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This is a book about you, as an American and as a partner in domestic progress. There are some problems that you and I share as Americans, and we simply cannot table them to a more convenient time. We can take no refuge behind the mighty debate and the agonizing fact of Vietnam. In spite of the war, our domestic situation demands action.

Of course, Vietnam and the war intrude on any consideration of domestic legislation; the war blurs the lines between domestic and international. In 1968 the war in Vietnam is more than a shadow across the land. It is tragic reality, an ugly part of the American experience. Our involvement suggests that we have much yet to learn about the role of a great international power. While most world powers sought dominance, gloried in preparation for it, and waged war to achieve it, our status as a super-power came about by circumstance far removed from grand design. When we entered the arena of
world politics, it was not to conquer lands or people, not to add to our wealth, but to help weigh the scales of good against evil.

America is a new idea. To make it work, we have had to push and pull, give and take, and reach a thousand compromises. But there is one thing we are not willing to compromise, and that is our dedication to a better way of life for our people. Domestic programs of the 1960’s have given us a renewed sense of national unity and purpose, and we should not allow that purpose to be hindered or hampered.

So it is appropriate now, while we fight in Southeast Asia, to consider what it is we have already won at home. Those of us who worked first with John Kennedy, and then with Lyndon Johnson, value these victories highly; and we regret that the war has caused a slow-down, or worse, in so many programs. We do not want to see our accomplishments and our aspirations put on a shelf.

At times, the frustration is overwhelming. Some have said that it is "more important to save Cleveland than it is to save Saigon," and we can understand the passion behind this declaration. The temptation to abandon one campaign and run off to pursue another is all around us.

A statement last year, from a witness at a Senate hearing, summed up the urgency of our domestic efforts:

\[\text{We are skilled in the art of war; we are unskilled in the art of peace. We are proficient in the art of killing; we are ignorant in the art of living. Somewhere in the scheme of things, these values must be reordered...}\]

We cannot ignore the art of living. The human spirit and the national conscience are capable of the will to carry on with our domestic obligations. Let us, then, take as our task the development of all human potential. Let us develop compassion and understanding for others, courage and conviction for our work.
Many proposals for ending the Vietnam conflict have been advanced both in and out of Congress. To date, none of these proposals have met with much success. Instead, the unhappy tempo of the war continues to mount, and whether we count lives lost, property damaged, or programs curtailed, the cost is enormous.

We must continue to seek a solution to the war. At the same time, we must make every effort to consolidate the domestic gains made in the past few years. Most important, we must take stock by evaluating our successes in meeting the demands of our times.

The war should make us more concerned about the nature of the society we are creating and more determined to right the wrongs we find. Given a large measure of patience and perseverance, we will make this a better nation.
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"Man is a long time coming. 
Man will yet win. 
Brother may yet line up with brother."

—Carl Sandburg, from “The People, Yes”

WE STAND AT THE CROSSROADS

Los Angeles, host city to the Democratic National Convention in 1960, was singularly appropriate for that meeting, because it typified many of the problems discussed in the Party platform adopted at the Convention. To take a bus meant five transfers to go ten miles and, then, to end up having to take a taxi—in the whole process cursing urban sprawl. Skies, unusually clear for the Convention, would soon be filled with smog. Watts had not yet become a symbol, but it was there, festering. The city seemed to generate a feeling—shared by delegates who came from more habitable parts of the nation—that something was out of control. People had been subordinated to irrational growth.

Just before the Los Angeles meeting I had been in a different America, traveling throughout rural countryside on the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. We
were looking into the poverty of the migrant farm workers, who had not yet been brought into the prosperity of the 20th century. The people were poor, but the land we saw on that journey was wealthy and beautiful. The land held the fresh air and sunshine and open space that the city lacked.

And then we went on into Los Angeles, a spiritually oppressive, dehumanizing urban tangle. My work in the Senate had achieved some progress in urban rehabilitation including approval of a modest federal program to promote mass transit systems and reduce inner-city automobile traffic. Ideas for more "open space" and more rational use of land in urban areas were also gaining Congressional attention. Los Angeles was the victim of the things that we most needed to correct or prevent, and to see that turbulent city was to have new incentive for the task of persuading the Congress to recognize its urban responsibilities.

John F. Kennedy gave his acceptance speech before 80,000 hopeful and anxious listeners in the Convention finale. His words were a spark to the crowd at Los Angeles, and to the waiting nation:

The problems are not all solved and the battles are not all won—and we stand today on the edge of a New Frontier—the frontier of the 1960's—a frontier of unknown opportunities and perils—a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and threats. Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom promised our nation a new political and economic framework. Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal promised security and succor to those in need. But the New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises—it is a set of challenges. It sums up, not what I intend to offer the American people, but what I intend to ask of them. It appeals to their pride, not their pocketbook. It holds out the promise of more sacrifice instead of more security.

Many of us knew then that the work begun by Harry Truman would finally be continued. It had been that great
Missourian’s mission to take up the tasks left untended while we fought a war, and at the same time to bring the nation to a position of enlightened leadership in free world reconstruction.

Housing in the late Forties was one of our most visible deficiencies. (How many communities built “temporary veterans’ units” only to discover that temporary was a long, long time?) Apartment units that had begun to deteriorate were rapidly approaching a state of decay, and quarters had to be found. Housing had become a nightmare in the urban centers, where families crowded together in substandard relics of another era.

Human needs of other kinds, while less obvious, were just as pressing during the early postwar years. President Truman’s Commission on Civil Rights produced a report that might have headed off the past few “hot summers” in Watts, Newark, and Detroit, but the immediate response was scattered and even skeptical. Senator Robert Taft, a great conservative, called for 800,000 homes for the poor people of our country. Even with the liberal majorities in the Congress, this nation has not caught up with Robert Taft. And even though the Truman Administration produced a full employment law, the nation would see growing evidence of hard-core joblessness.

As John F. Kennedy made his acceptance speech at Los Angeles, we could finally expect serious action on a backlog of problems that had worsened during the 1950’s. Serious action was indeed taken; and on a scale and with an energy few people could have imagined.

The years of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson have brought concept after concept to meet the needs of the people. There have been a few mistakes, and a few failures; but these have only served to sharpen the effort to correct the weaknesses.

What we did not know, and what few men ever know when they set out on a great undertaking, was the magnitude of the task. If it can be said that Kennedy made us see the
New Frontier, then it is true that our experiences of the last seven years have made us see a farther frontier. A good piece of road still stretches out before us.

Standing at the crossroads, we can assess what we have done, and what we need to do. We have, for example, begun a far-ranging attack (not yet a “total war”) on poverty. Thanks to the leadership of a President who understands what poverty
really is, the “haves” of the country are finally recognizing that the “invisible poor” exist, and that their problems are everyone’s problems. We are beginning to understand that poverty is more than a personal tragedy; it is a grave human, social, and economic drain. All Americans are poverty’s victims; those who suffer from it, and those who now combat its consequences.

The War on Poverty is only three years old, but already the mention of its name brings images to mind: the Head Start youngster caught by a photographer as he gazes happily at a turtle brought to class, the VISTA worker driving a school bus for Indian youngsters or climbing a stairway in a roach-infested New York tenement, the Foster Grandparent reaching out to a child caught in a mood of hopelessness in a mental hospital, the thin Job Corpsman who sees in the operation of a simple power drill a key to the kind of success he has been denied.

Our national understanding of poverty, and of a host of other domestic problems, has intensified over the last seven years. We are beginning to develop a sense of shared responsibility for the affairs of the nation. This intensified awareness must continue if we are to solve the problems now
hard upon us: the awakened anger of American Negroes, the
dynamics of city disintegration and suburban isolationism, and
the aimlessness of so many of the young and the old.

Urgency should be the order of the day, and it is heartening
that more Americans than ever before share in that mood. Nevertheless, reaction always follows in the wake of progress. It is easier to rip apart a new idea than to improve where improvements are needed. And reaction is our danger now: Congressional debates on the Office of Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 showed how close negative forces can come to scuttling an entire program.

How many setbacks or near-misses can progressivism take? Historically, the progressive attitude has won out over reaction. Even a “return to normalcy” in the Twenties could not permanently damage the social achievements of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson; Franklin Roosevelt’s innovations and Harry Truman’s postwar refinements were threatened by a latter-day fondness for normalcy, but most survived or served as a basis for change.
The question today is not whether negativism will triumph, but whether it will cause costly slowdowns. We cannot afford another pendulum swing back to stifling reaction. The stakes are too high; too many human destinies hang in the balance. We have begun a journey, and we have said that we will not stop until we have erased poverty, ignorance, and urban decay.

Now in 1968, as we look back on what we have done, we can take some satisfaction from many individual programs, many specific accomplishments. I am far more impressed, though, with the momentum we have generated. It would be a tragic mistake to lose that momentum, because only recently have we known what it takes to deal with large-scale problems realistically and effectively. It is not the problems of the day that are novel; it is our involvement in finding a solution that is new.

Jeanne R. Lowe, in her fascinating book, *Cities in a Race with Time*, discussed a report called “Our Cities—Their Role in the National Economy.” The major thrust of the report, she writes,

... was that the mess in American cities was much more than a housing problem. It stated that tumble-down industrial districts, deteriorated central business areas, old structures made obsolete by new technology—all these and other poor, inappropriate or outmoded land uses of the past—undermined urban vitality, as did residential slums, and must be altered.

The date of that report, issued by the Urbanism Committee, was 1937–30 years before the “urban crisis” had become a cliché. Now, as we stand at the crossroads of 1968, we can look back with all special insights of the second-guesser and say how it all should have been done. But the plain fact is that it was not done, or at least not attempted on any meaningful scale, until very recently.
We did get moving, but because we lost so much time, we found that our tasks during the 1960's had to take on new forms. Occasionally we had to rescue earlier domestic programs in need of repair. Welfare, for example, began as outright "depression relief." We didn't really do much else with it until the mid-Sixties, when it became clear that old-fashioned methods were leading to many other problems, were becoming more costly, and were helping almost no one escape from poverty.

President Kennedy’s amendments in 1962 were a start at making the welfare system part of an ongoing rehabilitation process designed to help the capable break out of welfare bondage. Much more is needed, though, if we are to make welfare a serviceable instrument to help people attain a living standard based on training, employment, and productive interaction with society.

Welfare is not the only domestic program we have had to re-think. The Hill-Burton program for hospital construction is another example of a good idea that has been broadened, and that needs further expansion today. The program, almost a quarter-century in doing, provides funds for administration, planning, research, demonstrations, and a wide range of facilities other than hospitals: rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, and centers for the mentally retarded. A fine working relationship among federal, state, and local officials has evolved, with heavy emphasis on local initiative and regional planning. Town officials across the country can be proud of buildings financed in part through Hill-Burton funds.

Needs are not static, however, and today Hill-Burton could do more: outright grants, for example, to communities so poor that they cannot possibly take on the responsibility of the conventional loan. In other communities, the biggest boost might come from a program of federally-guaranteed loans, including help with interest payments. These and other new ideas will help fulfill the fundamental idea behind Hill-Burton.
Old programs have been strengthened; and entirely new approaches have also emerged during the last seven years. Our eyes have been opened, and we have extended federal participation into previously neglected problem areas. Probably the most significant new territory we have entered is
education, and here again we have worked with states and municipalities to choose the right targets for federal action.

As a result, education has taken new directions which will certainly be of great significance to present and future generations. Schools can now innovate, boldly, with modern technology. We have found new ways to make school buildings fit directly into the daily life of a community. Novel and exciting programs for educational development, particularly for the disadvantaged child, are creating enthusiasm where there was despair.

Consider, too, the struggle against air and water pollution. Until the 1960's, the federal government had seldom entered
the campaign against pollution, simply because pollution had always seemed a "local" matter. But the health and safety of the people is a federal matter. We see now a banding together of many forces against pollution: state boards, regional pollution control compacts, private research firms, and federal agencies. These groups form an effective coalition. They are making headway against pollution, but every step of the way is across new ground. Negative thinking and reaction can turn the ground into quicksand: less than half the amount authorized for water pollution control in fiscal 1968 was actually appropriated. This cutback came at a most unfortunate time, because states are just now creating pollution control standards that are tough enough to get the job done.

Situations like these present us with decisions to make, at this crossroads, where now we stand with mixed reactions.

We are surprised at the enormity of what must be done.

We know what has happened on the road behind us. We know the hard times, the difficulties encountered in getting this far.

We are anxious about negativism. Will the backsliding begin again, or do we now see that it must—this time—be checked?

We feel chagrin at the long delays in getting started, and perhaps that chagrin has fed the sense of urgency that brings change for the better.

And we ask, again and again, will we let the war in Vietnam become an excuse for detouring our domestic programs?

It is a question for all of us, because the answer will mean much to us and to all men’s freedom. The answer to the question will not be given in one year, or on one issue.

Instead, we will have to make hard choices on a multitude of matters that may not seem related to the set of challenges John Kennedy put forward. The next chapters will deal with several great issues on which some decisions have been made, but which call for additional thinking and acting. These are matters that warrant our close attention as we stand at the crossroads.
“Anticipate charity by preventing poverty; assist the reduced fellow­man, either by a considerable gift, or a sum of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood, and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity . . .”
Moses Ben Maimon (Maimonides)
(1135-1204)

IT'S HELL TO BE POOR

“We can believe with justification that poverty is being eliminated and the poor are being listened to. The Nation has been alerted . . . We have created a means of bringing social change, not social upheaval.”
–from “The Quiet Revolution,”
a report from the Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

I. THE TRAGEDY OF OUR TIME

Historians of the future, digging in the artifacts of the mid-20th century, will encounter a strange and tragic contradiction when they examine our social record. They will look back, many years from now, and will see photographs of towering skyscrapers, vast and abundant fields of grain, fine homes, shiny new automobiles, and healthy, happy people.

In contrast to this happy picture, the historians will find other photographs:
A hollow-cheeked baby girl, naked and filthy, who has had little to eat and less to call her own. There will be rats, dashing across the floor, and, when bold, biting the little girl.

A young mother, sitting on the iron stairway on a brownstone tenement in Manhattan. Somehow it is clear she has nothing else to do.

After a long day of toil on a stranger’s farm, a gaunt father pats his child’s head as they sit on the one bed in the room, waiting for their sparse evening meal.

They are Americans in 1968, people in poverty amidst the wealth and bounty of the most powerful nation ever known. The future will wonder at how they and so many others could suffer so terribly, for so long, while others lived so well.

There is the danger that history will claim that our age, and our country, simply ignored the problem. We may stand accused of failing to use our technological sophistication, and our industrial and scientific genius, because we saw no need to act. In short, ours may be judged as an era too sated with abundance to notice the deprivation all around us.
There would have been a time in our nation's history, not too many years ago, when these harsh judgments would have been accurate. For a long time, we thought of poverty as a personal hardship, an individual sorrow, something to be brushed out of sight with patronizing charity.

Ours is the age, though, which is beginning to understand. Now we have come face to face with poverty, and now we recognize it for the tragedy it is:

Poverty is the fundamental deficiency that intensifies all other weaknesses in our society.

Poverty perpetuates poor education, inadequate health standards, and disgraceful housing.

Poverty makes discrimination easier because its victims are usually isolated from a hostile society.
Poverty cripples the spirit. The poor become hopeless or angry; the affluent become uneasy and defensive. Neither group understands or communicates one with the other.

The cost of poverty is immeasurable. We have no measure of the talent lost, the suffering sustained, and human spirit afflicted by despair or boiling resentment. Our cost in human resources is far greater than our cost in broken windows and burned-out buildings. We do know the loss in terms of dollars. Total social welfare costs, part of the price of poverty, for example, came to about 100 billion dollars in 1967. The cost of the past three summers of ugly upheaval in our cities—almost 715 million dollars—can also be traced directly to poverty.

Poverty, the most bitter of human conditions, leads to so many other hardships. There are 30 million Americans, nearly
15 percent of our people, who have not shared in the national abundance, and on whom the doors of opportunity have been closed.

The story of poverty is told best in small voices, speaking simply. I have heard them during my travels through the migrant camps, and into the heart of urban ghettos. People, desperate and anguished people, have shown the Congress what it means to live in abject poverty.

One Indiana mother talked about feeding and clothing her school-age children.

 Mostly, I go around asking people if they know anybody who has clothes to fit my child. This is how I get clothes for my children. I have kept one of my daughters out on account of shoes. She is hard on shoes and she didn’t have any; so I couldn’t send her out in the snow without shoes... my boy didn’t have no gym clothes to go to school play gym and last week they put my girl out of school because I didn’t have a dollar to buy a birth certificate.
She told her story to a committee investigating the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. She was not alone in her plight; many of her neighbors came with her to testify. Other people, called to comment on the dimensions of urban poverty, were not concerned with clothes; they were worried about rats.

"I was living in one apartment, the rats got in bed with me, and my sister is still living in the same building, and the rats are jumping up and down. The kids they play with rats like a child would play with a dog or something. They chase them around the house and things like that."
People talk most often about their children, because it is in the children that they see the best hope for a better tomorrow. Another mother described her children this way:

_They is alive and you bet they is, and then they go off and quits. I can tell it by their walk, and how they look. They slow down and get tired in their faces, real tired. And they get all full of hate; and they look cross at you, as if I cheated them when I brought them into the world. I have seven and two of them have gone that way, and to be honest I expect every child to have it happen—like it did to me... it doesn’t take but a few months to see that they’re no longer kids, and they’ve lost all the hope and the life you tried to give them._
These stories of poverty, told by small voices and weary faces, are part of the story of a nation that has acquired the greatest wealth ever known to man. We see more automobiles on more highways. Economists give us new tables each month to tell us how far the gross national product (GNP) has gone up. For 83 months at this writing the growth trend has been rising, and our yearly production now stands at $800 billion. Television sets somehow seem to be a popular measure of our boom, and in 1967, total ownership in homes was 70 million sets.

In just six and one-half years, the gross national product (total value of all goods and services) has increased by more than $285 billion. This increase exceeds the 1966 GNP for France, West Germany, and Italy combined; in that year, their total GNP was $283.1 billion. We have grown as if we had "annexed" a year's production of three very strong countries.

One massive shadow is cast over this otherwise sunny picture of national prosperity. There is a flaw in the dazzling diamond. There are still 30 million people living in poverty.

II. OUR CALL TO ACTION

During the last few years, as we assessed and reassessed the mounting costs of widespread poverty, the federal government came to realize that the problem could not be dealt with in a sporadic, inconsistent series of stop-gap measures. The realization dawned that here was a national crisis, a crisis calling for thoughtful, energetic action. President Johnson, in a 1964 message, declared "national war on poverty":

*With the growth of our country has come opportunity for our people—opportunity to educate our children, to use our energies in productive work, to increase our leisure—opportunity for almost every American to hope that through work and talent he could create a better life for himself and his family.*
I remember thinking, at the time of the President’s 1964 message, that we were finally coming to grips with the cause of our long and costly neglect of poverty. It seemed to me then, as it does now, that what had been missing during all the apathetic years was not charity, not wealth, not imagination; what was missing was an awareness of how much we needed to join together all our efforts. The word “war” denotes something all-out and comprehensive. By calling us to “war” against poverty, Lyndon Johnson brought us to a new high of energy, concentration, and dedication.

The Congress created the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in 1964 and declared that the policy of the United States is “to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.”

In creating an agency of the government to combat poverty, we acknowledged that to get at the root causes of poverty we had to commit regular personnel, working on a regular basis, day in and day out. There was general agreement, too, that the scope of the effort against poverty required total mobilization of our forces. New government
machinery—federal, state, and local—was essential to launch the attack and stay the march of poverty that had not been held at bay by charitable handouts.

When we created the Office of Economic Opportunity, all we had to guide us was a rough estimate here, an educated guess there, but very few hard facts on poverty and its victims. In some areas, though, we knew more than in others. The work of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, which began four and one-half years before OEO was conceived, provided valuable insight into the problems of one group of poor Americans. The successes of this work in treating the needs of the migrant serve as an excellent starting point for an examination of the war on poverty.

**MIGRANTS**

By conservative estimate, there are 1.1 million Americans caught up in the nomadic life of the migrant farm worker. Many of these 500,000 workers, and 600,000 family dependents, begin their travels from home bases in Texas, California, or Florida. Tens of thousands of them come from Puerto Rico. The typical migrant earned about $1307 in 1966, and found work only 121 days out of the entire year. In spite of poor wages and constant hardship, the migrant provides a labor base for a part of our economy worth many billions of dollars. The neat iced trays of grapes, peaches, strawberries, celery, and other produce found at the local supermarket were picked, in large part, by seasonal labor in the hot summer sun. Many of poverty's victims are locked outside the world their countrymen know. Worse still, they are locked *into* a world that most Americans think ended with the depression of the Thirties.

Until a few years ago, Congress paid practically no attention to the migrants. In fact, I was warned in 1959—when I first proposed that a subcommittee look into their problems—that there was no chance at all of getting legislation passed on their behalf. Migrants, after all, had little power at
the polls; they were nobody's constituents; and any efforts to help them would stir up the growers. Growers could certainly make themselves heard even if migrants could not.

What was overlooked in this analysis was simply that the story of the migrants cried out for telling.

It was a dramatic and heartbreaking story, as I learned then and have been learning ever since. Men, women, and children stay on the road for months at a time in vehicles that often carry their passengers to spectacular accidents, and occasionally death. There are migrant workers who find, at the end of the growing season, they they have earned nothing—and in fact owe money to their crew leaders. There are young children who, because of inadequate child labor laws, work in the fields under conditions that are hard even for strong, healthy men.

I have heard of hospitals turning migrant families away because they have no money to pay the bill. In trip after trip, the Subcommittee visited the migrant camps all across the
country, from Florida to upstate New York, from Texas to Minnesota, from California to New Jersey, and 20 states in between.

The conditions I have seen have turned my stomach. One of the worst camps I saw was only about 30 miles from my home town in New Jersey. The towers of Princeton University could be seen from where we stood in this camp.

Poverty, for the migrant worker, means cold food, a pest-ridden bed, a burning fever, and no medicine. It means flies swarming through the shacks in the South and defective stoves burning up shacks in the North. It means whole families moving, always moving. In quiet, hollow voices, poverty screams out in these bleak migrant camps. There was no march, no protest, or a boycott at that time. But the ragged edge of a family, hapless and worn, somewhere in the farm country, told the story.

These were the conditions that compelled the U.S. Senate to create a Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, under the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. When the Subcommittee was a working reality, our first task was to tell the story of the migrants in such a way that the conscience of the nation would be awakened. We knew we would have to educate as we went along, and we knew that the educating would be difficult.

It took years, for example, to get across the point that decent housing for migrants could actually help growers by making it more likely that they would have a dependable supply of skilled workers—men who would be willing to come back year after year to relatively comfortable quarters.

We had to argue again and again, too, that establishment of health facilities would help relieve burdens on those hospitals that did accept migrants, only to discover that there was no money to pay their bills.

Today there is on my desk a directory of migrant health projects. In August of 1967, there were 115 of them, receiving grant assistance from the Public Health Service in 36 states and
Puerto Rico. Our campaign of education and legislation has begun to pay off, because these facilities—a legislative product of the Migrant Health Act of 1962—are now an accepted fact of life. Hearteningly, the growers have learned to accept these facilities, and the philosophy behind them, because they see
good in it for all of the community. One Florida vegetable grower told the Subcommittee last year:

_The family clinics that we have available in the camps now I think have been the best thing that has happened. With the immunizations of small children a lot of times other diseases are discovered, enough ahead of time to save great losses both to the farmer in the loss of the use of his labor, loss of time to the hospitals, and to the general public as a whole._

Health, housing, education, child day care—we have made progress on all these fronts. But, earning power is another story. It took seven long years to bring migrant farm workers under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We succeeded, finally, in 1966, but even then the minimum wage for farm workers was pegged substantially below that for industrial workers. And although far too few of the farm workers were covered, this has not turned out as badly as we thought. When big corporate farms are required to pay $1.15 an hour (the minimum wage for 1968) the wages of all workers tend to follow suit.

The Subcommittee work continues, and in many ways we are now tackling our most difficult assignments. We must enact legislation to establish that agricultural farm labor has the right to bargain collectively for adequate pay and other working conditions. It’s hard to believe, but the farm worker still does not have this basic right, enjoyed by most Americans for more than thirty years. In addition to collective bargaining, we have to bring the children of migratory farm workers under the child labor laws and end the national disgrace of six-year-olds working in outdoor sweatshops.

On balance, we are making significant inroads into the conditions of desperate poverty among migrants. These early successes are important, because they have helped shape the thinking behind the war on poverty—thinking based on
energetic contacts with the people and clear recognition of their basic needs.

THE ELDERLY POOR

Until a few years ago, we knew as little about the poverty of the elderly as we did about the migrant farm worker. Evidence began to mount, though, that there were large numbers of elderly Americans living on grossly inadequate incomes. The 1966 median income for families headed by a
person over 65 was only $3,645 (an income level 46 percent that of younger families). For single people, the difference is even greater—$1,443, compared with $3,443.

Increased longevity is a mixed blessing. While it is true that older people are able to live longer, it is also true that they cannot enjoy these added years when retirement income is strained beyond manageable limits.
One indication of the seriousness of this squeeze on retired persons came as President Johnson gave his message on the needs of older Americans, in 1967:

- 5.3 million older Americans have subpoverty incomes
- only one out of five has a job, usually at substandard wages
- more than two million senior citizens are on welfare
- nearly 40 percent of the single elderly have total assets of less than $1,000

My own personal indicator of the needs of the elderly is the heavy mail I receive every day from old people throughout the country. Speaking in the same personal way that the mothers spoke about clothes and shoes and rats, these Americans tell me about their lives.

_I wish you could do something about our Social Security . . . I had a bad fall broke three ribs and jaw falling over the bathtub . . . what of all the suffering I went through . . . Please help us. I cannot get welfare as all my family has their own family to look after times and food are bad. Thanks a lot._
The lady wondered about Social Security, and she had company. President Johnson outlined a sweeping program of increases for Social Security recipients, but it took the Congress many months of haggling before an increase was approved—and when it was finally enacted, the bill came nowhere near the need. Nevertheless, I imagine that some increase was better than none.

_And when are we going to get our raise in Social Security and time is getting very bad and we like the raise in Social Security and here is my address... to go on welfare is very degrading...

Knowing the despair that these elderly poor were facing, in the late fall of 1967, I fought, along with 13 other Senators for a more adequate increase in Social Security benefits. The majority of the Congress, regretfully, chose to accept a greatly reduced version of the bill. When the Social Security amendments finally passed, benefits had been raised by 13 percent, and 800,000 elderly poor were lifted above the poverty line. In my judgement, the increases were far too small, but we did manage to take some action.

I am convinced that the mail from my New Jersey constituents and from older people across the country represents a true picture of the economic plight of millions of older Americans. A Kentucky newspaper editor verified the pattern in testimony before the Aging Committee:

_These people follow a set pattern. As they become too old to operate their small farms, they sell and buy a home in the nearest small town. Their remaining capital is then set aside to support them through the balance of their lives. Generally speaking, their Social Security eligibility is at minimum levels and, because of the valuation of their home and their nest egg of cash securities, they are not eligible for other forms of old-age assistance. In our particular area, their average income is $89 per month from all sources._
One of the most difficult tasks in combatting poverty among the elderly is to find the people in need. To this end, OEO devised Project FIND, in 1967. FIND was one of the concrete responses made by the Office of Economic Opportunity after public hearings of the Senate Committee on Aging. This story and other publicity made Americans realize that the elderly are among the most unnoticed of our invisible poor.

Many FIND participants are poor and old themselves. They seemed to lose a few years, though, when they began to give real service to others, and there are more applicants than jobs. Some workers in New York are past 80; the average age in Michigan is 67. Their job is simple, and it is difficult. They are to seek out Friendless, Isolated, Needy, and Disabled older persons, interview them to find out what they need, and then refer them to existing services and report deficiencies in services.

What has FIND found? In St. Petersburg, Florida, a "Sunshine City" for some retirees, they found poverty. Of the first 740 elderly interviewed, 44 percent had incomes of less
than $1,500. Many faced a cruel daily decision of whether to buy food or drugs. The St. Petersburg experience was repeated all across the country.

In addition to Project FIND, the Office of Economic Opportunity has established other programs for the elderly poor. Green Thumb is a project for retired farmers and other rural elderly retirees who work part time, planting and beautifying and maintaining along major roadways. They can earn $1,500 a year. It doesn't sound like much, but it can double a man's income. A Trenton man confided to me that his Green Thumb income enabled him to pay his taxes on his home. This project has the essential ingredients of the successful anti-poverty program. The poor are urged to work in their own behalf, and the results of their work bring benefit both to the impoverished and to the nation as a whole.

THE COMMUNITY AND THE POOR

The important thing to remember about all of the OEO programs is that for the first time we are getting the poor involved in their own rehabilitation. For example, one in every four Community Action Program (CAP) policy makers is himself impoverished, and it is not surprising that one in every two program employees is a victim of the very poverty he is trying to overcome.

The scope of the local CAP effort is tremendous: 5,000 communities and community agencies and institutions had projects either in development or operating during 1966. These projects reached down into the locality, to touch every victim of poverty: urban ghetto-dwellers, rural castoffs, migrants, Indians. When the poor see this kind of effort made at the local level, they are more likely to view the program as their own, and will hopefully involve themselves without the old doubts and distrust getting in the way.

It has been my contention, ever since the opening of debate on the poverty program, that the greatest good we could
derive from programs like CAP would be the chance for an exchange of dialogue between the poor and the "comfortable" citizenry. These two groups don't talk with each other very often, and it's difficult to help someone with a problem (or help someone who is, in turn, trying to help you) without communicating.

Communication is vital to work essential change, to put behind the one-way handouts we used to think were the answer to poverty. If we work with the poor, and help to rebuild their shattered self-image, we have a chance to stem the persistent defeatism that haunts the impoverished. For too long, we have taken our task to be that of the comforter, the nourisher, without much understanding of the individual's need to believe that he counts.

**JOB CORPS**

There is nothing quite as depressing as the future seen through the eyes of a school drop-out who has not yet reached the legal age of responsibility. He has no place in a mechanized, highly sophisticated industrial society which offers no consolation prize for failure, and holds little promise for quitters.

Just about two million young men and women, aged 16 to 22, are caught in a brutal trap. They lack education and skills. Forty-five percent of them come from broken homes. In two-thirds of their homes, the breadwinner is unemployed; forty percent of their families are on relief. Most have never seen a doctor professionally, nor a dentist. Many need glasses. Most are underweight. Because they have little education, they have little earning power; their average income is about eighty cents an hour. These young people have not been reached by teacher, relative, or friend.

Job Corps training centers are working to restore these people to a measure of self-esteem. Given a boost, they are becoming capable and intelligent members of society. Job
Corps gives them the help they need, and it does it by training them in work skills while they change themselves from within.

For an effective poverty program, we have to reach the nation's poor where they live—in the hills of Appalachia, in the streets of Chicago, in the fields of Texas. This was my intention in developing the original concept behind VISTA, the Volunteers in Service to America. VISTA workers do not examine poverty, they confront it. They live where poverty lives. They serve all hours, all days, in so many different ways that a catalogue of their accomplishments would fill another book.

Our best record of the results of this program are the comments of the people involved:

_The work of the VISTA Volunteers can only be assessed in terms of the human lives they have reached... in the things they have taught the community... in the new hope they have brought to the underprivileged. Up until now, the town and the farmers always worked with the migrants from the outside. It took the VISTA Volunteers who went and actually lived with these people to tell us that the families from the South were_
freezing during our cold nights. We never realized this. And don't think VISTA didn't tell us a lot more we didn't know.

Reaching human lives is the key of the VISTA programs. It is an honest attempt to reach out to the nation's poor, and to deal with them as equal partners in the struggle against poverty.

**HEAD START**

Head Start is the OEO program which holds greater long range promise for defeating poverty than any other. As we will see later, the ghettos have the greatest immediate need for Head Start, but the child of poverty everywhere must have special help to catch up.

This program addresses itself to the very young child who is ready to learn about life and his role in society. The deprived child will not learn this lesson well, unless he is given special attention; and that is precisely the function of the Head Start
program. Head Start is there to carry the child through his early school years, and to make sure that he does not suffer throughout life because of childhood disadvantage.

There are 2.5 million children in need of this kind of experience, children aged three to five who must be brought slowly into the world of sights and sounds and sensations they could not know as poverty's children. Talented, patient teachers must help them build bridges from one new learning experience to another. Unfortunately, there is money enough to serve only about 600,000 to 800,000 children a year under Head Start.

Despite limited resources, Head Start also supports intensive training programs for thousands of teachers and other workers in Head Start centers, as well as research projects dealing with the special teaching needs of the culturally deprived.

Head Start is the most popular of OEO's efforts. It generates broad support for its pioneering concepts, its attempt to foster new ideas in childhood, and its promise of better opportunity for tomorrow's adults. But it is not without its problems. For example, the Head Start "graduate" needs some kind of continuing exposure to cultural experiences once he returns to the impoverished world of the street. Little children ought to be able to count on a "Keep Up," as a follow-through to the Head Start they receive.

Then, too, there are the proposals for making Head Start a function of the traditional educational system. There are tremendous responsibilities for both systems, and they should complement each other. The needs of the Head Start youngster are so great that his program must be of unique design and content; and the need to strengthen the existing traditional pattern of education is so great that we ought to give that system our separate attention.

Adult drop-outs are being helped through a work experience program conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The thrust of work experience is to
train unlettered and unskilled parents, and to make them employable. A companion program, adult basic education, helps to bring people up to a working level of education, so that they may then set out to close the gap between the drop-out and the graduate.

I don't want to give the impression that the entire poverty program is designed for the unemployed, the illiterate, or the socially disadvantaged. These people are desperately poor, and need help, but there are many Americans who work, and work hard, and yet earn far less than they should, and some of the most impressive gains in the anti-poverty effort have come on this front.
The Minimum Wage bill enacted in 1965 is the most far-reaching law of its kind since the original bill was passed, some 30 years ago. It raised the industrial minimum wage to $1.60 an hour, a far more realistic figure than the $1.25 which had been in effect. The increase provides an annual wage of $3,320 if the worker is employed throughout the year—a meager amount, at today’s prices, but it is progress.

The legislation we passed in 1965 had even greater impact on seven million workers brought under coverage for the first time. We finally secured a minimum wage for some of the workers in the historically low wage service industries such as dry cleaning, restaurants, and hospitals. These employees, some with families, had gotten by (and sometimes failed to get by) with an hourly rate less than $1.25—beneath the poverty level.

III. WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE

Our aim is not to put people on welfare. Our aim is to get them off. We want to reach them, communicate with them, convince them of our sincere desire to help, and then put them on the road to productivity. No one wants to be a welfare case, if by welfare case we mean a useless non-member of society. Welfare is a temporary system, a holding action; the ultimate that we have in mind is a renaissance of the human spirit.

There are examples of this spirit all over the country. A group of Negro and Puerto Rican women in New York run a garment factory on the Lower East Side. Most are mothers; all are on welfare; none want to be. They chose a high-demand industry, and may subcontract. Their enterprise will attract more small business. This is the kind of “right now” project that can defeat poverty. It produces the necessary change in self-image (from despair to self-respect) and financial change (from no money to some money). Their futures belong to them, and they earn the right to defeat poverty by themselves.

These women, and thousands of people like them, are self-starters. Given adequate support, they will break poverty’s
cycle and find a place in the business community. But there is a deeper crisis among the very poor: the hard-core unemployed, whose chronic joblessness is a tragedy to themselves and a drain upon others. Men perpetually out of work don't earn money, and don't find any way to join the economic mainstream.

The only cheerful note on the hard-core unemployed is that they have no place to go but up. They can't sink any deeper into poverty. About 500,000 of these persons are now unemployed in the major cities of America. Again and again, throughout their lives, their job requests have been rejected. They don’t bother to ask anymore, and finally they are not even officially recorded as among the unemployed. The half-million figure is just our best guess as to their numbers.

As President Johnson put it in his January 1968 State of the Union Message: “...the time has come when we must get to those who are last in line—the hard-core unemployed—the hardest to reach.”

The President has called for business participation in this task, because business has the resources, the imagination, and the ability to make an impact on this problem. A corporate president, recently addressing himself to the reasons for business joining the war on poverty, offered his philosophy:

(1) We, in industry, owe it to our society to use our resources to cure a social ill that has been with us too long; (2) We, in industry, must maintain for ourselves and the nation a trained labor force; (3) So, we in industry, have the capital, the manpower, the skills, the technology, and the desire to get the job done.

These three ingredients—responsibility, good business sense, and capability—can add up to significant progress in the struggle against urban hard-core joblessness. We will have to use the same kind of strategy against another pocket of poverty, the rural countryside. Rural poverty is less obvious
than the poverty of the inner city, but it is just as oppressing, just as damaging to the nation.

**RURAL POVERTY**

As we come to know more and more about poverty, we find that it is a far more omnipotent enemy than anyone could have realized. Urban poverty has finally caught our attention. There is good reason for turning also to our rural areas, where poverty takes other forms to cause similar effects.

"A national disgrace," is the conclusion reached by the President's Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. Even as city problems tug for our attention, we must look closely at the grim findings presented in the Commission report:

- Only 30 percent of our total population lives in rural areas, but 40 percent of the nation's poor live there—14 million in all.

- The rate of unemployment nationally is about 4 percent, but in rural areas it is about 18 percent. Underemployment—working too many hours for too little in return—runs as high as 37 percent.

- Hunger, even among children, does exist among the rural poor, as a group of physicians discovered recently in a visit to the rural South. They found Negro children not getting enough food to sustain life, and so disease-ridden as to be beyond cure.

- Schools are generally poor. Three million rural adults are classified as illiterates.

- Rural America accounts for 40 percent of all sub-standard deteriorating or dilapidated housing. "Unfit to live in" is the condition of one of every 13 rural housing units.

The report has much to say about the way in which federal programs have been unable to reach people most in need of
help, and it has powerful arguments for over-hauling of manpower programs, changes in the rural education system, and much else. And it makes it quite clear that poverty anywhere causes problems elsewhere:

*The Urban riots during 1967 had their roots, in considerable part, in rural poverty. A high proportion of the people crowded into city slums today came there from rural slums. This fact alone makes clear how large a stake the people of this nation have in an attack on rural poverty.*

There is now general agreement that the rural-to-city flow of people has been far greater than the urban centers’ capacity for absorption. And there is little argument that a dollar invested in people in the rural sector yields far greater return than a like amount invested in the city. Lower land costs and lower population density in rural areas make this point practically self-evident. There is also no doubt that we have the technology and other means for making rural life sufficiently attractive to keep people living there, and possibly even reverse in some measure the outward flow.

There must be a greater effort all around if we are to escape history’s harsh judgment. More federal resources will have to be used and used wisely. There will have to be better state programs to implement the activities of anti-poverty agencies; communities will have to become so aware of poverty, and its terrible toll, that they rise up against it. We will have to bring the best we have to the war on poverty, or we will never know the greatness of a free people whose great wealth is shared by all.
“The South has a safety valve for its racial tensions. If Negroes refuse to accommodate themselves to segregation they can get out—go North. But the Northern and Western cities cannot shift the burden. They represent the end of the racial line.”

—Samuel Lubbel,
The Future of American Politics, 1952

“...where does one run to when he’s already in the promised land?”

—Claude Brown,
Manchild in the Promised Land, 1965

THE HIGH COST OF DISCRIMINATION

Ann Arbor, Michigan, is a beautiful, quiet college community approximately 40 miles from Detroit. Soon after 9:00 p.m. on July 23, and following a speech in the gracious old ballroom of the student union, I drove back to my hotel in Detroit. When I left the city earlier in the day, tension and violence had already disrupted a few Negro neighborhoods.

On the drive back that night, the violence that was to prove typical of the summer was obvious. The sky was lit by the fires. The sharp crack of gunfire could be heard in the distance. Abandoned automobiles were burning by the roadside. The tanks were rolling. There were armored troop carriers, roadblocks and checkpoints, soldiers with rifles, national guardsmen on the move.
Detroit had exploded, during the summer of 1967 which saw Newark, Cleveland, Minneapolis, New Haven, and 53 other American cities suffer through long nights of blood and fire.

In the days that followed, I remembered a speech I had made in 1963 soon after police and civil rights demonstrators had fought their tragic battle in Birmingham. I suggested that we try to understand what was happening in the South because it appeared, even then, that the days of Northern self-righteousness about the great Negro revolution of the 1950's and the 1960's was about to end. The North had more than latent evidence of the Southern conflict that could well erupt into racial violence.

My speech was widely reported in the South, and I assume that at least a few segregationists derived some satisfaction from the spectacle of a liberal Northern Senator who, for a moment at least, had stopped criticizing the Southerners who stubbornly refused to recognize that equality really does mean
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that lunch counters, bus waiting rooms, voting places, colleges, and much more should be open to all people.

Birmingham was a turning point. While there would continue to be much-needed campaigns to make registration more universal, juries more just, and housing more open, the fight against discrimination would turn more and more to the ghettos of some Southern cities, and many more in the North. While some would continue the lonely, solitary efforts to end outright discrimination, many others would join in a collective effort to erase the blight of big-city ghetto life.

The North lived in tragic ignorance during the 1950's and early 1960's. Dramatic civil rights showdowns—grown men taunting school girls in Little Rock, a governor barring the door of a college, Medgar Evars murdered in front of his home, clergymen arrested during marches—seemed somehow comfortably distant to the urban North. To many Northerners, it was plain that discrimination was a Southern problem.

Time, and harsh reality, have changed the mind of most Northerners. Now we know that discrimination has borne bitter fruit in major Northern cities. Now we know that discrimination is not a “Southern problem,” but a national crisis.

There was a time when the ghetto was an ethnic neighborhood, created (and tolerated) in order to perpetuate a people. Today, the very term “ghetto” is repugnant because it epitomizes the discriminatory practices and substandard living conditions which have been the lot of minorities. The ghetto becomes a place spurned by the majority.

The Negro ghetto of the 1960's is unlike any seen before in our history. Some observers say that the Negroes are much like immigrants of the last century; given time, they will work their way out of the ghetto.

This convenient theory ignores many sad truths. Robert Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, makes a particular point of the difference between the Negro and the earlier minority:
The poor white can usually in time work his way up and out of the slums, educate his children, and merge into the greater American society. This has been the pattern with all the waves of immigrants of the past: But it is seldom true for the nonwhite and that is the basis for much of the frustration, and withdrawal, and rising anger of the racial ghetto. This is an unpleasant truth we should not try to obscure.

Weaver’s observation is underscored by Jeanne R. Lowe in her book Cities in a Race with Time:

He . . . has not only the ‘badge of color’ but also the ingrained burdens of generations of cultural and economic deprivation. His move to the city makes painfully and inescapably apparent the effects of dependency and weak family organization which had their origins in slavery but were perpetuated after Reconstruction by the Southern plantation system. This is the system that has shaped the mass of the ‘new urbanites,’ the people who comprise 20, 30, and even 60 percent of central cities’ populations and who, during the 1970’s may be expected to increase their present number by 50 to 100 percent.

The best documentary evidence we have on a crisis ghetto about to blow up is the Bureau of Census special study of Cleveland, Ohio, completed in 1965. This is the only study available for an entire major city in the mid-1960’s, and it details social and economic changes in Cleveland over a five-year period. It is a telling forecast of conditions which triggered the riots there.

The Cleveland findings reveal that in the first five years of this decade, conditions grew worse, not better:

- Incomes, which had ranged from $3,170 to $4,900 in 1960, had slipped to $3,000-$4,160 by 1965. In
nearby Negro neighborhoods outside the area, in­comes had gone from $5,450-$6,230 in 1960 to $5,460-$6,500 by 1965.

- Unemployment went up—14.6 percent for men and 17.2 percent for women—three times the city-wide average.

- Though population declined by one-fifth, Negro female-headed families increased by 8 percent.
The implications of this census study are appalling. People in the hard-core ghetto of 1960 had become less numerous but more desperate by 1965. At the heart of the problem for many families was the dearth of jobs for untrained men. Many industries that had once eagerly sought unskilled labor had moved to the suburbs, too far to reach even if public transportation facilities were adequate.

Think of a youngster during those five years—losing out at home, unable to see any real purpose in school, slowly succumbing to the vice-grip of the ghetto. He is one of the hapless ghetto-dwellers who was born poor, who became poorer, and so thought he had nothing to lose by joining in when the rioting began.

This intense despair gives rise to a psychology of self-destruction, which sets in wherever people have abandoned all hope. Desperate men resort to desperate means to express their anguish. Prisoners in rebellion burn their own beds; youngsters in reform school strike out at the world by burning their own gymnasium; and ghetto rioters, torn by bitter frustration, bring violence down on their own heads.

When the looting and the flaunting of authority ends, the ghetto loses the excitement of conflict and momentary solidarity. Ghetto dwellers gain nothing, except one important foothold—someone may be looking at their bitter bonfire.

There are those who contend that improving the ghettos now would be rewarding the rioters for their acts of violence and destruction. The best answer to that was offered by William Taylor of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in testimony after last year’s rioting:

*Times of crisis can teach us quickly lessons that we otherwise may be slow to learn and can generate corrective action that we are slow to take in times of tranquility... The basic question is whether we have the will and commitment to undertake the kind of effort necessary to deal with economic and social injustices. The answer to that*
question, at this point, is far from clear. For example, one reaction to the disorders has been that we should reject ameliorative measures which could be construed as rewarding violence. To adopt this position would be to withhold from all the means for establishing equality of opportunity in the name of punishing the few who have perpetuated violence.

Taylor went on to make the point that “we have developed a society that is rapidly being divided into opposite camps, hostile and mistrustful of each other.” He made the haunting observation that it is possible for a Negro child, reared in the heart of a large city, to reach adolescence without knowing a single white person of his own age.

If we had to start on a national scale and undo the effects of this isolation, I would doubt that we had much chance of success. But fortunately within the last seven years, two Presidents have given us many of the instruments we need to come to grips with the forces that perpetuate ghettos. Delay has already been costly; we cannot afford any more delay.
The way out of this wilderness of desperation and despair will be long and hard, but there will be no way out at all unless day-in, day-out efforts are made to help people there change their own lives for the better. On-again, off-again projects for improvement won’t work. Whether the object is education, more jobs, or simply more livable neighborhoods, the work ahead is enormous, and it will take time.

**EDUCATION**

Schooling won’t be of much help to a youngster who’s going nowhere and knows it. Unless educational innovations are made available to boys and girls most in need of them, these ghetto children will not be ready for the opportunities that open up to them. If the signs on the buses are accurate, and “Times Are Getting Better,” we need to mesh greater learning with greater opportunity.

One early attempt to provide special experiences for the disadvantaged child was Operation Head Start. Since the impoverished urban child is generally the victim of discrimination, Head Start was designed to overcome the deprivations of a financially and socially starved child. Head Start is making headway. By 1967, more than 1.3 million youngsters had been enrolled. There were gains in areas other than learning: 70 percent of the children had their first medical and dental examinations under Head Start.

The project continues to yield valuable lessons on specialized teaching techniques, and it is building a cadre of teachers who can help others spread the word. Also, educators now have the tools to help provide follow-up and other help badly needed by ghetto youngsters in the critical years before and immediately after entry into high school.

Head Start is not the only program for strengthening education in the ghetto. A major vehicle for sustained action is Title I of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, an Act which provided almost $1 billion during that year alone for special programs in impoverished areas.
Additionally, the Act offers incentives for experimentation and direct application of research findings.

Title I projects have made tremendous inroads into the educational deprivation of ghetto youngsters in a number of cities. In Detroit, 2,700 elementary school youngsters with difficulties in symbolizing linguistic structures are receiving help at communications skills centers in low-income neighborhoods. Washington, D.C., and Greencastle, Indiana, children are being offered a physical education program which includes necessary gym clothing (remember the desperate mother and her plight over gym clothes?), and in the case of the Washington children, breakfast before the classes. Inner-city Art Action Centers are bringing crafts and related skill projects to Rochester, New York, youngsters.

In the total attempt to break down the handicaps which plague the ghetto child, such programs are rich in promise. With the cooperation of the educator, and the understanding of the general public, these experimental programs can do much to bring education to discrimination’s victims in the urban ghetto.
INCOME AND HOUSING

To some sociologists, solving the ghetto problem is simple: give a guaranteed income; scrap the welfare system; move the suddenly-affluent into better housing, which they could then afford; and sit back to let the government mail out the checks, a purely mechanical process.

Proposals for a negative income tax or some other form of guaranteed income merit serious attention, but money alone will not solve all problems. More realistic employment opportunities have got to be provided, not only for the resulting paychecks, but for the over-all atmosphere of the ghetto.

A California corporation president, Victor Palmieri, rejects the notion that the ghetto will "disappear" with training and education alone:

Once the community commits itself to this strategy, a whole range of regenerative possibilities will come into view. Federal housing and redevelopment programs—particularly those accentuating rehabilitation—can be brought into play to establish the potential for racially mixed communities in conjunction with the new centers of public employment. Rent supplements can be used along with long-term submarket interest rate loans to insure that such communities do not follow the principle of 'Negro removal' so often involved in redevelopment projects. There will be a prime opportunity to integrate all the human renewal aspects of Federal, State and local health and welfare and anti-poverty programs. But more importantly, there will be a confrontation on the issue of the drastic changes that must be made in the quality of the ghetto schools.

More jobs and better living conditions both within and outside the ghettos will help in two ways. For those who want
out, the door will be opened. For those who prefer to remain where they now live, life will be better.

A big step forward in breaking up ghettos has been taken in some cities by corporation executives acting in the name of both conscience and good business sense. They are getting the word out that they will hire men now regarded as hard-core unemployed. They are discarding irrelevant, rigid hiring practices (such as written aptitude tests that had flustered many an able, but shy or unlettered, applicant). They instruct personnel directors to take sensible follow-up action after men are hired—making certain, for example, that the worker is not discouraged during his first few days on the job by unfamiliar work procedures or just plain nervousness. The willingness of business to experiment and adapt is having immediate impact. Jobless men who had been idle and resentful on Monday have been hired and put on the production line by Thursday. Men and women who had almost given up on themselves are finding that they can earn a living, and support their family.

Tied to the programs for improving the income of the ghetto Negro are new concepts for ghetto housing. If the ghetto is to be a livable place, and if the income created by
private and public programs is to be used for improving life, there will have to be housing improvements. I have seen the ugly gray of slum housing, and the dingy halls and porches of run-down, rat-infested tenements.

The 1960 housing census identified 4 million urban housing units that were completely dilapidated; 3 million more units were "badly deteriorated," and another 2 million housing
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units were badly overcrowded, and found to be in violation of housing codes. Surveys since 1960 show that these estimates were far too conservative, and that there are as many as 8 million units of substandard ghetto housing.

In spite of anti-discrimination campaigns, and some federal requirements, these woefully substandard housing units are home and shelter to millions of persecuted Americans—Negroes, Puerto Ricans, even Eskimos and Indians. It seems clear that regardless of the work we have done so far, discrimination still stands in the way of decent housing for racial minorities.

Our work at improving urban housing goes beyond discrimination into the heart of the urban rehabilitation effort, as we will see later. For the moment, though, let's consider what we can do—and have done—to curb discrimination against people, as they try to find a decent place to live.

It is clear that in housing, we have not yet spoken out as strongly as we have in other areas of discrimination. In spite of specific actions—the housing order by the President in 1962, the Civil Rights Act of 1964—there is still a moral imperative to do more.

But what we have done is to get moving, to chip away at the hard rock of resistance. We are working to provide housing for low-income families outside as well as inside the ghetto. We have tried, with some success, to break down the barriers in tenant selection for public housing. Through all of these programs, our goal is to make adequate housing available to the greatest number of Americans.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

From time to time, we hear the argument that all new federal programs tend to move the people and their government farther and farther apart. It would be futile to ask for a truce on this old battle cry on the grounds that our current domestic problems are much too complex for such grade
school reasoning. Instead, I will describe what is happening—thanks to federal programs—in a ghetto which accounts for almost one-quarter of the serious crime in the District of Columbia. It is the “black ghetto” known as Shaw-Cardozo, and it is the epitome of ghetto joblessness, poor education, and crumbling housing.

The Model Inner City Community Organization (MICCO) has been established because a clergyman wanted to plan an urban redevelopment program based on benefit to the present residents, rather than wholesale disruption of their lives. MICCO grew out of a desire for renewal, not Negro removal. MICCO leaders are learning about the attitudes and ambitions of the people in the 145-square block area. When necessary, the group negotiates changes in public agency proposals. The theme of the MICCO program is community involvement; the people of Shaw have a voice in their own destiny.

Other agencies and programs carry out this theme. The United Planning Organization, funded through OEO and other federal agencies, has been at work in recent years to develop leaders, provide services at neighborhood centers, and in general help ghetto residents live better lives. Although MICCO
leaders and UPO personnel are often in sharp conflict over procedure, they agree on the impact federal incentive has made in Shaw. Without federal participation, Shaw would almost certainly be a more desperate place.

Programs of several federal agencies have been tailored to fit the needs of ghetto neighborhoods, like Shaw, all across the country. At the beginning of this year the Departments of Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education, and Welfare, joined forces in a cooperative ghetto rehabilitation program. The three Secretaries, working with OEO, funded $23.7 million for 11 cities to begin a Neighborhood Services Program. President Johnson had earlier requested the establishment “in every ghetto of America—a neighborhood center to service the people who live there,” and his request was based on the underlying premise of special ghetto services. Ghetto dwellers have problems so far removed from the ordinary that conventional social services are inadequate, or unavailable.

Neighborhood Service Centers will fill the gap, by providing parent and child guidance, employment referral, contact with isolates, centralized work-training programs, and expanded public health services.

There are other community programs for the ghetto which draw on the resources of state agencies and private firms. The federal initiative here has been to bring the parties together, to provide a framework for their efforts, and to advise when necessary. Ghetto neighborhoods, and whole communities, benefit from this kind of coordination through federal participation, and in ways that contribute to the most urgent needs.

In New Jersey, for example, the State Housing Finance Agency, together with a private insurance firm and a private construction company, have begun construction of a 279-unit condominium in Newark’s Central Ward, the scene of 1967’s ugly rioting. The $4.5 million project, consisting of 16 three-story brick garden apartments, will house 1,100 people.
The community becomes the focus for this kind of effort, because on completion, a non-profit cooperative organization will manage the complex and sell the units. Control and coordination stay at home, in the urban center. This project is the nation’s first under a program in which the insurance industry has created a $1 billion mortgage fund to be used in ghetto rehabilitation. Twenty-three other cities will be given a chance to duplicate the Newark experiment.

Ghettos are certainly the most visible evil of discrimination. Our work to dismantle ghettos, and erase discrimination’s mark on our cities, is well started. The mission now is to get on with the dismantling, and to be certain that we do not falter in the process.

Note: These basic observations on the problems of the ghetto were given an unparalleled priority by the monumental report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, issued as this book was going to press. The “Kerner Report,” named for Commission chairman Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois, presents an exhaustive study of the causes and consequences of riot. It is a mandate to the conscience of every American, to find his own role in repairing the damage to our society.

We have seen the toll taken by racial discrimination, how it makes each of us poorer because it deprives our economy and our society of useful manpower, purchasing power, and brain power.

The barriers we create because of race cause their more disastrous consequences among our youth. Their frustration nurtures corrosive anger and explosive flare-ups that have already destroyed neighborhoods and might some day destroy cities.

Discrimination of another kind is also causing pent-up emotion, but there will be no riots, sit-ins, or demonstrations in front of the White House because of it. Its victims don’t
know each other. They have no identifying color of skin to unite them. They are more likely to be ashamed of their plight than outspoken about it.

They are victims of discrimination in employment because of age.

Sometimes, age discrimination can be even more destructive than racial discrimination.

A witness at the 1967 hearings on a bill to prohibit age barriers in employment put it this way:

I have always been struck by the fact that when the Packard plant shut down permanently in 1956, we found that the Big Three auto companies in Detroit—Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler—did not discriminate between Negro and white ex-Packard workers. Ex-Packard Negroes had just as good a chance of getting new jobs with these companies as did the whites.

One of the major reasons, perhaps the most important reason, was that the state of Michigan already had had a fair employment practices law,
prohibiting job discrimination on the basis of race.

But what about age? Here, unfortunately, the picture was not a good one. In the interviews with the ex-Packard workers, one year after the shutdown, it was found that among younger workers—under 45—58 percent obtained new jobs with the Big Three. But among those aged 45 to 54, only 30 percent. And among those aged 55 to 64—only 15 percent.

Incidentally, among the workers who were under 65, the 45-to-64-year-old men constituted more than 80 percent of the work force at the time of the permanent shutdown. I have often wondered what has happened to these Packard workers of the past 10 years.

The Department of Labor report in 1965 on the older American worker made several eye-opening points about the cost of discrimination because of age:

- Unless checked, age discrimination could increase simply because the population of older workers is increasing significantly. Today there are 22 million men and women between 45 and 55, almost 17 million between 55 and 65, and 18 million 65 and over.

- In 1975, there will be almost 24 million men and women between 45 and 55, about 20 million between 55 and 65, and about 21 million aged 65 and over.

- Half of all employers in 1965 applied specific age limits beyond which they would not consider a worker for a job. Limits were typically set from 45 to 55.

- An estimated million man years of productive time are unused each year because of unemployment of workers at or past age 45.

- Costs of unemployment insurance, lost production, and welfare costs cause a dollar loss from age discrimination of several billion dollars a year.
The full toll goes beyond dollars. Look at the pernicious consequences to the individual: 75 percent longer unemployment than among younger groups, the "deterioration of skill and motivation, with consequent reduced acceptability to employers and the personal frustrations and anxieties."

That mood of personal frustration and anxiety was described forcefully by a constituent, Mr. Walter Morris, who has published a book of this age discrimination problem. At age 54, Mr. Morris found that his white collar job had been quietly eliminated when his employer sold the business. This "older
worker" then went through an ordeal that is almost unbelievably—except to those, including unemployed members of the "Forty Plus" clubs, who have experienced it elsewhere in the nation.

His book, *Diary of a Discarded Man*, has not been widely distributed. But, as its publisher says on the jacket, it is "survival reading for every person, regardless of age, whose existence depends upon a pay check." Mr. Morris tells us about the doubts that arise when job interviews suddenly are cut short after the age is mentioned, about the uselessness of employment agencies for a man over 40, about the anxious wait for the Sunday *New York Times* and its want ads, about the signing of checks when the bank balance dips to the final few dollars. And Mr. Morris explodes:

> When a person is up against prejudice, he is up against a kind of social automatism, a blind process that just kicks along in its own way and is seemingly impervious to anything that can be brought against it. Rational argument is impotent and plain facts are laughed at or angrily denied.

> Upon first encounter, the whole thing seems unbelievable; then when its full shape is seen, disgust is aroused, and fear, blazing anger. Perhaps later, after long experience, one becomes resigned.

> In the job market, every job-seeker is immediately plastered with all kinds of tags and labels. The law has been moving in against this practice, and against the more glaring forms of discrimination, but it doesn't do much good. An employer can reject you because you're a Jew or because you're 'too old,' but he knows better than to say so. He'll simply say, 'Not Qualified.' For the most part, legislation only makes prejudice cagier and less outspoken.

Mr. Morris has a point about legislation, but a law is needed as a beginning. The significant fact about the 1967 bill to ban
age discrimination is not the ban itself; the bill also is designed to be positive in its provisions calling for research and education on the usefulness of older workers. In other words, it will try to fight the myths so many employers take to be "facts." Let me take a few of those "facts," or commonly used arguments against hiring older workers. Then I will give a quotation in answer to each and, finally, I will divulge the authoritative source of the quotation.

"FACT" ONE: It costs much more to hire older people in terms of pensions, insurance benefits, and unemployment insurance.

The Response:

"Workers hired in lower age brackets cost more over the long haul than those hired at higher ages under the pension plan because . . . longer life expectancy for younger workers means they will draw benefits for longer periods than older ones."

In addition:

"... benefits paid in future years are likely to increase substantially, requiring rising contributions by the management."

As for insurance and other benefit plans:

"The study pointed out that for a 50-year-old employee, $3,000 of group life insurance would cost $2.25 per month more than for a worker 30 years of age. With dividend or rate credit, there was further reduction until the net difference was usually less than 1 cent an hour."

And finally, workmen's compensation:

"The cost of workmen's compensation insurance, accident and sickness, and hospitalization and surgery insurance are not materially increased by the inclusion of older people in the work force."
"FACT" TWO: Older workers are chronic absentees.

The Response:

"Absence due to illness is actually less among over 45's than with younger employees. It is true that when they are out, it is sometimes for a longer period, but it is much easier to plan production when a worker has to be away for a week than when one takes off an unexpected day at a time over a period of months."

"FACT" THREE: Older workers are bound to have more accidents.

The Response:

"Mature employees are less likely to take a foolish chance than the younger ones. They don't engage in horseplay and are actually more careful than younger people. Records show that they have fewer accidents."

"FACT" FOUR: Our economy can't use older workers.

The Response:

"It is customary in talking about jobs to think in terms of industry. Actually, manufacturing provides only about 25 percent of the total job opportunities. This means that for every opening available in manufacturing industry, there are three opportunities in commerce, trade, finance, insurance, wholesaling, retailing, construction, services, transportation, government, and other kinds of enterprise. In many instances, organizations outside manufacturing have even greater opportunities for older job applicants."

Many more arguments can be given and they can be knocked down easily because they are straw—the stuff that
prejudices are made of. And what is the source of the responses given above in quotations? It is not the Department of Labor, the National Council of Senior Citizens, or even the Forty-Plus Clubs. It is the National Association of Manufacturers, which urges its members to recognize that it is sound business to employ older job seekers.

Fifty-three years ago, Henry Ford announced that he would pay his assembly-line men $5.00 per eight-hour day instead of the prevailing $2.40 per nine-hour day.

Mr. Ford was mercilessly denounced by those who said he would price himself out of business and ruin the labor market besides. But, as Frederick Lewis Allen writes in The Big Change, Henry Ford had immediate practical reasons for making the change, as well as a feeling, however vague, “that if more Americans got high wages, there would be a market for more industrial products, including of course Ford cars.”

Ford turned out to be right. He refused to be stopped by those who declared that there simply wasn’t enough to go around—not enough market for new cars, not enough profit for investors. The “not enough” thinkers are always with us. They fear free trade and long for new tariffs because there is not enough market here for our products and theirs, too. Perhaps they won’t say it out loud, but they fear true equality among races because there are not enough jobs to go around. And, by all means, let’s not hire older workers because we must make way for the young.

There’s just not enough to go around. Let’s huddle together and guard the minimum.

What kind of people say such things? What kind of people believe them? The sad response to the question is: too many people! Though living in the richest nation on earth in the most exciting period of change and enlightenment ever experienced, too many people not only say and believe untruths based on fear, meanness of spirit, and prejudice, but they guard them, nourish them, and strike out against others in their name.
"The true test of a civilization is not the census, nor the size of the cities, nor the crops, but the kind of man the country turns out."
—Emerson

"Every child has the right to as much education as he or she has the ability to take. I want that for our children’s sake, but I also want it for our nation’s sake."
—Lyndon Baines Johnson

**TALENTS FOR LIVING**

In life today, learning can no longer be limited to the classroom between ages six and the mid-twenties. It must begin at birth and continue through life. The lifelong student must be able to change his career both to accommodate his talents and to fill the manpower needs of the time.

Failure of the learning experience can be found throughout modern America. It may show up in the eyes of a neglected infant in a slum house, or in the awkward hands of a high school dropout. It is apparent in the aimless course of a man’s life, wasting away in the wrong job; it sits heavy in the heart of an elderly woman, with only loneliness in her remaining years. The learning breakdown is evident in the vacant gaze of the runaway youth in a hippie haven; college professors see it in the unhearing disinterest of a disenchanted student.

We must therefore find far better ways to seek out and develop our best talent, whether it be in a ghetto or an elite suburb, and then provide the opportunity for that talent to develop and express itself. Simply doing something for tradition’s sake has no place in this picture.
In Jefferson’s agrarian society, land ownership was the ideal in the “pursuit of happiness,” and when one parcel of land was worn out, people had to move on. Today, a parcel of education is the ideal possession, and when people find themselves on a worn out foundation, they must move on to more education.

We have been slow to develop new techniques for dealing with the knowledge explosion, and its potential for human advancement. Serious deficiencies in the quality of education were almost guaranteed by the lack of federal participation. As we entered the space age, we still used too many little red school house materials, methods and ideas in education.

Part of the problem stemmed from forces at work within the education establishment. Outdated methods of instruction, unwieldy credential requirements, and antiquated facilities all contributed to the drag. In the critical area of instruction, the teacher himself has traditionally been a second-class citizen. (And he still is, to judge from today’s strikes.)

A second factor at work until the 1950’s was the unfortunate doctrine of “separate but equal” education. Our school systems, and in fact our total educational environment, was never able to realize its potential because of this inequity. Life skills are developed out of the individual’s total experience, and when a system denies wide experience to anyone, that individual cannot possibly “learn” about his own capacities.

Also, there were hackneyed methods in use throughout much of the education system. Evidence continues to mount that the rigid atmosphere of the classroom is not likely to be the most productive of learning situations. John Gardner, arguing for change, put the case this way:

All too often we are giving our young people cut flowers when we should be teaching them to grow their own plants. We are stuffing their heads with the products of earlier innovation rather than teaching them to innovate. We think of the mind
as a storehouse to be filled when we should be thinking of it as an instrument to be used.

Compounding the problem, was the federal government’s low level of interest, and misunderstanding of its responsibility. The United States traditionally considered education a responsibility of the states and localities—no matter how poor or overburdened. Eighty-six Congresses, 33 Presidents and 172 years of time produced only a thimbleful of action. In the past decade, all that has changed. It had to.

If Congress and the White House were unsympathetic to maximum education as recently as the 1950’s, the Supreme Court offset this with its landmark decision in 1954 that outlawed segregation and focused national attention on the lack of equality between school and school—not just the “white” school and the “black” school, but variables, North and South, East and West, between communities and within communities.

The Russian space achievements in the late 50’s added new urgency to federal efforts in education. The defenders of the locality’s right to educate its young made their case loud and
clear, but there was irresistible need to upgrade the quality of education. As it turned out, there was nothing to fear. Federal appropriations have actually strengthened the states and localities. For the most part federal funds are channeled through state agencies, which, for the first time, have the means to innovate and experiment. There was also growing impact from the burgeoning civil rights movement which did not settle for equal facilities. The Negro demanded quality of education, his only key to opportunity.

Faced by these strong new forces of change, state and local officials had to look anew at their role in education, and they also had to help the federal level understand these problems. A partnership had to be formed.

For local school boards, education is, of course, their sole concern. The boards must conduct day-to-day operations of public elementary and secondary schools. Teachers must be assigned to classes, books and instructional supplies must be ordered, and policies governing public education must be developed and implemented.

At the state level, education is a major problem, but not the sole concern. State agencies must set minimum standards of school operation and maintenance, certification standards for teachers, establish certain teacher-training institutions, operate retirement systems, and develop schools for the physically and emotionally handicapped.

The third partner in this alliance, and the catalytic agent in our recent growth, is the federal government. For the federal government, education is one of many concerns which must be considered along with national defense, full employment, and elimination of poverty.

Traditionally, federal action in education has been limited to advice and financial support. Today however, federal presence provides several unique contributions: a stronger financial base for research; the potential to help localities reduce their overdependence on property taxation; the means to provide adequate resources to low income states with low
standards; and above all, the partner that must bring national perspective.

The effectiveness of this partnership depends on the wise assignment of educational responsibilities, so that each partner employs its greatest strength, and receives compensation for its weakness. In this way, we will be able to embrace educational change as it comes, and make the appropriate response at all levels of the learning process.

Change has already brought response. Education is reaching out and touching lives in positive, personal ways never dreamed of prior to the 1960's. It is providing opportunity for the very young, the elderly, and the many in between.

The three-year-old need no longer spend his years in a ghetto vegetating. He can enter a "Head Start" program and begin preparing for school and the education President Johnson refers to as his "right."

The struggling young teenager who missed "Head Start" because it wasn't in existence in the early 1960's is likely a beneficiary of the many federally-assisted tutoring programs engaged in by college students, many of whom once themselves stood in need of help.
Nor is the young adult who missed out on both "Head Start" and tutoring forgotten. Job Corps and Manpower Development and Training programs are offsetting his lack of formal education with special education in whatever fields he might show a talent.

Those "phased out" through automation are also finding help, as well as the handicapped, the housewife who wants to work, and the elderly.

One of the most effective national educational efforts, the World War II G.I. Bill, was offered to over 16 million veterans.
This was one of the earliest federal actions in education, and, as it turned out, one of the most effective.

Most World War II veterans find it difficult to express themselves fully regarding the impact that the G.I. Bill had on their lives.

Education and manpower experts are not so tongue-tied, however, and state quite openly that this 1944 legislation ranks among the most significant laws ever passed by a U.S. Congress. It's doubtful that even its most enthusiastic supporters at the time foresaw its effects.
Perhaps the most important lesson taught us by the G.I. Bill was that a high percentage of our youth—higher than anyone could have guessed—is capable of continuing their education past high school—if they have the means. Informal surveys of college graduates educated under the G.I. Bill show clearly that thousands would not have pursued college after the war had it not been for Veterans’ educational benefits.

This pool of talent, found and developed under the G.I. Bill, has its parallel today. There are thousands of college-calibre youngsters who would continue their education if they were able, and there is a corresponding demand for talent in the business and professional world. Clearly, a need has developed for educational assistance that will close the gap between untrained talent and unfulfilled demand.

Recognition of this need, coupled with the diversity of human interest and experience, has been the chief reason for federal involvement in the educational process. Under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, the Congress passed into law 65 percent of the programs now in operation under the Office of Education.
It must be remembered, of course, that the federal actions had to be directed at carefully chosen targets intended to provide the most help for the most people with the greatest need. This selectivity remains essential, because education is a $55 billion industry involving: almost 55 million students acquiring a formal education at all levels; some 20 million adults engaged in continuing education; 2.5 million teachers; 105,000 elementary and secondary schools; 23,000 school districts; 2,200 institutions of higher education, 55 state and territorial departments of education; and rapidly growing numbers of junior colleges, public and private technical, vocational, and business schools, national associations, and professional groups.

The federal share of the $55 billion education industry is about 15 percent.

Certainly no other network of governmental activity has produced greater human involvement—involvement based on deep understanding of the educational backwaters that carry millions of Americans in their currents.

Those currents run especially strong against the youngsters who, because of economic or racial handicaps are doubly jeopardized.
They have not the chance to develop with their own age group, nor can they expect to be ready for training and development in adult life. They are harbored and hidden in the urban ghetto school, the one-room wooden school houses in Appalachia, the adobe schools of the Southwest, and in migrant labor camps.

President Johnson's historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 made these children one of our most important target groups. Funds from Title I of this Act, entirely in the hands of local educators, are at work to break the life pattern that has kept these children in the dark for so long. Some of the excitement of what is going on under Title I shows clearly in the experience of a non-verbal second-grader who was given the chance to express herself through line and color. A teacher at an “art action center” in Rochester tried to stimulate the youngster with crayons and paper, then sent her home with words of encouragement. When the teacher arrived next morning, she found the bright-eyed girl waiting at the door, with her drawings, ready to tell about her experience. Her verbal deficiencies had given way, for the moment, to a new-found eagerness to communicate.

Title I provides this kind of boost to the children; and in many cases, it opens new avenues of communication to teachers as well. In Atlanta, instructors undergoing preparation for a Title I remedial reading program were given a unique tool with which to approach the class: the repetitive verse of a Beatles’ rock song. Using the familiar lyric of “Little Child,” the teachers found that they could stir up an interest and an enthusiasm in their students that they had never known before.

Other students, almost six million of them, have handicaps that go far beyond a lack of interest and enthusiasm. They are the blind, the mentally retarded, and the emotionally disturbed. The tragic truth is that until recently only one-fourth of these youngsters received special educational attention. The majority struggled to keep up in regular school, or did not go to school at all.
Their struggles had pained local schoolboards for many years. Here, the big problem was that trained teachers for the handicapped were, and still are, in short supply. Crash programs to provide that teaching talent, under the Mental Retardation Facilities Act, are now under way.

Higher education has its own bundle of problems. A few years ago, we drafted the National Defense Education Act to correct a then-pressing need: strengthening of colleges' programs of study so as to improve the qualitative dimension of higher education.

Even while we continue to carry out the thrust of the NDEA, we must also address ourselves to a pressing shortage of bricks and mortar. University and college facilities have always been hard-pressed, but in 1963, a college population of approximately 4 million, together with the prospect of greatly
increased numbers of students, prompted Congress to enact the Higher Education Facilities Act.

It appears now that we acted just in time. College enrollment has swelled to 6 million today, and is expected to hit 9 million by 1975. This spiral in college attendance, and the continuing pressure on classrooms, libraries, dormitories and laboratories, means that to keep pace with higher education, we shall have to expand our assistance efforts.
Our non-college graduates, 21 million of them, were being shortchanged, too. Education was not giving them the learning tools they needed for full earning power in today’s labor market. The nation had to come up with a plan to find the unemployed, and give them training in job and related skills. President Kennedy recommended major changes in vocational training; the Congress carried them out through
enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. In this way we opened up opportunity for the young, the so-called "older workers" (in Labor Department parlance anyone past 45) and the high school drop-outs who need specialized training to become fully employable.

An example can be found just outside Clarkson, Georgia, not far from Atlanta, where 1,500 persons each year are reshaping their future in a $1.44 million complex of four huge buildings. During the day some 600 students work toward a vocational education that will assure them of a good, well-paying job after graduation. Then at night, under the blaze of bright lights some 850 adults—victims of technological change or a poor education—are retooling their talents. This complex area technical school is just one of 331 such schools built or under construction in 41 states. No longer the backward stepchildren of the school system teaching obsolete skills, the new vocational institutions offer courses in data processing and in electrical, electronic, chemical, and mechanical technology. They offer courses in accounting, punch-card accounting, secretarial science, and clerical studies.

They train students to be appliance repairmen, auto mechanics, draftsmen, radio and television servicemen, welders, refrigeration repairmen, practical nurses, and medical assistants. They learn food preparation, photography, graphic design, and offset printing.

Along with the bread-and-butter vocational courses, these schools also give their students instruction in reading, mathematics, psychology, and science.

Some adults do not go to school buildings at all. They have lost jobs to automation or other change and are being retrained in shops, hospitals, factories, and offices where they work. Some are learning to read and figure for the first time.

Youth has received most of our attention—and for good reason. Our sensibilities tell us that youth has the best chance at future growth and development. On the other hand, Americans past traditional school age have potential for
growth and development, too. They can benefit from new ideas and forms of education to develop their talents for work or wise use of leisure.

Seymour L. Wolfbein, former director of the Federal Manpower and Training Program and now Dean of the Temple University School of Business Administration, has said that the American labor force now has an hourglass shape—big bulges for the young at one end and older workers at the other.

This means that the middle group, workers 34 to 44, are in short supply and hence, have practically no problems in finding jobs. Indeed, in 1975 there will be one million fewer workers in the age bracket 34 to 44 than there are in that bracket today, and they will be increasingly in demand.

Because the middle group has such prospects, Dean Wolfbein concludes that "we will have an extraordinary opportunity to expand opportunities for the older person whose experience ought to count even more in a manpower world where the premium is going to be on experienced talent and skilled hands."

Manpower experts are coming up with lively new ideas on how to sharpen up talents for changing opportunities.

Talents can be developed and used at any age. We can change our ideas about life patterns. Former HEW Secretary Gardner recently gave members of the Senate Committee on Aging the following to think about:

*Some have suggested that formal retirement would be less traumatic and the whole life cycle more rational if we thought of every career as having three components—study, work, and community service.*

*The community service component might have an early peak, for example, a tour of duty in the Peace Corps, but would normally begin to rise during mature years. And this component might well reach a peak during the retirement years.*
There are now 5 million men past the age of 65. The amount of free time they have for the balance of their lives amounts to over 100 billion hours. Even if only a few hundred thousand of those five million retirees wanted to give us their talents, think of the mighty work they could do!

Several new programs have already proved that we can tap this great reservoir of talent. The Foster Grandparents and Green Thumb programs offer vivid illustrations:

*The Foster Grandparent Program:* Try to imagine a youngster brought to a mental institution after almost total rejection by his parents. Nurses do their best to make the child respond to a fast smile or a word or two of cheer. Doctors do all they can and then go on to the next patient. The child remains silent, withdrawn. But one day an elderly woman appears in
the ward. She does what any grandmother would do. She spends hours a day with him, talks to him, and waits for a sign of interest or response. One day that sign comes. Hardworking doctors and nurses testify to the program's effectiveness. They say it provides loving care where it is most needed.

Love may be an unlikely by-product of federal policy, but Foster Grandparents has made it an essential ingredient of one of the most heartwarming projects in the entire war on poverty.

**Green Thumb**: Participants—for the most part, retired farmers—are making our countryside prettier in a multitude of highway beautification projects, park construction or reconstruction, and special projects like the rehabilitation of an historic old mill in Minnesota. Hearty men in their sixties, seventies, and even in their eighties, are using their green thumbs to great advantage, and—like the Foster Grandparents—they earn up to the maximum allowed by Social Security ($1,500 in 1967).

As one Green Thumber from Arkansas has put it:

> In our country, when this Green Thumb program started, before it started we had a number of citizens that were sitting on their porches, even letting their lawns grow up. Since this started, the chair has hit the floor, the wife is fixing a lunch pail, she is watching her husband go back to work. She is living again, and she knows when he goes out that gate he is going to do the job, because she has confidence in him, and I think that our nation should be very proud of the stockpile of knowledge that is laying in our elderly citizens.

Green Thumb, the Foster Grandparent plan, and the range of activities dedicated to developing and using human capabilities, are useful prototypes. It is fairly evident that we have been at work to provide the widest possible selection of programs, projects, and personnel services, to all those who want them. Increased federal participation in educational
growth during the last few years has been in response to a national need—the need of our people to learn and grow.

Our efforts have touched many groups: impoverished children, who never knew education could be so vital; youngsters in middle-class communities who had never been given the most efficient instructional aids and techniques; college students who had struggled for years with cramped, inadequate facilities; jobless adults, who had given up hope of learning new skills; and the elderly, who had not been called upon for their talents, experience, and energy.

There are still perfections to be made in many of these programs. We will continue to adjust the techniques, but we have established the doctrine from which we will work. Our role in education is to generate opportunities for all people, to sharpen their talents for living. People are the focus of the
federal involvement in education, and we have learned, from our programs of the last few years, just how important are the unique interests and abilities and potentialities of all people.

Whatever the dimensions of our future involvement with education, our nation will have to contend with challenge and change as complex as we have yet known. In sheer numbers alone, our task will become more formidable: The American Association of School Administrators in their 1967 report on School for America reports, "The traditional 5 to 17-year-old school age group increased from 31 million in 1950 to more than 43 million in 1960 and is expected to reach 54 million by 1970." More than 6 million college age students are in post high school training. By 1975 this age group will total more than 9 million.

Even today, young people in record numbers are attending all kinds of schools. We expect that 50 percent of all high
school graduates will be in college before 1970. And, graduate school enrollments are swelling almost beyond belief.

All of this means much more to the nation than we now imagine. With opportunities opening up for an increasing proportion of our people, those unfortunates who are left out will be worse off than their counterparts today. Tomorrow's hard-core unemployed are today's youngsters who have life's deck stacked against them. How to reach them before the hard core hardens?
Compensatory education provides part of the answer. The Economic Opportunity Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have given us a start, but only a start. For example, the Office of Economic Opportunity reports that we will need at least 100,000 additional classrooms and 133,000 teachers by 1970 to provide compensatory education for all three to five year olds who need it.

Let's not forget about the dissatisfaction which is already setting in among some of the youngsters with full advantages. There is growing disenchantment with the tedium and the horse-and-buggy pace of much traditional education, and we need to do something to reverse this trend.

One way to bring this about in part might be through wider use of television and computers—key components of our new technology. Marshall McLuhan, the noted communications theorist, has observed that many youngsters today feel that their education is being interrupted when they leave the television set to attend school. If this is the case, greater and more imaginative use of educational television and computers in the classroom might recapture the disenchanted youngsters McLuhan speaks of.

Assuming that we rekindle the spark of interest in the grade schools, what will be the result beyond? A high school education should become a doorway to more education, not the end of it. Higher education should be the forum for deep, far-reaching study, and we should bring more people into the forum. We ought to have a way to provide at least two years of tuition-free post-high school education to every student who wants to continue. The education partnership—federal, state, and local—must now decide that our high school graduates are entitled to two years of tuition-free study in an institution of their choice: private college, public university, vocational or trade school, and any other type of post-high school training which meets reasonable cost yardsticks.

In education, as in all development of life skills, the future belongs to lively ideas and creative efforts. What we are after is
the best use of resources to facilitate the greatest development of talent. Our schools are already becoming neighborhood centers; classrooms serve as headquarters for community meetings and discussion; our colleges and universities tie together the influences of the campus, business, and industry, and exert a cultural force on the entire community.

With these beginnings, we can help each man fulfill his personal goals through his talent for living.
“Woe to them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room.”

- Isaiah 5:8

“. . . many of our social goals have to do with eliminating abominations. The reason we have not gone further is that not enough people deplore them sufficiently.”

—Lyle C. Fitch, President, Institute of Public Administration (in speech given in July 1967 at THE NEXT FIFTY YEARS Conference of the American Institute of Planners)

OUR HARD-HIT CITIES: OUR ISOLATIONIST SUBURBS

Campaigning in 1964 gave me my first extensive helicopter view of New Jersey.

Much pleased me, but much, too much, appalled me.

Taking off from a golf course at a northern country club one day, the landscape below showed a brilliant green. Trees shadowed lawns; rooftops and blue-bright swimming pools interrupted only occasionally. Only a few miles away, the green gave way to brown and gray. We landed in a school yard and looked around. Factories or parking lots abutted apartment houses. Billboards and gas stations and asphalt dominated everything else.

The difference between the first scene and the second was about 50 years. The terrain was almost identical—rolling
ridges, pleasant valleys—but the developers of a half-century ago regarded land solely as raw material that should yield the greatest profit possible. Commuter rail lines and improved trolley travel had just opened the community to development; commuters would soon follow. And so the builders destroyed greenery; they crammed in row houses of solid stone and wood, or tiny one-family homes with slivers of lawn; and no one objected when other entrepreneurs, also attracted by cheap land and new ease of transportation, began cramming adjacent neighborhoods with dark brick work buildings that housed noisy machines and were too often rightfully known as sweatshops.

The community which was the start of the journey that day had not been swamped by the early outbreak of suburbia. Its blessing was that its land was just a few miles beyond the easy reach of the factory and the slum makers. The long-distance rail commuter, who worked in New York City during the day and who wanted suburban peace at night, came instead. Once there, he vigorously protected his real estate investment, listening receptively to early advocates of zoning and planning.
When World War II ended, many acres of land in his town were available for high-quality suburban development at prices that only the prosperous could pay. Community leaders had maintained control over the pace and the quality of their development. They had created an enclave of relative serenity amidst seething metropolitan growth; and they would stand shoulder to shoulder against anyone or any force that threatened it—or even seemed to threaten.

From the helicopter, however, it is sometimes difficult to tell whether such suburban citadels are as strong as they first appear. To the east, across the Hudson River, is New York City, center for jobs but generator of smog and other problems. Superhighways below cut wide paths and most seemed to lead to river crossings that take people to and from the great city. To the west and south are many of the older cities of New Jersey—less massive than the colossus across the river but with too much of its featureless urban sprawl.

As a Senator from the nation’s most densely populated state, I am proud of our fine residential communities and cities that have managed to remain attractive even while being busy. But as the pace of urban growth ever increases, the question arises—how much control do mayors and others in our metropolitan areas have over their own municipal destinies?
During the last nine or so years in Washington, we have worked to devise ways to make Congress and federal agencies more helpful, not only in preserving what is already wholesome in our cities and suburbs, but also doing whatever can be done to rehabilitate and renew that which should serve our people better. The going has been difficult, but our efforts have become far more purposeful and far more comprehensive.

At the heart of the problem, of course, is the accelerated obsolescence of urban centers even while those centers now are expected to serve people most in need of help. Shelter needs alone are staggering. As HUD Secretary Weaver said last September, "There are still some four million urban families living in housing that violates the conscience of most Americans."

For good reason, then, programs to improve housing have been at the forefront of federal interest in metropolitan areas. Early public housing programs and the Federal Housing Administration's financial support for the building of postwar suburbs, immense as such efforts were, could not stand by themselves. Needed, too, were the instruments to make constructive changes related not only to housing, but to the business potential of communities and the overall quality of the environment.
The dominant spirit, particularly within recent years, has been a willingness to try new ideas and improve old ones. That willingness—even determination—to break new ground was symbolized by the creation, in 1965, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the appointment of Robert Weaver, the first Negro cabinet member in history, as Secretary.

Perhaps the most important—and most controversial—program taken over by the new department was urban renewal. For every acre of cleared land, there seemed to be a few hundred people with grievances. Many relocated tenants could not understand why they had to move in order to make way for luxury apartments; many thought of their quarters as "homes" and not especially "blighted," as required by federal statute before such quarters could be destroyed.

But, on the other hand, there was no doubt that urban renewal was an attention-demanding manifesto that had to be made by federal and city officials who believed that the vitality of the central city must be expressed in new buildings and new growth patterns. The missing ingredient, until recently, was sufficient concern about the human purposes of renewal.
Now, however, things are changing. Secretary Weaver has ordered that the program officials be more sensitive about their objectives and their methods, and recently he reported:

Today we can show that eight out of ten persons displaced by urban renewal do move into decent, safe, well-constructed housing. Today, urban renewal upgrades the quality of housing for the vast majority of those who originally lived in the slums and the blighted areas that are being renewed. I am not saying that everybody is happy to be displaced. Of course they are not. And that is one of the primary reasons that we stress efforts to preserve and not demolish neighborhoods . . .

In public housing, too, HUD is trying now not only to produce large quantities of units, but to provide production that meets priorities and goals. For one thing, the department is looking for ways to make public housing available to large families as well as to individuals and couples. Another goal is to create a balanced supply of low-rent public housing both inside and outside of the existing slum areas and racial ghettos.

Another federal agency has been instructed to find its role in serving the low income sector. The commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration gave the message in blunt fashion to his regional directors:

We have got to recognize that stimulating a flow of mortgage funds into the inner city—yes, even into the slums—for the transfer of houses, for rehabilitation, and for new construction, is an FHA mission of the highest priority . . . You should work at this task as though your job depended on it—because it may.

This new determination is being carried out, as shown by this sampling from the last three years. Some 700 communities are accommodating 1.4 million persons in low-rent public housing projects. Urban renewal projects have advanced in
more than 100 additional communities. Rehabilitation units are larger in volume than demolition (at long last, we're building up more than we're tearing down). Supplements are putting private housing within reach of 30,000 families; 1,700 communities have been enabled to install water and sewage facilities.

The Congress has also voted funds to help make it easier to plan metropolitan development more rationally, and it has also heeded Administration requests for more adequate funding of vitally needed research.

Something less than one-tenth of one percent of our total research and development expenditures by government has dribbled to housing and urban affairs. Contrast this to the fact that 70 percent of our people live in urban environments. We cannot allow this imbalance to continue. Can we be more
concerned with Mars than men, with international rivalries than our own communities?

The President has moved in a constructive way by recommending $20 million in fiscal 1968 to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for general research, and an increase from $13 million to $18 million for additional studies and experimentation in the areas of housing, urban development, and urban transportation.

To anyone familiar with the dynamics of urban-suburban growth, it is quite apparent that all the housing renewal, and all the research in the world won’t be of help if some attempt is not made (1) to put such programs within a rational context of metropolitan-wide planning, and (2) unless as many amenities as possible are provided to keep metropolitan living attractive enough to make people want to live, as some have said, “where the action is.”

In 1959, “planning” was regarded with some suspicion. Today, federal policy is more positive. A 1966 Act has provided new metropolitan development incentive grants for projects giving realistic attention to such regionwide goals
as: modern water and sewer facilities, adequate transportation, beautification, recreation, libraries, hospitals, and medical facilities.

A metropolitan area must be sufficiently attractive to keep inhabitants interested in its affairs. "Amenities" have therefore become necessities. Open space, one such amenity, became a matter of federal concern through an amendment to the Housing Act of 1961. Just recently I received a six-year progress report on that program. The idea was to help local officials set aside land that might otherwise be lost in heedless, hurried development. Between 1962 and 1967 under the program:

- Local authorities set aside 236,032 acres of open space for a total acquisition cost of $328 million. Grants were concentrated in regions and states with greatest population pressures: mid-Atlantic, far West, mid-West.
- Over 70 percent of parcels acquired were less than 100 acres, reflecting the urban emphasis of the program.
- Many communities created small neighborhood parks. Others reserved land now remote to serve future
population growth. Farsighted local leaders have used federal grants to acquire wetlands, wildlife habitats, and lands containing unique plants and flowers. Historic sites have been preserved in some states, New Jersey among them.

“Turnkey Housing” is another idea being put to the test. One of the strongest, and most valid, criticisms of federal public housing programs has been that they are slow and unimaginative. The private construction industry, it has been said, could build housing much faster and much more tastefully. Now, under the Turnkey Housing program, private builders locate the site and build the housing. If the units meet the requirements of the local authority, the builder simply sells the project to the authority—turns the key over—and it is
ready for occupancy. In theory—and in fact, so far—this is a cheaper, faster way of providing public housing which is more responsive to the desires of those who live there.

We are also experimenting with instant rehabilitation of tenement interiors. Work teams rip out the interior of the building completely including roof and floors. Then completely prefabricated rooms, within 48 hours, including plumbing and electrical wiring, are lowered and fastened into place. The tenants, meanwhile, have been housed in temporary quarters and their furniture stored. When the rehabilitation is complete, they simply move back to the same building at the same address, but into a brand new apartment.

These ideas weren't even dreamed of 10 years ago, because few people—and nobody in a position of leadership—had much attention to spare for our cities.

John F. Kennedy was the first President to declare a federal responsibility in our cities and suburbs. The Kennedy eloquence and the logic of his case for getting our cities moving finally stirred the nation to action on this long unrecognized obligation. President Johnson has added his imprint by his willingness to inject new life into old programs and begin new ones.

The federal interest in cities still falls short of what it should be, however. Too many members of Congress remain tied to ideas and attitudes of last century's predominantly rural America, resisting the plain reality that 140 million of our 200 million citizens live in metropolitan areas. It takes time for such attitudes to change.

THE MASS TRANSIT STORY

In 1959, soon after my election to the Senate, I tried to find out why no city commuter transportation legislation had ever been passed. The answer seemed to be that nobody had done it before, nobody was interested, and furthermore, that we were spending a lot of money on highways. In addition,
help would be needed from Senators who represented primarily rural states.

Even though to me it seemed crystal clear that costly highways moved far fewer persons during rush hours than modern buses and rail cars could do at considerably less cost, it took two years of almost endless persuasion, plus some intricate parliamentary strategy—with the timely help of key Southern and Western legislators—before we finally succeeded in having a bill passed.

When we did enact the bill its importance lay as much in the precedent established as in the program itself. Modest as it was, the Mass Transit Demonstration Act of 1961 paved the way for passage of the 1964 Mass Transit Capital Grant Program.

The 1964 Act marked a political coming of age in America. It recognized that just as large-scale federal aid had been supplied over the years in meeting the need for a modern highway system connecting all parts of our country, so federal
transfusions were needed to revitalize our mass transportation arteries. The Act authorized $375 million, and $320 million of that has been appropriated for improvements in many kinds of intracity facilities. The additional demonstration program was also broadened.

Then in 1966 the program was expanded to provide grants for technical studies—the planning, engineering, and designing of mass transportation—for fellowships to train specialists in the field of mass transportation and for university research into mass transportation problems. And while we continue to refine the program, our major task now is to deal with old, fixed notions about "the folklore of the fare box."

**BREAKING THE FARE BOX BARRIER**

For many communities the 1964 capital grant program was exactly what the doctor ordered. The Memphis Transit Authority was able to purchase 75 new air-conditioned buses and complete a three-year-old modernization program. The city of Minneapolis received a grant to develop a planned transit-way and pedestrian mall along eight major downtown streets. But these projects were already paying their own way out of the fare box or were receiving sufficient local subsidies to stay in business.

Unfortunately, we have been beguiled by the "folklore of the fare box" and have tended to evade the disconcerting fact that many public transportation systems—buses, subways, and commuter railroads—are simply not meeting their operational costs and consequently are in no position to apply for capital grants.

From Watts to New York City bitter experience has shown us that the commuter lines and the other mass transit facilities must be maintained and improved if our cities are to grow healthy again. It is a fact of domestic life that we must do what is required to keep commuter lines of all types alive and growing.
To do what must be done, we need legislation that acknowledges a basic fact of urban life; we must keep the commuter lines operating.

Whatever long-term arrangements we make for the prosperity of commuter buses, subways and railroads, our short-term problem is one of their continued existence; and for this the lines must have help to meet their day-to-day operating deficits. Where the fare box can't make it, federal contributions should help. My bill would provide a contribution of two-thirds of out-of-pocket operating losses of a commuter line. Freight losses, of course, would not be covered.
(The concept of public subsidies for operating losses is hardly a new one. My own state has been paying out between $6 and $7 million a year to the Erie-Lackawanna, the Jersey Central and the Pennsy. Connecticut has authorized a subsidy of up to $4.5 million annually to keep the New Haven in operation. And New York set up a separate corporation back in 1954 to run the Long Island Railroad rather than let it go out of service. New York City and Chicago have long realized the necessity of subsidizing their public transportation systems and Philadelphia is following suit.)

Subsidies should do more than extend the longevity of dying commuter lines. Needed, too, are actions to build a solid foundation for efficient, modernized systems operating without losses, and attracting sufficient passengers to continue operating without losses. My bill therefore also provides grants for well-planned, long-range capital improvement programs that can lower deficits to levels manageable by local or state governments—or even eliminate losses altogether.

Naysayers believe that the public has abandoned commuter lines permanently and cannot be brought back in sufficient numbers. These critics apparently do not know that modern, attractive, commuter facilities and techniques are even now showing us the face of transportation in the twenty-first century.

In San Francisco, workers are completing the longest prefabricated tunnel in the world. The tunnel will carry the 80-mile an hour trains of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. If all goes according to schedule, 1970 will see the opening of this rapid-transit system, which links San Francisco with Alameda and Contra Costa Counties on the East shore of the Bay.

At Rutgers University, scientists are studying the feasibility of using the airspace over northern New Jersey for short-haul passenger traffic. The study will cover such developments as the possibility of a vertical take-off aircraft which would carry large passenger loads at low altitudes at relatively low speed,
and how to provide parking, terminal, and take-off and landing facilities.

The Long Island Railroad is researching and testing a gas turbine engine for commuter rail cars that could turn out to be a cheaper, cleaner, more efficient method of propelling a commuter train.

There have also been interesting studies done with demonstration grants that test the social and economic values of public transportation to disadvantaged groups. A grant of $2.7 million to the state of California is financing a study of the transportation needs of persons living in South Central and East Los Angeles in terms of employment opportunities, access to community facilities and other requirements, and will test through actual operations how these needs can be met by new, improved, or coordinated transit services.

These programs and designs and futuristic marvels are not fiction. They are ready, or nearly ready, today; and hopefully, the good ones will be in use tomorrow. Under this program of grants, administered by the urban transportation agency in HUD, I am convinced that we are making headway with the needed legislation. Soon, perhaps, we will catch up to the engineers and scientists.

MODEL CITIES

By 1965, we had enacted a number of federal programs to treat the problems of urban development and rehabilitation. These were generally enacted on an emergency, problem-oriented basis, so that it became clear to us that we needed to determine just how well the programs worked together. We needed to know whether the programs were serving their original purpose, or whether they were overlapping or conflicting with each other. We wanted an accurate estimate of their impact on the cities.

In response to this need, President Johnson outlined the Model Cities program. The proposal, an example of "creative
federalism” at its best, provides federal assistance in two areas: program planning and development, and project implementation. The cities participating in Model Cities are to coordinate all available public and private resources for an overall concentrated attack on the specific urban problems each city faces.

Sixty-three communities shared in the first Model Cities grants, announced late in 1967. They ranged in size from tiny (pop. 5,000) Pikeville, Kentucky, to New York City. All of the cities which won Model Cities grants in the first round of applications shared certain goals in their community plans: prompt solutions; the arresting of urban blight; social, educational, and health improvements; and expanded opportunities for all the citizens. As a working base for Model Cities, these widely diverse American communities share the desire to build a new physical and social structure.

A whole host of special projects and proposals make up the outlines for action of these 63 pioneer cities. Most applicants focused their attention on housing, education, and unemployment—the three salient elements of the urban crisis. Some of the Model Cities have emphasized community health needs,
experiments in innovative education, planning for home ownership, and special programs for youth.

Many of us in the Senate, worked hard for a full appropriation of $662 million, as requested by the Administration. In the end, though, only $300 million was approved—and much of this money is to be held in reserve until the original 63 cities complete the first year of their plans. Then these communities will share in the bulk of the Model Cities funds, in the form of urban renewal grants and supplemental appropriations specifically set aside for Model Cities by President Johnson.

The full appropriation is still needed. One-hundred-and-thirty cities had to be denied a chance to participate in this first round of Model Cities grants, because of the smaller appropriations figure. This, to me, is one of the most serious challenges we face as we work on the urban crisis. We run the risk of opening our minds and hearts to the needs of the cities, but short-changing the programs when we set out to fund them.

LAND USE

As closely related to the urban crisis as model cities, housing, and transportation, is the need to make better use of our land. Anyone who has taken a jet flight from the East to the West has seen the unpopulated expanses between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Coast. It would seem that there is land enough there for centuries to come.

There is land, but there are no systems (commercial, transportation, communications) to support large segments of our population. The result of all this is incredible crowding in urban areas: 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land.

This imbalance can be corrected, though. Already, changes in population location are at work: the land around Phoenix, Arizona, once thought to be desert, is now an irrigated and
rapidly expanding metropolitan area. The entire state of California was once thought to be a recreation playground, but it is being developed so fast that the recreation "frontier" is pushing northward into Oregon.

In times past, the land changed before we knew how to use it, and conserve it. The time has come, though, to think of the land as a potentially exhaustible resource. The federal government has a responsibility to make this known.

One of the first steps might be to conduct an organized nationwide inventory of land we have already used, and land that has promise for future development. Ordinary planners' statistics and demographic charts won't yield the kind of
information we need so badly. Aerial photography has done wonders in military intelligence; perhaps we could make it serve the needs of an expanding civilian population in search of space. We might make use of one of our expensive satellites; in fact, plans are already on the drawing board for a "natural resources satellite" which would help identify the most useful pieces of land left on the planet.

Within recent months, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has called attention to the "need to exert as much imagination and effort to build progressive and workable non-metropolitan regions as we are now investing in the big city and its sprawling suburbs."

Some pundits claimed that the Secretary was advocating a "back-to-the-farm" movement. Serious analysts noted, though, that Freeman was making a very valid commentary on the migration of the rural Negro and other low-income residents from the country to the bigger cities, mostly Northern cities. Freeman was inviting the nation to take action that would help make the smaller communities of this nation more attractive and more capable of supporting large numbers of our population under conditions far less crowded and far less hectic than those in our mammoth "inner city" complexes.

This suggestion does not mean that we must break up urban areas in order to populate the "more fertile ground for domestic peace and tranquility." What is does mean is that by developing smaller communities in the rural areas surrounding the big cities, we are offering more choices, more alternatives for people to adopt. Great concentrations of commerce and people tend to attract even greater numbers of people, and our best possibility for reasoned growth lies at the fringes of these concentrations. In a nation as dynamic and as democratic as ours, everyone ought to be given as many choices as possible—including the choice of a life style, be it urban, suburban, or rural.

Our cities suffer from many illnesses. Discrimination and its inevitable concomitant, poverty, cannot be tolerated; they
are two of the primary causes of the sickness of our cities. The ghetto dweller, the chief victim of the city sickness, shows his resentment at these conditions by anger, despair, or sullen apathy. That sullen apathy, as we have regretfully learned, can suddenly flash into an angry, violent outburst.

Our national achievement is tied to our cities. Some say that gradual improvement is the only really effective improvement; they say that by the year 2000 all will be well. I cannot accept this prescription for our sick cities, because we have already had two explosive summers to prove that urban dissatisfaction is not always sullen and passive. Thirty-two more long hot summers, each building on the lightning and storm of the last, would almost certainly bring us back to the time when Mr. Lincoln wondered if a nation so conceived could long endure.
WHO'S IN CHARGE OF ENVIRONMENT?

San Francisco, saluted in popular songs and poetry, is strikingly beautiful largely because of its hilly terrain and wide, bending bay. People there have occasionally protested when builders spoiled the view with misplaced high-rise structures. Many neighborhoods of that city are crammed with old walk-up wooden apartment houses that, even with bay windows, look shabby. But even if the land is sometimes misused the bay will always be there to enjoy.

Or will it?

There will undoubtedly be a bay near the Golden Gate Bridge and the great waterfront of that city, but the startling fact is that the outer bay is getting smaller every year because people are dumping huge quantities of garbage and other fill at
its fringes. Malvina Reynolds, the California poet turned conservationist, wrote recently that the bay covered about 700 square miles a little over a century ago. Now it has only 400 square miles of open water. Land promoters now own large tracts in shallow parts of the bay and are just waiting for the day when garbage and other "fill" will transform their inundated acreage into solid, saleable real estate. Marshes with their bird-life are dwindling; the great cleansing circulation of ocean and river waters is lessening and pollution is worsening.

What will happen as this fill-up continues? To many bay area residents, it seems inevitable that the man-made flatlands will simply extend urban sprawl farther out from the shores
until—some day—parts of the bay may be little more than a wide river. Eventually, if all land “susceptible of reclamation” is eventually salvaged—says Mrs. Reynolds after consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—the bay will consist of only 187 square miles.

It is my guess that the protest over the dwindling bay will mount and even attract national sympathy. Ten or twenty years ago, the average American would probably have said: “Garbage must be dumped somewhere, and people have to live somewhere. Isn’t it better to ‘use’ the land than to let it stay under water?”

Many people feel the same way today, to be sure. But it seems to me that more than 200 million Americans who share our national landscape are slowly realizing they must somehow exert more positive control over the future of that landscape. Sometimes, as we have seen in our discussion of the open space program, the best possible “use” that can be made of land is simply to reserve it and keep it for breathing room in our most populated regions.

One of the forces that led to the establishment of that program may have been the growing realization that the big squeeze in metropolitan areas was about to become unbearable. Another powerful force was the concern of the Kennedy Administration, and the free, fresh thinking of such Presidential advisors as Stuart Udall, Secretary of the Interior:

“When I took office, our conservation philosophies and policies were resource-oriented. Now they are people-oriented.”

Secretary Udall recently gave that succinct summary of the tremendous change that has taken place since 1960. Historically, Interior had been primarily concerned with the conservation and use of basic natural resources. Secondarily, it had been concerned about the sport and recreational uses of lands and water over which it had been given custody.

Historically, too, most of Interior’s time, money, and attention had been given to the vast arid or semi-arid plains or
inaccessible mountain ranges of the great western basin between the west slope of the Rockies and the east slope of the Sierras and Cascades. Almost all public land in the United States is found in 10 of the 11 western states, Washington excluded. Nevada is 87 percent publicly owned.

When Udall took office under a President who had told all Americans to seek out New Frontiers, he saw that only two major additions had been made to our national park system between World War II and 1961.

In that same period, visits to the national parks more than tripled, from 21 million visits in 1946 to 71 million in 1960; and there was no doubt that not only were parks of all kinds badly needed, but much more had to be done to preserve the environment. The American people—and to some degree, the Congress—were beginning to become painfully aware that they
lived in a cramped and dirty environment which was deteriorating at a terrifying rate. Air pollution wasn’t just annoying—it could, quite literally, suffocate. Water shortages for the most part were not shortages of water at all; they were shortages of clean water. The bulldozer and the dragline, once symbols of progress, were devastating the countryside. People were becoming aware of our appalling failure not just to improve our environment, but to put a brake on its deterioration.

Population growth and mobility certainly make it difficult to keep things under control. Of today’s 200 million Americans, 140 million live in urban areas. You and I cannot really comprehend such numbers. But it is not at all difficult for us to grasp the fact that where we once drove to the seashore in an hour, it now takes two hours—and there may be no place to park when we get there, or not enough room on the beach to make the outing a pleasure. When the water coming from the tap reeks of chlorine or other chemicals, it’s not hard to figure out why those chemicals had to be put into the water. And when industrial smoke peels the paint off a house, the homeowner has all the incentive he needs to write a letter to the editor (which is, all too often, just about all he can do).

Such experiences have been repeated a million times in our postwar years. And they have created the climate which has enabled the Congress and the federal departments to act.

**THE RACE FOR INNER SPACE**

The first goal simply was to hold onto land needed now near huge population centers. The idea that esthetic and recreational values of land should become a major concern of federal interest had grown slowly. But when it matured, it seemed to burst upon the American people, the Congress and the federal bureaucracy like a compelling revelation.

With growing support in the Congress, the new Administration began to heed that call to action. In 1961 and 1962, three
new national seashores were created: Point Reyes in California, Cape Cod in Massachusetts, and Padre Island in Texas. The pace accelerated. Ocean and lake shores and riverways were set aside at a truly astonishing pace: Assateague Island in Maryland and Virginia, Fire Island in New York State, Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, the Indiana Dunes along Lake Michigan, Cape Lookout National Seashore to name but a few. All told, during the Administration of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, some 46 acquisitions have been made by the National Park system, including six national seashores, two national parks, two national lakeshores, three national monuments, and five national recreation areas.

For the first time we are preserving priceless irreplaceable "inner space" where it counts most. The land we are now setting aside is not arid desert far removed from population centers. It is the choicest land to be obtained and it is accessible to the teeming millions of our urban areas.

New Jersey offers one of the best examples of this activity. A 40 thousand-acre national recreation area is being established surrounding a 35 thousand-acre reservoir to be created
on the upper Delaware River in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. It will be within an hour's drive of the northern New Jersey suburbs; an hour-and-a-half from New York City; two-and-a-half hours from Philadelphia. More than 30 million Americans will live within 100 miles of this priceless recreation asset.

On the other side of the state, the Defense Department and the Department of the Interior have cooperated on Sandy Hook, a decade ago a barren and almost unused military reservation, by turning it over to the public for fishing, bathing, picnicking, bird-watching, and nature study. Here are 12 hundred acres—seven miles of beaches—an Atlantic peninsula on the fringes of the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, which is on its way to becoming a national seashore in miniature. By setting aside the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and Sandy Hook, the federal
government has done more to preserve inner space in New Jersey in one decade than it had done in the preceding 200 years.

The Department of the Interior is also beginning to open up to the public that vast domain in its charge. Access roads and trails are being built, certain limited public user facilities are being constructed, and the Department is beginning to manage the land more intensively for multiple use. It is administering the grazing, timber, and mineral rights so that they are compatible with hunting, fishing, hiking, and similar uses.

In some cases, federal administrators found they already had the legislative authority to do more. What had been lacking in the past was leadership. For instance, perhaps the most important single step taken was the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in 1962. That was accomplished by a stroke of the pen. The Bureau, a very small one, exists solely to plan for and coordinate, at the federal level, our outdoor recreation needs.

In 1965, the Congress enacted legislation establishing the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is providing more than $100 million a year from users' fees and from direct appropriations for acquisition by the federal government and by state and local governments of recreation lands. The Wilderness Act became law on September 3, 1964, and it is, perhaps, symbolic. It had teetered on the edge of passage for a number of years. But it was the 88th Congress, called by some "The Conservation Congress," which finally made it law. It sets aside undeveloped areas in national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges as areas where "the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

"WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE"

Preservation of land, essential as it is, doesn't mean much unless life within the metropolitan areas is improved, too. The
water we drink, for example, should be pure. Why not cleanse river basins, beautify them at the same time, and open up new sources of water?

Certainly, such control would not be easy, but it would be better than costly half-measures that had been fruitlessly and fitfully pursued for years. (In one river valley of New Jersey, residents had spent millions of dollars during the Fifties to build a trunk sewer designed to eliminate pollution of the river and restore its beauty while creating recreation resources. Almost a decade after the trunk sewer was built, and after numerous complaints to state health authorities, the head of the sewerage agency, in desperation, conducted a tour of the river and bay, pointing out 88 sources of pollution. The problem was bigger than the government mechanisms of the day could handle.)

Consider also the plight of New York City. That metropolis has an extensive system of huge reservoirs which dam up the waters of the Delaware and Hudson Rivers and their major tributaries. These dams and reservoirs and the pipelines and
conduits deliver the water at enormous cost. Yet, the Hudson River flows right past Manhattan, where, if the water were clean, it would be free for the taking. The city had a difficult problem in finding a place on the river, however, even many miles upstream, where the water was clean enough to mix in small proportions with the water from the reservoirs in order to alleviate the five-year drought that lasted through 1966.

The Hudson provides a classic example of a river struggling to purify itself but failing because of repeated volumes of filth poured into it. At Troy, just above Albany, scavenger eels feed on raw sewage and attack sanitary engineers when they sample the water. The Hudson is not alone. The Missouri flows red with blood from slaughterhouses and carries greaseballs almost the size of footballs. Most beaches on the Great Lakes are closed because of pollution. The Merrimack, down which Henry David Thoreau once canoed, recording his observations of nature and his reflections on man and his environment has turned filthy brown. Fresh water bodies, especially rivers, have great recuperative powers, but even the mightiest of them can be overcome by massive and repeated infections of industrial and other waste.

Nagged constantly by conservationists who had already been disappointed first by local and then by state governments, the White House and Congress have moved slowly over the years on anti-pollution legislation. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 was significant only as a precedent; it made only a fainthearted gesture at enforcement, relying more on timid suasion. Then in 1961, Congress authorized $100 million a year in grants to states for construction of sewage treatment plants and facilities. A substantial research program was launched.

It took the Federal Water Quality Act in 1965, however, to deal with entire river basins, and to put the Secretary of the Interior in a major leadership role in a new program that provides for adoption by the states of water quality standards and establishment of the machinery to enforce these stand-
ards. The Secretary has the power to enforce the adoption of these standards, and the power to enforce the standards against anyone polluting interstate or navigable waters.

An equally important step was taken by the Congress in 1966, when greatly increased appropriations for local sewer construction were authorized. Unfortunately, the cost of the war in Vietnam has hit the war against water pollution where it hurts the most—in the pocketbook. Of the $450 million authorized for fiscal 1968, only $203 million was appropriated, despite the fact that every urban state and many rural ones indicated they badly need the full allocation.

It seems to me, while we have at long last made an effective beginning in the fight against water pollution, it is only a beginning. To win the fight will require a great deal more money and even more effective enforcement tools.

There is a section of the United States where all water, clean or dirty, is scarce. That is the great western basin. Here, the Department of the Interior has, historically, spent most of
its attention and money. It has speckled the West with dams and reservoirs. Some eight million acres received irrigation water during the 1965 crop season. The food and fiber grown on this land had a value of $1.6 billion dollars. And even more dams are being built. During fiscal 1966, eleven dams were completed and at the close of the year, another 17 dams were under construction. These irrigation projects have, quite literally, made the desert bloom. As a by-product, cheap electric power has been provided to much of the West. In some areas, the water and the electricity have created a thriving farm and industrial economy where no one lived and no one thought of living before. These early and energetic federal efforts have contributed as much to settling the West, with the exception of the Pacific Coast itself, as the pioneers in their covered wagons.

THE AIR WE BREATHE

The autumn smell of burning leaves is disappearing from the American scene, by mandate of municipal air pollution ordinances. But a great many other odors, more troublesome and even injurious, remain with us despite an overwhelming number of conferences, studies, seminars, papers, reports, etc., on the subject of air pollution. Indeed, if most of the printed material published during the past 10 years were thrown into a fire, it would create a substantial air pollution problem all its own.

But, it might clear the air. Certainly research and study are necessary. And, if all these conferences and reports contribute toward a public dialogue on, and an awareness of, air pollution, that's all to the good. But what is needed most of all is the will to use the knowledge we already have.

We know where most of the air pollution is coming from. It is produced by the burning of fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gasoline. For example, the U.S. Public Health Service published a list of 373 firms in the New York-New Jersey
Metropolitan Area which spewed more than 100 tons of sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere in 1965. The volume is unbelievable. The Consolidated Edison generating station on the Hudson River led the list. That plant alone poured more than 55 thousand tons of sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere in 1965.
We already know two basic ways to cut this volume to a small fraction of its present level. The simplest and best method is to burn coal or fuel oil which is naturally low in sulphur content. The other is to remove the sulphur by refining. Further research may lead us to some new and better method of curbing sulphur dioxide emissions. Whatever the remedy, it will cost money. Nobody knows the real cost, but we can be certain that it would be more than offset by reduced destruction to lawns, flowers, and trees; savings in cleaning streets, buildings, automobiles, and clothing; and especially lessened crop losses. The best estimate available indicates that air pollution costs each American family approximately $65 a year. And that does not include health costs.

Sulphur dioxide, of course, is only one of the pollutants emitted by coal or oil burning electric generating plants. And power plants are only one source of pollution. There are many others: oil refineries, chemical plants and an almost endless variety of industrial processes, crop-dusting airplanes, the furnace in your home, and many more. One of the most infuriating of all is your own city garbage dump or incinerator. It seems ludicrous to me that many of the municipalities which forbid the homeowner to burn the leaves which he has raked off his lawn, haul those same leaves to a municipal dump, where they are burned in combination with the day’s collection of garbage and refuse.

The worst polluters of all are automobiles and trucks. They contribute approximately half of all the air pollution in this nation. And the passenger car is far and away the worst offender. We’ve had industrial air pollution with us for a century and more, but air pollution from cars and trucks is a relatively recent phenomenon. And, when it did begin to present a serious problem, it took a long time for us to figure it out, because auto exhaust is almost invisible and, except in extraordinarily high concentrations, it doesn’t have a highly distinctive odor. More importantly, it was hard to pinpoint
auto exhaust as the culprit because of what happens to the exhaust gases after they leave the tailpipe. The real cause of the famous Los Angeles smog is something called a photochemical reaction. The famous southern California sun makes chemical changes in auto exhausts which produce highly dangerous, sometimes lethal, concentrations of carbon monoxide, ozone, and other chemical compounds in the atmosphere.

Most of us are too unhappily familiar with the effect of air pollution on our health to warrant a great deal of space here. Lung cancer, emphysema, pneumonia, heart disease—air pollution contributes to, or causes all of these and many more. When nylon stockings are dissolved by air pollution, there is something a bit humorous about it. But, when 400 deaths are attributed to a temperature inversion over New York City which caused a two-week buildup of smog, there's nothing funny about that. When 10 thousand residents of Los Angeles are told they'll have to move elsewhere for their health, there's
nothing funny about that. Yet, we Americans seem to take the hazards of air pollution in stride, as we take 50 thousand auto deaths a year in stride. Local efforts toward clean air, with few exceptions, have been so ineffectual as to be almost meaningless. And the federal government has been a reluctant partner in progress, until recently.

The development of federal legislation on air pollution control parallels that on water pollution control; a foundation was laid in the mid-Fifties, but the Congress has been erecting the structure in the Sixties. The Clean Air Act of 1955 provided a small federal research effort and minuscule grants to the states for research. It was amended in 1958 to permit the surgeon general to conduct a study of the effect of motor vehicle exhausts on human health.
But it was the Clean Air Act of 1963 which began to provide meaningful help to the states. That legislation provided grants to local and regional air pollution agencies for abatement programs and provided authorization for interstate compacts for the prevention of air pollution. This latter was a belated recognition that air pollution, like water pollution, doesn't recognize the arbitrary political boundaries established by man. The fact that so-called "regional air-sheds" are the basic unit in dealing with air pollution also was recognized by providing financial incentive to regional abatement efforts.

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1965 provided the federal government with its first real weapon against polluters. That historic legislation provided for the establishment of motor vehicle exhaust emission standards, and it provided the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the power to ban from the roads any motor vehicle which does not meet those standards.

The battle over those standards is now being fought at the administrative level between the auto industry and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But the historical significance here is that the federal government has assumed responsibility for control over one-half of the air pollution in this country.

It seems inevitable to me that, if local efforts at control of other kinds of pollution do not meet with more success in the very near future, there will be an irresistible demand from the American public for federal action.

Constituent mail and the newspapers show clearly that people are aroused. But they are powerless to act as individuals, and they want action, not excuses.

THE DAYS AHEAD

On September 3, 1964, in those hectic closing days when the 88th Congress was reaping the fruits which President
Kennedy had sown, President Johnson signed the Wilderness Bill and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill. He said:

If the 88th had not earned already so many honorable titles, such as the education Congress, the health Congress, the full prosperity Congress, it would be remembered as the conservation Congress, because in addition to the measures before me this morning, Congress has wisely this year passed the Ozark Rivers National Riverway bill, which I signed last week; the Fire Island National Seashore bill, which is awaiting action; the Canyonlands National Park legislation, which I expect to sign shortly, creating our first new national park on this continent in 17 years. But Congress has done even more. Action has been taken to keep our air pure and our water safe and our food free from pesticides; to protect our wildlife; to conserve our precious water resources. No single Congress in my memory has done so much to keep America as a good and wholesome and beautiful place to live.

The President had good reason to be proud, but he has also made clear that he believes there is much yet to do. In conserving open space, by any objective measurement, we did a reasonably good job, not only in the amount of land we set aside for future generations, but in its quality. We did, in fact, beat the bulldozers by a million acres a year. And we did it with prime recreation land, for the most part readily accessible to the 140 million Americans who now live in cities or suburbs. Not, in my judgment, since Teddy Roosevelt have we made such progress in acquiring open space.

It is good that we took these first steps. We must continue, because what we save in the next few years will be pretty much all that we save. There will come a day in the not too far distant future when money simply will not buy good recreation areas. Near the cities, they simply will not exist.
Further away, they will already have been commercially developed.

In halting the steady deterioration of the water we drink and the air we breathe, we have made some important beginnings. In the Sixties, the Congress began to concern itself with the challenge of preventing our rivers and lakes, and our skies, too, from getting dirty in the first place. These first programs in environmental conservation have been experimental, and we are finding ways to make them more effective. It seems to me that this process of improvement must quicken if we are going to live in a decent, wholesome, and esthetically pleasing environment.

To repair the damage of the past, to prevent the potentially catastrophic damage of the future, we must fight the battle against pollution on all fronts with increasing intensity. We cannot afford the steps backward we have taken, from time to time, out of an uncertainty for the way we are proceeding.
Research will ultimately provide us with the knowledge to do many of the things which need to be done easily, cheaply and, perhaps even painlessly. But we cannot wait for research to give us easy answers to all the hard questions. We must fight today’s battles with weapons now on hand.

That means, very simply, that the Congress must increase its financial and technical assistance to the states and it must forge better enforcement tools. The very quality of the lives we lead is at stake. The phenomenal growth of our economy has provided 200 million Americans with an abundance of leisure time and recreational opportunities never dreamed of even a generation ago. Now we must work to secure the physical setting for our dreams.
CONCLUSION:

ON “THE WAY LESS TRAVELED BY”

In a speech before the National Housing Conference, Vice President Hubert Humphrey made a reasoned appeal for cautious optimism in our domestic affairs. His message was simple: he urged us to hesitate before we judge America’s condition too harshly. On balance, he maintained, our society is making progress in the right direction:

... So don’t sell America short. Not only do we have nearly half the world’s GNP at our disposal and an unprecedented reserve of human and technological resources. I find a determination and a willingness in all parts of society to overcome what may be the last hurdle on the long path to full democracy.

Vice President Humphrey was talking about the lingering imbalance between the privileged and the underprivileged, the black and the white, the young and old. I have tried to demonstrate in this brief volume, that there have been many of these “hurdles” in our own time.

A great deal has happened to us since 1960, and Los Angeles and the convention. We have discovered, in the years since John Kennedy fired us with his vision, that frontiers change almost as soon as they are identified. The lessons of the past eight years have been hard, and frequently we have seen our efforts fall short because we did not understand the depth and complexity of the problems.

Nevertheless, we have met with many successes in the 1960’s due in part to the inspiration and imagination of two
great Presidents. John Kennedy brought us into open recognition of our responsibilities; he acted as if he believed that we could master the forces of history, as if we could succeed if only we had the will. Lyndon Johnson has continued to act in that belief, and has given the nation a wide range of programs and policies dedicated to domestic improvement.

The central question confronting our society is this: Do we want to continue on the course Kennedy and Johnson have set, or do we want to submit to the pressures of the fatalistic bloc in our country who would let events have their way? Put another way, we need to know if we are willing to take the straight road ahead, or a detour into gray and shabby country.

I think our choice is clearer, our decision more concrete, than was the choice facing us in 1960. We set out then to tackle a whole catalogue of problems about which very few people had any hard facts. We were less than clear on the dimensions of the program, and less than certain that the solutions were going to match the needs.

But now, at this second major crossroads of the 1960's, we have some answers. We are aware of the tremendous scope of poverty, discrimination, urban decay, and environmental blight. We have a deeper understanding of the needs our society has produced. And, most important, we have experience in a variety of domestic programs, experience which must certainly be counted as valuable when we move on from this point in time.

For my part, I choose the progressive, creative path. I want to belong to a generation that does not shrink from its hard tasks, and that makes its mark on the American experience.
Williams, Harrison Jr.
United States Senator-New Jersey
Crossroads - U.S.A.
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workers, President John F. Kennedy called on him to steer the controversial domestic peace corps legislation through the Senate. The was enacted and VISTA became a reality. Likewise, President Johnson asked Williams to lead the battle for new education programs. This became national policy in the form of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Senator Williams has taken a leadership role in legislative battles for mass transportation in urban areas, water and air pollution controls, medicare, voting rights, civil rights, Appalachia development, housing for the elderly and for low income groups, immigration reform, and much more. His identity is established: he is a major spokesman for the aged and underprivileged, and for urban-suburban America.

Harrison A. (Pete) Williams, Jr. resides in Westfield, New Jersey.
CROSSROADS
U.S.A. is an exposure in depth of the sores that afflict the Nation's body politic and its soul. Portions of the book come directly from the mouths of men, women, and children whose lives are blighted by the tragic indifference displayed by more fortunate elements of the society. A flow of exclusive photographs—haunting, poignant, and benumbing—document the narrative.

Despite its searing affects the story is overtoned with hope. Alleviation (though not yet enough) has come to millions of Americans through legislation and executive activities generated by the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. The story projects no cure-all for this or next year. But it dips uncannily into the American destiny and we see ourselves differently. Most readers will like what they see.