

The overriding problem of our cities is segregation by race and income. There are no urban solutions of any validity which do not deal directly with the questions posed by this segregation.

The facts are these: 23% of the total population of our central cities is Negro, and 35% of these Negroes have incomes in the poverty range. Within five years, assuming present population trends and allowing for current levels and even greater effectiveness of ameliorative public programs, the proportion of Negroes to central city population will rise to 28%, with a constant percentage remaining in poverty. By 1978, both proportions will be 35%. By 1983, our central cities population will be 44% Negro, nearly two-fifths of them poor.

These are percentages of the total population of all our central cities. By 1973, at least ten of our major cities will be predominantly Negro; by 1983, at least twenty, including Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, etc.

To repeat, these are our projections of which will happen if (1) present population trends continue, (2) there are no sudden and surprising changes in public attitudes, and (3) current governmental policies and levels of spending remain in force.

The Task Force believes that a significant change in (1) - despite the notorious unreliability of population trends - is unlikely. We believe that changes in (2) also are both unlikely and unpredictable.

Given these uncertainties our report focuses on (3) - current governmental policies and level of spending -. We recognize Government action is only one element in the process of urban decline. And, while it may not be a sufficient condition for turning the tide, it is certainly a necessary one.

The sheer magnitude of the problem is staggering. Our population models tell us that simply holding the size of central city ghettos to their present size will require movement of approximately 600,000 Negroes a year into predominantly white suburbs. Such a figure would represent from ten to fifteen times the present rate of Negro out-migration. Our crude cost calculations for providing a minimum acceptable level of social services in all central city ghettos indicate Federal expenditure patterns of staggering and unlikely proportions.

We believe that to alter these projections significantly, quantum leaps will have to be taken in public policy and levels of spending. Yet without a massive effort disparities between white and black, affluent and poor, city and suburb will grow larger. The probability for potentially dangerous confrontation which divides American society along these lines will continue to increase. We do not presume to calculate how high that probability is but we are quite sure that it is high enough to be cause for urgent concern.

It is apparent then that segregation by race and income in our great metropolitan areas is outstripping whatever we are now doing to offset it. Yet the Task Force recognizes that American society

in 1967 is not prepared to pay the costs of a fully integrated urban society. We know that integration will not be possible in the life of this Administration, but we suggest a place to start - a line of policy which will build towards a future breakthrough.

In summary, the Task Force identifies as a problem of the greatest national urgency the growth and poverty of central city ghettos and the related race and income segregation in urban areas.

- 1) We believe that this situation already provides a driving force in urban decline and that its importance is increased by the unequal pattern of urban development.
- 2) We are convinced that a dramatic confrontation between white and Negro, affluent and poor, growth and decline already is building in most of our urban areas.
- 3) In the absence of state, Federal and local action on a wide front accompanied by enlightened private activity, these problems will grow larger, more dangerous to American society and increasingly difficult to solve.

We therefore recommend a series of strategies designed to:

1. Increase individual access to jobs, education, income, housing and other social services.
2. Increase racial and income integration in metropolitan areas.
3. Increase the proportion of middle-class population, especially Negro, in central cities.
4. Increase the ability of new immigrants to adjust to urban life.

Priorities

1. The specific proposals based on these policies, indeed the policies themselves, may often seem to be in conflict.
We believe that these contradictions are more apparent than real, and that the very limits of our present ability to achieve any of the above goals on a large scale makes it imperative for us to move in several directions at once.
2. While it is clear that a large scale of effort is required we believe that the first stage must focus on experimentation and refined efforts in many areas of present activity.
3. While a truly integrated and stable urban society is our ultimate goal, we believe our ability in the short run to attain massive integration is quite limited. We, therefore, place an especially high priority on those policies designed to create a larger middle class with a stake in the city.
We seek methods of increasing stability as the proportion of Negroes in cities continues to increase.
4. As a minimum, we believe that it is a matter of the highest national urgency to attempt to "integrate" ghetto populations into the mainstream of American life by raising their income levels and the level of accessible social services.
5. We have ordered our recommendations in response to a crude attempt at cost effectiveness - feeling that some attempt at systematic ordering was better than none at all.

6. We have seen no value in asking the President to spend his urban resources, political and financial, on proposals which are unacceptable to American society in 1967; we of course urge him to continue his leadership in educating the American people to the necessity of accepting our central cities ghetto residents as full participants in American society. Only such a development can offer hope for our cities and the people who live in them.

We intend our proposals as far as possible to be consistent with the following principals:

1. Federal assistance should be tied not to institutions but to individuals.
2. Federal assistance to state and localities should be designed to strengthen the role of political executive wherever possible.
3. The administration of programs should be carried out at the lowest level possible and with the greatest flexibility possible.
4. Programs designed to up-grade ghetto life should also make a contribution to integration - if possible.
5. New institutions should be created only under the most unusual circumstances.

Proposals

We have divided our proposals into two sections. The second are those which are in some ways most desirable and ambitious but which seem to us to be only long-run possibilities. The first are meant to be the first stage - perhaps about five year - developments in urban policy making.