester is viewed as one of three major neighborhood leaders, the other two being Esther Lefever and Virginia Wadsley); Doug Blackmon, "Former piggyback foes now sing praises," AJ & C, Aug. 3, 1986, p. 2-B (highlighting her views on the Piggyback Yard after its approval by the Courts and calling her the "former leader" of the "No Intown Piggyback" group); Peter Scott, "Five Cabbagetown Houses to get original look," AC, I-X, May 19, 1988, p. 1 (quoting her in her role as an outspoken chairperson of the city "Neighborhood Planning Unit" including Cabbagetown).


A 1975 article indicates that the low-income Cabbagetown community and its leaders pursued National Register status as a further protection from demolition and redevelopment which many of them feared would swallow up Cabbagetown’s potentially valuable, near-downtown property. ["Cabbagetown-Reynoldstown Communities Work Together," AJ, April 24, 1975, n.p.] Esther Lefever reinforced this idea in an Aug. 18, 1989 interview with the author. This sense of such a use for the preservation tool of districting will be seen again in the thesis’ contextual chapter in the case of the Soulard and Tremont neighborhoods.


14. The author was at first surprised by such information, expecting an "age vanity" factor. After many responses to the question specifically regarding age – D11, on page 8 – it could be seen that a desire to keep one’s age private, at least for this impressionistic survey, existed more among newcomers.

15. The offspring of a neighborhood’s "oldtime" families, of course, often do not stay in their native section. Commenting on the Whittier Mill Village, for example, Donald Rooney (see p. 121) told the author that the younger generation of Mill-connected families has largely moved away. [Interview, Dec. 29, 1989.] South Atlanta, an historic African-American neighborhood on the city’s South Side, provides another instance of a place, which according to Rev. Craig Taylor, has lost most of the young people from its long-standing families. [Interview, Jan. 2, 1990.]

While the author would admit that Cabbagetown remains a mixture of young and old "oldtimers" largely because poverty has kept many people there, recent decades, with their call for economic improvements benefitting native residents, present a wonderful opportunity to strengthen Cabbagetown’s generational chain.


17. Enrico’s imagery of moving people into a housing project was echoed by Jimmy Delton, who was definitely the most thoughtful and thought-provoking person among long-time interviewees. Delton imagined a scenario of moving everybody out of Cabbagetown, and having "a tribe of pygmies" move in; in that case, he said Cabbagetown’s structures would not be valuable to those people, but "with the people here now, they have value, sentimental value." [Jimmy Delton, Aug. 27, 1989.]

Chapter 6. Views on Cabbagetown’s Historical Significance

Chapter 7. Housing Preservation

1. One example—the only one expressing the idea that it did—came from a lady in her early 30's; having just stated that "(You're) paying double if" you "tear an old home down (to build a new one) when all you got to do is fix the old one like it was," she added the social commentary that "all these bigshots don't have to live like we do . . . they don't realize the value of stuff." [8/27-5.] If widely held as a viewpoint, this opinion could be fertile ground for preservation in a lower-income community. While many people might agree to it in Cabbagetown, it was only expressed by this one talkative and occasionally critical respondent.

2. Starling Sutton, telephone interview, Feb. 15, 1990. Sutton reinforced his response by giving the then current example of two houses for which CRAFT had requested a demolition permit. In each case, according to Sutton, 90% of the houses' materials would have had to have been replaced. One of the one-bedroom houses would have had a total renovation price of $65,000, instead of $50,000 for a new house. The houses, at 222 and 224 Berean, are shown in photo N-1 on p. 331.

3. Bill Reitven, interview, Aug. 25, 1989, Atlanta. The other newcomer was questionnaire respondent and professional renovator Oscar Urdman [8/5-3.]

4. Reitven, Aug. 25, 1989. In talking with the author, Eileen Rhea Brown also voiced strong opposition to the demolition of the homes on Savannah Street, calling it a "travesty." (Interview, Jan. 3, 1990.)


6. The roof pitch of these new homes, for one, had to be no more than 20% greater in relation to the average pitch for all existing homes on Savannah Street. Two other examples of regulations are that porch posts must be four by four or two by two inches and that shotgun houses must have shallow setbacks from the sidewalk. [Atlanta City Code, Section 16, Chapter 20A, Section 20A.006, "Shotgun and Cottage Housing (Sub-Area 3)," "Cabbagetown Historic District Regulations," 1982, pp. 9, 10.]


8. This comment brings to mind an instance recounted to the author by Atlanta preservationist Timothy Crimmins. Based
Photo N-1. 222 and 224 Berean Street. (See note 2 for chapter 7 on p. 330.)
largely on his role as a member of the UDC, Prof. Crimmins observed that gentrifiers in Cabbagetown had tried to create a false history for the neighborhood. He cited the case of homeowners who came to the UDC proposing a chain-link fence at their residence. Middle-class neighbors argued that a picket fence would be more historically appropriate. Crimmins, in talking with the author, felt that chain-link had been the typical fencing material in Cabbagetown, at least since the 1940's and 50's, but that the "folks who had moved in had a different vision for Cabbagetown." While he and other commissioners gave the owners in this case a certificate of appropriateness, he told the author that "we wouldn't approve [the use of chain-link] in Druid Hills, emphatically referring to a noted, upper-middle class Atlanta neighborhood of the early 20th century. [Interview, Jan. 4, 1990.]

9. A second correlation was found among five groups of responses, regarding "individual rights and preferences," as the author would put it. 52-year old Dora Jillette, for example, felt residents should have personal freedom in designing new homes, and later, regarding newcomers' renovations, that "it's their business." [8/5-1.]

10. Ms. Davis, indeed, is well-known, or notorious, for her sharp tongue and provocative remarks. Once, in a public shouting match with Dan Vallone, another leader in the gentrifying community, she told him, as she recounted to the author, "to 'go back to New York with the niggers.'" [8/17-2.]


Chapter 8. The Mill (no notes)

Part II, Section C. A Context for the Case Study.

2. National Register Inventory-Nomination form, Section 8.

3. Joyce Sonn, "National Urban Displacement Policy and the Need for Granting Countervailing Power to Low Income Communities" (M.A. thesis in Urban Affairs, St. Louis University, 1987), pp. 32-34, 37, 38; Robbi Courtaway, "Souard is no longer 'obsolete,'" South City Progress Edition, Feb. 27, 1991, pp. 1A and 2A.

4. In an interview with the author, twenty-year resident Tom Cochran hinted at this split, saying that oldtimers' interest in districting, especially for the National Register, was motivated mainly by fear that their neighborhood would undergo the same massive demolition in the name of urban redevelopment which destroyed adjacent neighborhoods. [Telephone interview, Feb. 12, 1992.]

5. With regards to the first debates and divisions of the 1970's, readers are directed to Sandra Schoenberg's book Neighborhoods that Work (note 1) and its analysis of Soulard on pp. 84-100. Elaine Viets' "Tradition Could Fence Neighborhood In" (SLPD, May 8, 1990) provides a more recent example of the contentious relationships between different groups in Soulard. It focuses on a then-current allegation that SRG members posted fake fliers to cancel an SNIA-sponsored meeting (relating to the newly proposed historic code), a "trick [which] brought the animosity level to an all-time high," according to one Soulardite. SRG members vigorously denied this charge.


8. Carol Poh Miller, "Tremont pride stands up to Grace Plans," Habitat [a Cleveland real estate publication], July 24-30, 1987, pp. 11-12; Catherine L. Kissling, "Tremont's feud rooted in history / Neighborhood split by preservation rules," PD, June 24, 1990, pp. 1-B & 4-B.

9. National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form, "Spring Garden District" (Prepared by Spring


Remarks in 1980 by Robert Bruegmann, a planner and consultant, might well receive enthusiastic approval from Brandhorst, Sonn and their St. Louis allies: "[I]t is hard to escape the conclusion that [the principles of preservation] are based on nothing more solid than the current aesthetic preferences of the upper middle class. That would be simply amusing if preservationists did not eagerly seek legislation to enforce their preferences in the historic districts they have claimed as their own turf." (Robert Bruegmann, "What Price Preservation?" Planning, June 1980, p. 15.)


17. Richard Dembowski, interview, April 2, 1991, Cleveland. Jeanine Heasley, the executive director of the Tremont West Development Corporation, brought up the matter of finances in a different way, saying that some residents make a correlation between preservation and gentrification with the feeling that the only people who could afford to make changes being pushed in a district were newcomers. (Interview, by telephone, April 3, 1991.)

18. Joe Davidson, "Elfreth's Alley Plea Rejected," The
Bulletin (Philadelphia), Oct. 21, 1977, n.p. [on Planning Commission meeting]. Until the eastern section was certified in 1983, this sentiment was reiterated by Dr. Richard Tyler, the city’s Historic Preservation Officer, while he has since changed his views on the economic effects of historic certification.

National Register certification did contribute to accelerating displacement in Spring Garden, based on sources such as Robert Beauregard’s 1989 article "The many faces of gentrification" (note 11). In it, he says that in just a few years during the mid-1980’s, "almost 600 dwelling units were rehabbed with historic tax credits, and that "[i]t was this rehabilitation on a massive scale . . . that caused the displacement of a good portion of the Puerto Rican community."


20. Rev. Roger Zeppernick, interview, Feb. 27, 1992, Philadelphia. The 1985 Philadelphia Inquirer article cited above, "Cultural clash. . . ." (notes 10 and 11) reflects the sense among a portion of Spring Garden residents that their neighborhood was being destroyed by insensitive newer inhabitants.


22. Fred Andres and his wife Cecilia, telephone interview, June 18, 1991. Based on her comments in a Feb. 4, 1991 telephone interview with the author, Phyllis Young, a newcomer in the 1970’s but more recently the alderman (city councilperson) for most of Soulard, strongly agrees.

23. Fred Andres, telephone interview, Feb. 23, 1992. Reinforcements of both sides’ views as to how the historic districting dialogue proceeded are found in the article "SNIA calls for vote on code revisions / Young disputes group’s claims," written by Robbi Courtaway, on pp. 1A and 5A in the South City Journal [St. Louis] of Feb. 13, 1991.

24. Gary Grabowski, interview, Mar. 31, 1991, Cleveland. Grabowski’s remarks on leaders provoking residents were echoed by Bob Holcepl, in part through an anecdote that when new Hispanic residents moved into Tremont, one of the neighborhood’s leading social service centers rushed to put out flyers to assist them in settling into the area, but did
not do anything when the first group of artists came into Tremont, because of, according to Holcepl, a bias against them for their middle-class backgrounds. (Bob Holcepl, interview, April 1, 1991, Cleveland.)


27. Interviews: Donna Peters, Executive Director, Neighborhood Opportunities Center (Tremont), April 2, 1991, Cleveland; UnaVee Bruce, Executive Director, Concerned Citizens of Francisville, Feb. 26, 1992, Philadelphia; Tom Cochran (St. Louis), by telephone, Feb. 12, 1992; Larry Bresler, by telephone, April 1, 1991.


29. Justino Navarro, interview, April 18, 1992, Philadelphia. The two preservation projects in question were the renovation of a former school (the Darrrah Elementary School in adjacent Francisville) for residences, and the rehabilitation of mid-Nineteenth century townhouses on the 1500 block of Spring Garden’s Green Street.


31. Readers are reminded of an earlier reference - chapter 5’s note 9 (p. 328), indicating this desire for protection from development as one reason for the push by Cabbagetowners to create a National Register district in the 1970’s.


As to the fourth example of Tremont, the author would say that it is certainly likely to undergo such a debate as its redevelopment continues.

33. Mick Rossiter (questionnaire 8/12-1), for example, felt that CRAFT emphasized housing "native" and "long-time" residents too much, and risked isolating Cabbagetown from a healthy diversity. He expressed his concern as being "afraid from . . . seeing projects like these in other cities that they have a tendency to backfire, creating a permanent ghetto attitude, which is real negative. / I think it’s necessary for
CRAFT to realize they’re going to have to allow new blood into the neighborhood. [T]he neighborhood [doesn’t continue to exist] if change is not allowed to happen. . . ."


35. The author feels certain that had he conducted a very similar survey in Cabbagetown 8 to 10 years previously, during the initial period of chaos over the section’s gentrification, that feelings on the socioeconomic changes there would have obviously ran higher, and his hypothesis of connections would have been tested in more fertile ground. Based on observations like this, it may be meaningful to speak of differences between Cabbagetown and the contextual neighborhoods largely as matters of timing.

Part III. Conclusion

1. To some extent, these concerns are mirrored in a late 1980’s study of Cabbagetown by two Georgia State University students, Sabrina Flowers and Richard Putter. They stated that "[p]erhaps our biggest worry with . . . carrying out our project in Cabbagetown was whether we would be accepted by the residents. Coming from comfortable middle-class backgrounds and having little experience . . . with people from such a different cultural background," they felt they needed to be careful in not imposing their values on others. [Sabrina Flowers and Richard Putter, "Cabbagetown" (paper written for a class at Georgia State University, 1985-88 (undated), p. 11.]

2. In relation to this, see a discussion of the "Oley Image Study" on pp. 295-297, in Appendix 3, "Studies Relating to Attitudes Towards Preservation."

3. This unusual possibility, at least in a low-income setting, was brought up by Dr. Richard Tyler, the head of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, when he spoke to University of Pennsylvania students including the author in 1989. Dr. Tyler recounted the objection of a community leader when he suggested that certain very deteriorated homes might be torn down within her neighborhood, which was then a proposed historic district; she responded "Sir, you will not do that to my neighborhood." [Dr. Richard Tyler, discussion with students in the University of Pennsylvania’s Preservation Studio class, Oct. 23, 1989.]

5. While this concern will appear unreasonable to some, one anecdote reinforced its validity. One questionnaire respondent told the author that five people had asked him about the author and his on-site "investigations" within the space of a few weeks; the author would note that this respondent - Mick Rossiter (8/12-1) - was a newcomer as opposed to an older resident who would probably be more trusted by fellow neighbors in the case of such inquiries. One can imagine that such exchanges took place among other people, and another Cabbagetowner told the author, in a very friendly way, "You better watch out," namely for people who would mind what they saw as inquisitiveness.

Appendices

[Appendices 1A and 1B do not have endnotes.]

Appendix 2. A Detailed Explanation of Questionnaire Components

1. Oraien Catledge, mentioned for his photographs of Cabbagetown's people on p. 157, is one very close observer of the neighborhood who also expressed great concern regarding Cabbagetown's social transformation in the late 1980's. When he first spoke to the author in 1989, he said of Cabbagetown that "you better study it quick because it's changing fast." He noted that when he first started taking pictures of neighborhood people in 1980 that he would have to turn away potential subjects because of the abundance of interesting ones. "Now," speaking of 1989, Catledge said that "I have to really search for good pictures, because so many of the old people are gone." (Oraien Catledge, telephone conversation, July 30, 1989.)


3. A number of articles over time have shaped this image of religiousity. One example is a May 19, 1979 Atlanta Journal and Constitution report titled "Cabbagetown" (pp. 1-A and 4-A), by Michael Pousner. In it, he suggests that revival
meetings and small churches which "are packed each Sunday" are among some things about Cabbagetown [which] are timeless."

Appendix 3. Studies Relating to Attitudes Towards Preservation


2. One place in the author’s researches where connections between rural and urban Appalachian communities were brought to mind was in the Foreword to Oraien Catledge’s 1985 photo-essay Cabbagetown (see Appendix 2’s first endnote just above), written by psychologist Robert Coles. There, Coles makes the point that Appalachians transplanted to city neighborhoods such as Cabbagetown still feel a tremendous attachment to the land, "even when it is urban land," because of having had that devotion in their rural surroundings. [Coles, "A View of Cabbagetown," pp. 2 and 3.]


5. Williams, p. 204.


9. Low and Ryan, pp. 4 and 22.


Appendix 4. A Profile of Cabbagetown

1. The estimate that 75% of Cabbagetown's gentrifying population was homosexual came from questionnaire respondent Larry Underwood (1/3/90-1). It was corroborated by a Jan. 30, 1990 telephone interview with Edward (Larry) Keating, Associate Professor of City Planning at the Georgia Institute of Technology's School of Architecture.


3. Ironically, the heavily dilapidated house was being removed to make way for what would widely be seen as an improvement. In addition, the author told the boy that he wanted to show the good as well as the bad in his "report" on Cabbagetown. Despite these two points, the boy's comments had validity, as photographers and journalists both have often used the grinding poverty of a large segment of Cabbagetown as themes in their work. To some, photographer Oraien Catledge's book Cabbagetown (see references in notes for Appendices 2 and 3) is an example of such communication, while it has also been hailed for its sensitive, humanitarian vision of a cross-section of Cabbagetowners.
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1. **Abbreviations**

CC - Cabbagetown Counterparts, identifying interviewees listed outside of the bibliography's Section IIE, "Interviewees - Cabbagetown Counterparts" (pp. 358-359) who were consulted in the author's search for urban, Southeastern communities which could be considered physical and sociological counterparts of Cabbagetown.

2. **Miscellaneous Notes**

Generally, authors of daily newspaper articles are not given, unless they have strong local recognition in their cities and/or their names will be helpful in locating an article.

3. **Sources Omitted from the Bibliography**

The following sources are not found in the bibliography:

* Articles which are cited in the endnotes from daily newspapers and smaller specialized publications, such as newsletters on preservation in a particular city.

* Writings which only had a use limited to their section of the thesis, such as those articles meant to illustrate the connection between preservation and gentrification in the Introduction.

I. **CASE STUDY SOURCES**

IA. **Background and General Information**


"Cabbagetown: A Community has begun to believe in itself." \textit{AC}, Sept. 17, 1982, p. 5A.

"Cabbagetown / Cooperation Results in Pride." \textit{AJ \& C},
"Cabbagetown / A neighborhood with a strong sense of identity." Clearinghouse [Atlanta]. 1973 [no month or day].


Johnson, Stuart. Paper on Cabbagetown redevelopment [title not received] written for urban history class taught by Profs. Timothy Crimmins and Dana White, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Spring 1981.


IB. Demographic Materials

* U. S. Census Bureau materials are listed chronologically and all were produced by the U. S. Government Printing Office in Washington.


———. 1990 Census of Population and Housing / Summary Tape File 1C (compact disk found at regional census information centers).

IC. History


ID. Housing


"Banks lending $20 million in low-interest mortgages / $1.2 million earmarked for Cabbagetown effort." AJ & C, June 19, 1988, pp. 1 & 17A.


Cutler, Bill. "WE SHALL NOT BE MOVED. / Right, friend, and we have not yet met Priscilla House, have we?" Brown's Guide to Georgia, July, 1981, pp. 30-31+.

"Former Lockheed Workers Are Learning New Skills / They're Renovating Five Buildings in Cabbagetown." AC, Sept. 12, 1988, pp. 8 & 9A.


Mary Bankester et al, Plaintiffs -vs.- City of Atlanta. Department of Community Development, Defendant. COMPLAINT, December 11, 1986. Superior Court of Fulton County (Georgia), Civil Action No. D-39855.


"Piggyback Agreement Part of Cabbagetown's New Housing Start / 19 Homes Due For Summer Completion." AC, I-X, December 22, 1988, p. 5D.


Watson, Tom. "The New Land Reform / More Atlanta communities are adopting land trusts, a concept that is being called 'corrective capitalism' by some housing experts." Creative Loafing (Atlanta), Nov. 4, 1989, pp. 15A-17A.
IE. Interviewees.

* Unless otherwise stated, interviews were held in-person in Atlanta.

Bankester, Mary. Ms. Bankester lived in Cabbagetown for over twelve years (1980-1993), during which time she was widely seen as the leading spokesperson for the neighborhood’s middle-income newcomers. August 2, 1989 and January 5, 1990, Atlanta.

Brookshire, Joyce. Community Liaison, Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust, Inc. Ms. Brookshire is a life-long Cabbagetowner and is well-known in the neighborhood and Atlanta for her work as a musician and community activist since the early 1970’s. August 23, 1989.


Rooney, Donald. Curator of the General Museum Collections, Atlanta Historical Society, December 29, 1989; January 24, 1991 (telephone). (Mr. Rooney was also consulted regarding Southeastern "counterpart" communities to both Cabbagetown and his own Northwest Atlanta neighborhood of Whittier Mill Village, in the latter interview.)


Wigginton, Eliot. Founder and former director of the Foxfire program, which has received national acclaim for the heritage education curriculum it developed in North Georgia; Consultant to Cabbagetowners working to preserve the neighborhood’s Appalachian roots in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. April 11, 1991.

IF. Mill Redevelopment


IG. Piggyback Yard


IH. Questionnaire

"Neighborhood Questionnaire - Summer 1989." 64 resident interviewees, August 5-29, 1989 and December, 1989 - January, 1990. The questionnaire was formulated in consultation with the preservationists, planners and community leaders listed below. Those who were interviewed outside of this consultation are identified by the word "Interviewee" and the date of their interviews. Those who were consulted on urban, Southeastern communities which could be considered counterparts of Cabbagetown - in relation to pp. 129-130 in chapter 3, are identified by the abbreviation "CC," for "Cabbagetown Counterparts," and the date of the author’s contact regarding that consultation.

Costa, Fernando. Director, Bureau of Planning, City of Atlanta. (Interviewee, January 3, 1990.)

Crimmins, Dr. Timothy. Director, Heritage Preservation Program, Georgia State University. (Interviewee, January 4, 1990.) (CC, January 18, 1991.)

Gebhardt, Gary. Director [former], Savannah Landmarks Rehabilitation Program (SLRP), Savannah, Georgia. (The SLRP was devised by Lee Adler and other Savannah preservationists and it engineered a highly successful low-income preservation effort in that city.)
Horsey, Catherine. Assistant Executive Director, Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, Atlanta, Georgia. (Interviewee, December 28, 1989.)

Lyon, Dr. Elizabeth. State Historic Preservation Officer, State of Georgia. (CC, January 18, 1991.)

Taylor, Rev. Craig. Non-profit housing developer for Progressive Redevelopment, Inc. [Atlanta] and founder of Atlanta's Land Trust movement. (Interviewee, January 2, 1990.)

Taylor, Jennifer [no relation to above]. Community Services Planner, State Historic Preservation Office, State of Georgia.

II. CONTEXTUAL SOURCES

IIA. Attitudinal Studies


IIB. Attitudinal Studies - Consultations

* The following authorities, specializing in fields ranging from cultural preservation to urban sociology, were reached in the author's effort to locate studies much like his own.


Blake, Jennifer. Assistant Director, Office of Financial Services, and Program Officer (1983-87), Inner City Ventures Fund (ICVF), both of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Her affiliation of over 10 years with the ICVF has included work in Cabbagetown during her tenure as an ICVF program officer. March 7, 1990.

Gale, Dennis. Professor, Public Policy and Management, University of Southern Maine. See Section IID, "Gentrification," for examples of his leading research on gentrification while at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. August 21, 1990.


Laska, Shirley. Professor, Sociology, University of New
Orleans; co-author with Daphne Spain of Back to The City (1980), considered a landmark among early studies of gentrification. August 20, 1990.


Lowe, Stanley. Associate Director, Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation; has received national reknown for direction of housing efforts in Pittsburgh's inner-city neighborhood of Manchester. July 24, 1990.


Shlay, Anne. Associate Professor of Sociology and research associate, The Center for Advanced Policy Studies, both of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore; research on housing preferences published in Environment and Behavior and elsewhere. June 21, 1990.

Spain, Daphne. Professor, Architecture, University of Virginia. August 23, 1990. (See Laska reference above.)

Williams, Michael Ann. Assistant Professor, Folklife Studies and Historic Preservation, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green. (See Appendix 3, pp. 291-293.) July 23, 1990.
IIC. **Contextual Examples** (Section IIC, "A Context for the Case Study")

* Within sections for each city, all references to an interviewee’s place of residence are to the respective contextual neighborhood - whether Tremont, Spring Garden or Soulard.

* Interviewees for whom a brief sense of credentials has already been supplied in the text and/or the endnotes may only be listed by the dates of their interviews or by additional descriptions where the author feels this is warranted.

IIC1. **Cleveland**

IIC1a. **Interviewees**


Grabowski, Gary & Rita. Residents since the late 1970’s, owners of Tremont’s Miracles Restaurant and leading members of the Citizens’ Design Review Committee for Tremont’s City Historic District. March 31, 1991.


Keiser, Robert. Executive Secretary, Cleveland Landmarks Commission. April 1, 1991.


IIC1b. **Writings**


"Tremont isolation could become a hidden
asset." PD, Jan. 19, 1985, p. 15A.

__________. "Tremont's choice: Money or the neighborhood." PD, Oct. 26, 1987, p. 2B.


"Tremont residents are working to stop hospital expansion." PD, June 6, 1987, p. 2B.


IIC2. Philadelphia

IIC2a. Interviewees

* "SGCA" stands for the Spring Garden Civic Association.

Bruce, UnaVee. February 26, 1992.


Molina, Damalier. Resident since childhood and board member, SGCA. February 14, 1992.


IIC2b. Writings

* The Bulletin was one of Philadelphia’s major dailies until its demise in the early 1980’s. Collections of its articles are held by Temple University’s Urban Archives.

* Items followed by a parenthetical reference to the "PHC," or Philadelphia Historical Commission, may be seen in the Commission’s files on the Spring Garden neighborhood.

Cook, Anne (Spring Garden resident and member, "Committee to Extend the Spring Garden Historic District"). Letter to Dr. F. Otto Haas (Chairman, Philadelphia Historical Commission), November 18, 1982. [PHC]

"8 Killed in Blazing Rowhouse." The Bulletin, Oct. 17, 1978, pp. 1 & 3 [on fire alleged to have been set by neighborhood speculators].

"Homeless backers picket restaurant to protest a drive to close shelter." PI, Dec. 19, 1990, p. 3-B.


"Neighbors Plead for arts center." PI, Feb. 23, 1990, p. 7B.

Tyler, Dr. Richard. Letter to Gary Abraham (Spring Garden resident) on his position not to include the neighborhood’s eastern half in a National Register district then being proposed, December 10, 1982. [PHC]

IIC3. St. Louis

IIC3a. Interviewees


Brandhorst, Robert. Co-founder and Executive Director, Soulard


IIC3b. Writings

Davidson, Debbie and Joyce Sonn. Letter to Dan Barger, Editor, South City Journal (St. Louis), June 19, 1991 (regarding citizen input on Soulard historic district revisions).


_________. Ordinance 57078 [for creation of Soulard Historic District]. Approved by the Mayor, November 26, 1975.


IID. Gentrification


IIE. Interviewees - Cabbagetown Counterparts

* The following individuals were often recommended by others - usually within this group - as experts on their cities, states or the Southeastern U. S. as a whole, and thus they were seen as useful contacts in the author’s search for urban neighborhoods similar to Cabbagetown. This list is presented in conjunction with Chapter 3’s section B, "Cabbagetown as a Combination of Mill Town Heritage and Gentrification within the Urban Southeast," on pp. 129-130. The date of the author’s telephone conversation with each person follows a brief sense of their credentials.

Bishir, Catherine W. Architectural Survey Coordinator, North Carolina Division of Archives and History. In 1990, her work included a study on North Carolina mill communities which included searching for the "perfectly ideal mill village that’s also photogenic," or, in other words, not having undergone gentrification to any significant degree (as she put it to the author); she stated that that was an aspect she was not encountering, somewhat to her surprise. February 11, 1991.

Blaustein, Richard. Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology and Director of the Center for Appalachian Studies and Services, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City. April 11, 1991.


Kuhn, Cliff. Professor, Georgia State University, Atlanta; an initial researcher, in the 1970’s, on the project which lead to Jacquelyn Hall’s Like A Family; director for 1985 exhibit "Threads of the Past" (see "Southern Labor Archives" citation in "Local Sources," below); author of a book (in progress at the time of the author’s conversation with him) on a 1914-15 strike at Cabbagetown’s Fulton Mill. February 15, 1991.
McKithan, Cecil. Chief of the National Register Programs Division, Southeastern Regional Office (Atlanta), National Park Service. March 4, 1991.

Morrill, Daniel. Professor of History, University of North Carolina at Charlotte. While Professor Morrill did not consider any Charlotte or North Carolina community in his knowledge to be a true "Cabbagetown Counterpart," he did mention gentrification, but "ever so slightly," in Charlotte’s North Charlotte section. February 6, 1991.

IIF. Local Sources


"Oakland Cemetery / City’s Oldest Resting Place Celebrates 139th Anniversary." AJ & C "Weekend" (a magazine supplement), October 14, 1989, pp. 24-25.


Southern Labor Archives. Georgia State University. "Threads of the Past." [Essay to accompany a 1985 exhibit of the same name on the history of Georgia’s textile industry.]


IIG. Methodology


