

Telefax

# WESTERN UNION

Telefax



115P EST NOV 23 66 AA44T

DEB278 DE WA034 GOVT PD THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC 23

NFT

HON IVAN ALLEN, MAYOR, DONT DWR

ATLA

NEW YORK REHABILITATION TOUR SET FOR SUNDAY, 11/27/66. MEET  
AT HOME OF MRS. CAROL HAUSEMAN, 40 CENTRAL PARK, SOUTH, PROMPTLY  
AT 1:00 P.M. MEETING ON NOVEMBER 28, WILL BE IN WASHINGTON  
AT 10:00 A.M., ROOM 213, EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING. SECRETARY  
WEAVER TO MEET WITH GROUP MONDAY EVENING, 5 TO 8:00 P..

ARDEE AMES

1408

*Ames*  
*AC*

Telefax

# WESTERN UNION

Telefax



LW DM ATLANTA GA JUN 20 1967

MRS ANN MOSES EXEC SECY TO MAYOR ALLEN

FJT FAX ATLA

YOUR TELEGRAM JUN 20 TO RICHARD C LEONE THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON DC IS UNDELIVERED. WE HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO LOCATE  
ADDRESSEE COULD YOU ADVISE WHAT DEPARTMENT IS WITH.

WESTERN UNION JAY 2100 EXT 266

6:14PM

*8704*

*Advised to send to Executive  
Office Bldg - 6/21*

*Office of the Mayor*

ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
PHONE 522-4463

*From Mrs. Ann M. Moses*

*Ardie Ames*

*395-3247*

Some additional information on the  
Ribicoff Hearings

From the Desk of  
ArDee Ames



From the Desk of

ArDee Ames

From the Desk of

ArDee Ames

Some additional clippings on the  
Ribicoff Hearings.

From the Desk of

Ardee Ames

Telefax

# WESTERN UNION

SENDING BLANK

Telefax



CALL  
LETTERS

FJT

11/16/66

CHARGE  
TO

Mayor's Office, 206 City Hall

Mr. Ardee Ames  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.

MAYOR IVAN ALLEN, JR. WILL ATTEND THE TASK  
FORCE MEETING ON NOVEMBER 19th AT 9:30 A.M.

Mrs. Ann Moses  
Executive Secretary

*Send the above message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to*

**PLEASE TYPE OR WRITE PLAINLY WITHIN BORDER—DO NOT FOLD**

1269—(R 4-55)

## ALL MESSAGES TAKEN BY THIS COMPANY ARE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TERMS:

To guard against mistakes or delays, the sender of a message should order it repeated, that is, telegraphed back to the originating office for comparison. For this, the usual message rate is charged in addition. Unless otherwise indicated on its face, this is an un-repeated message and paid for as such, in consideration whereof it is agreed between the sender of the message and the Telegraph Company as follows:

1. The Telegraph Company shall not be liable for mistakes or delays in the transmission or delivery, or for non-delivery, of any message received for transmission at the un-repeated-message rate beyond the sum of five hundred dollars; nor for mistakes or delays in the transmission or delivery, or for non-delivery, of any message received for transmission at the repeated-message rate beyond the sum of five thousand dollars. In any case for delays arising from unavoidable interruption in the working of its lines.
2. In any event the Telegraph Company shall not be liable for damages for mistakes or delays in the transmission or delivery, or for the non-delivery, of any message, whether caused by the negligence of its servants or otherwise, beyond the actual loss, not exceeding in any event the sum of five thousand dollars, at which amount the sender of each message represents that the message is valued, unless a greater value is stated in writing by the sender thereof at the time the message is received for transmission, and unless the repeated-message rate is paid or agreed to be paid and an additional charge equal to one-tenth of one per cent of the amount by which such valuation shall exceed five thousand dollars.
3. The Telegraph Company is hereby made the agent of the sender, without liability, to forward this message over the lines of any other company when necessary to reach its destination.
4. The applicable tariff charges on a message destined to any point in the continental United States listed in the Telegraph Company's Directory of Stations cover its delivery within the established city or community limits of the destination point, beyond such limits and to points not listed in the Telegraph Company's Directory of Stations, the Telegraph Company does not undertake to make delivery but will endeavor to arrange for delivery by any available means as the agent of the sender, with the understanding that the sender authorizes the collection of any additional charge from the addressee and agrees to pay such additional charge if it is not collected from the addressee.
5. No responsibility attaches to the Telegraph Company concerning messages until the same are accepted at one of its transmitting offices; and if a message is sent to such office by one of the Telegraph Company's messengers, he acts for that purpose as the agent of the sender, except that when the Telegraph Company sends a messenger to pick up a message, the messenger in that instance acts as the agent of the Telegraph Company in accepting the message, the Telegraph Company assuming responsibility from the time of such acceptance.
6. The Telegraph Company will not be liable for damages or statutory penalties when the claim is not presented in writing to the Telegraph Company, (a) within ninety days after the message is filed with the Telegraph Company for transmission in the case of a message between points within the United States (except in the case of an intrastate message in Texas) or between a point in the United States on the one hand and a point in Alaska, Canada, Mexico, or the Sierra-Miquelón Islands on the other hand, or between a point in the United States and a ship at sea or in the air, (b) within 95 days after the cause of action, if any, shall have accrued in the case of an intrastate message in Texas, and (c) within 180 days after the message is filed with the Telegraph Company for transmission in the case of a message between a point in the United States and a foreign or overseas point other than the points specified above in this paragraph; provided, however, that this condition shall not apply to claims for damages or overcharges within the purview of Section 415 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.
7. It is agreed that in any action by the Telegraph Company to recover the tolls for any message or messages the prompt and correct transmission and delivery thereof shall be presumed, subject to rebuttal by competent evidence.
8. Special terms governing the transmission of messages according to their classes, as enumerated below, shall apply to messages in each of such respective classes in addition to all the foregoing terms.
9. No employee of the Telegraph Company is authorized to vary the foregoing.

6-54

Messages between

### CLASSES OF SERVICE

#### DOMESTIC SERVICES

##### TELEGRAM

The fastest domestic service.

##### DAY LETTER (DL)

A deferred same-day service, at low rates.

##### NIGHT LETTER (NL)

Economical overnight service. Accepted up to 2 A. M. for delivery the following morning, at rates lower than the Telegram or Day Letter rates.

#### INTERNATIONAL SERVICES

##### FULL RATE (FR)

The fastest overseas service. May be written in code, cipher, or in any language expressed in Roman letters.

##### LETTER TELEGRAM (LT)

For overnight plain language messages, at half-rate. Minimum charge for 22 words applies.

##### SHIP RADIOGRAM

For messages to and from ships at sea.



Telefax

# WESTERN UNION

Telefax



135P EST NOV 15 66 AF177

DEA354 DE WA069 GOVT PD WUX THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC

15 NPT

HONORABLE IVAN ALLEN, DONT DWR

MAYOR OF ATLANTA GA ATLA

THE SECOND MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE WILL BE HELD ON NOVEMBER  
19, 1966 IN ROOM 444, EXECUTIVE OFFICES BUILDING, 17TH & PENNSYLVANIA  
AVE, BEGINNING AT 9:30 A.M.

ARDEE ANES 149P

*Amel*



CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a fast message unless its deferred character is indicated by the proper symbol

# WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

W. P. MARSHALL  
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

R. W. MCFALL  
PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS

DL = Day Letter  
NL = Night Letter  
L = International Letter Telegram

The filing time shown in the date line on domestic telegrams is LOCAL TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is LOCAL TIME at point of destination

141P EST DEC 12 66 AF167 SYB280

SY WA270 GOVT PD WUX THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC 12 1153A

EST

HON IVAN ALLEN, MAYOR, DONT DWR

ATLA

MEETING ON DECEMBER 15, WILL BE IN WASHINGTON AT 10:00 A.M.,

ROOM 444, EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING

ARDEE AMES

(56)

141P EST DEC 12 66 AT161 2V2280  
SY WAZDO GOVT PD WUX THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC 12 1122A  
EST

HON IVAN ALLEN HAVAN MAYOR, DONT DNR

ATLA

MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, WILL BE IN WASHINGTON AT 10:00 A.M.  
ROOM 444, EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING

ARDEE AMER

(28)

RC ATLANTA G/

1966 DEC 12 PM 2 01

C- 87444



## BUILDING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Memorandum

Date: November 17, 1966

TO: Paul N. Ylvisaker

Project/No.:

FROM: Ezra Ehrenkrantz

Subject: Area of emphasis for White House  
Task Force on the City

In trying to write a letter in response to your request at the first task force meeting, I have become impressed by the extent to which the majority of the problems that we talk about today have been reviewed over and over again in the past. On most of these I am relatively inexperienced, and rather than trying to set out a grand framework on all of the problems that we should try to deal with, I would like to concentrate on one particular area which I feel very strongly about.

The Federal Government sponsors a great deal of research in city problems, some of it academic, and the bulk of it practical. Neither benefits substantially from the other. Theoretical study of the city concentrates variously on urban growth and form, social ecology, or the planning process, making little contribution to the understanding of action policies. Projects are developed on an ad hoc basis to meet a compromise among the expressed needs of their more vocal constituents; the outcome is frequently wide of the first objective and there is seldom any attempt to show how it got there. There are no controlled experiments in the field and little cumulation of evidence.

Performance in both the academic and practical areas of urban studies could be improved by providing a bridge between the two kinds of work. I suggest that a portion--possibly 2%-5%--of every Federal program directly or remotely affecting the city be committed for experimental work, and that these experiments be conducted under the direction of an interlocking body which would represent and serve all the affected Federal agencies, State and local officials where appropriate and representatives of industry, labor and the academic community. In addition to performing (1) research and (2) experimental projects, this body could:

- (3) provide policy coordination between agencies,
- (4) serve as a clearing house for information on regular and experimental programs of the linking agencies, and for consulting services in research and planning,
- (5) direct contract research for other public and non-profit bodies.

By:

120 Broadway  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Phone 415 434 3830

These experimental programs would review the effect of possible changes in codes, labor practices, market organization and many other aspects of our work in cities which affect cost and performance of our physical structures. We would equally be concerned with the relation of people to one another, the introduction of social services, and the development of neighborhoods. By structuring the experimental programs, it should be possible to develop a data base which would enable future decisions to be made on major programs for the city on better information than we have today.

Given such a means of coordination, Federally sponsored urban studies could be structured in a planned, cumulative sequence, contribute reliable experimental evidence, and provide a sound bridge between academic and practical study in the field.

I hope that I am not stressing a point of view on a single subject too strongly for the first go-round.

Ezra Ehrenkrantz



# EVERYDAY HELL

N.Y. Times 11/20/66

LA VIDA: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty—San Juan and New York. By Oscar Lewis. 669 pp. New York: Random House. \$10.

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

"LA VIDA" is unquestionably one of the most important books published in the United States this year. It is a shattering account of three generations of the Rios family in the slums of San Juan and the Puerto Rican enclaves of New York. Much of it is told in the tape-recorded words of the subjects themselves. The book is in large part, as Oscar Lewis says, "a picture of family disruption, violence, brutality, cheapness of life, lack of love, lack of education, lack of medical facilities—in short, a picture of incredible deprivation the effects of which cannot be wiped out in a single generation. This Zolaesque reality emerges from a Puerto Rican society in which the island average income per person rose from \$120 to \$740 between 1940 and 1963.

The casual, matter-of-fact descriptions of social hell that abound in "La Vida" are sometimes so appalling that the middle-class reader is in danger of being overwhelmed. How, exactly, does he assimilate to his experience the reminiscence of a crippled child who tells of having played the "game" of prostitution? But then three of the major characters in this book actually worked at the profession for a period, and one mother entertains her children by singing "dirty" songs. More conventionally, yet still not quite what the middle-class reader is used to, the five central figures of "La Vida" have already had a total of 20 marriages (17 of them consensual unions, 3 of them legal) and they are clearly not done yet.

Nevertheless, in a probing introduction Lewis argues that there are in these lower depths certain strengths. There is a fortitude and resilience in the Rios family, and its members are capable of great kindness despite the brutality of their circumstances. "Money and material possessions," he writes, "although important, do not motivate their major decisions. Their deepest need is for love, and their

life is a relentless search for it." In analyzing this coexistence of the pathological and the healthy, Lewis gives considerable precision to a term that he originated: the "culture of poverty." And he provides some important theoretical insights of considerable relevance to some of the political debates going on in America today.

Essentially what Lewis does is to incorporate two of the most popular oversimplifications about the poor into a complex idea. On the one hand, there is the belief that the impoverished have been spared the corruptions of affluence and are therefore a potential source of social regeneration. The extreme version of this thesis is the idealization by Frantz Fanon (author of "The Wretched of the Earth") of the "people of the shanty towns" as the creative and revolutionary force of the second half of the century. In American terms, the Black Power ideologists are making a similar claim for the victimized inhabitants of the Negro ghetto. And on the other hand, there is the view that poverty holds only degradation. The compassionate partisans of this view believe that they must help the passive and defeated poor who cannot help themselves, while the reactionaries believe that the slum dwellers "got that way" because they wanted to and lacked Goldwaterite virtues of thrift and enterprise.

Lewis's definition of the culture of poverty reveals the half-truths and large falsehoods behind these contradictory myths. Those who dwell in this subculture do not "belong" to any of the institutions of the larger society. Unemployment and underemployment make them marginal in the labor market; they do not join political parties; they spend rather than save, and pay more for inferior merchandise since they do not have access to cheap credit and don't shop in supermarkets; and so on. Now there are, and have been, poor people who did "belong." There are primitive and utterly impoverished tribes which nevertheless possess an integrated and self-sufficient culture. And various American immigrant groups, most notably the Eastern European Jews, came to this country with intact traditions that protected them from the extreme social and spiritual consequences of being poor.

MR. HARRINGTON is the author of "The Other America" and "The Accidental Century."



Thus, Lewis's culture of poverty is a very specific and unique phenomenon. It occurs in societies in which the cash economy and rapid change subvert the old ways and a group is left behind without either money or even a hungry solidarity.

People inhabiting the culture of poverty, then, are "out of it," and their life is the experience of a disintegration. This is the profoundly negative side of being poor (Gunnar

Myrdal was thinking along these lines when he said that the underclass of the affluent society is a "non-revolutionary proletariat"), and it will disappoint all the romantic expectations from Fanon to Black Power and back. And yet, as Lewis emphasizes, the very absence of regular institutions within the culture of poverty forces the people to create their own associations and values, in order to survive. The *(Continued on Page 92)*





## Everyday Hell

(Continued from Page 1)

problem is, the middle-class visitor from the Mars of the larger society will often not recognize this social ingenuity, even when he comes face to face with it.

For example, the marriage patterns — or more precisely, the endless succession of consensual unions — in the Rios family will strike most readers as chaotic. Yet the men, without jobs, income or property to pass on to their offspring, see no point in getting involved in legal entanglements. And the women fear being tied to men who are often immature and unreliable—and by refusing to give the fathers of their children the legal status of husbands, they maintain a stronger claim on the children if the couple separates. From the point of view of the slum there is a very real logic here; it is barely apparent, though to the outsider who has never had to cope with the kinds of problems which confront the Rios family every day.

It is from this vantage point that Lewis can see the neighborhood gang as a "considerable advance" over the more ravaging despairs and *anomie* that can be found in the culture of poverty. One remembers the fearful case in point that

Kenneth Clark has described: in Harlem in the 1950's when the police succeeded in breaking up the violent gangs, that moment was the start of the narcotics plague. The comfortable white could not understand that the gangs were a social invention as well as a police problem. Their destruction created a vacuum that was partly filled by heroin.

In any case, Lewis is quite right to understand the culture of poverty as a dialectic of strength and weakness in which the desperate need to survive simultaneously brutalizes and provokes a certain dignity into life. If these people are not a fount of revolutionary purity, neither are they an inert mass to be manipulated, "social-engineered" or nightsticked for their own good. For when political and social hope penetrates down into the culture of poverty, as happened with the Southern Negro during the last decade, the latent nobility surfaces, and, if it cannot transform modern society, it still makes a disproportionate contribution to social change and the common good.

I have, to be sure, some questions and reservations about aspects of Lewis's discussion. I think that the number of Americans who live in the culture of poverty, and are poor, is

greater than his estimate; I would not refer to the bureaucratic, collectivist system of Communism as "socialism"; I do not think that there is a "social-work solution" to poverty in America any more than in the Third World. But I have concentrated on my agreements with Lewis (which far outweigh the disagreements anyway) because I think "La Vida" is one more brilliant demonstration of the validity and profundity of the method Lewis has pioneered: the meticulous description, and tape-recorded self-depiction, of the daily life of a single yet archetypical family of the poor.

And finally, for all of the great interest of Lewis's introduction, the emotional force of "La Vida" comes, of course, from the Rios family itself. The poor, I have long felt, needed a novelist more than a statistician—and Lewis has proved once again that perhaps they are their own best novelists. The Rios family makes the dialectical concept of the culture of poverty unbearably real; the world which they describe is intolerable and their reminiscences should move a stone to tears. Yet they have not been overwhelmed; they have a capacity to act on their own behalf that demands liberation, not *noblesse oblige*.



## GOP on the Offense

### Revived Party Seeking More Positive Image With 'New Federalism'

More Local, State Activity With Federal Help Is Goal; Beating LBJ to the Punch?

But Unity May Shatter by '68

By JOSEPH W. SULLIVAN

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON — Congressional Republicans are beginning to flex their new post-election muscles. And like the ex-weakling in the traditional beach scene, they're getting an exhilarating feeling that they can outfight the "big bully"—in this case Lyndon Johnson.

This new optimism is not based on prospects for ramming through specific GOP-sponsored legislation in a Congress still dominated by the Democrats. Rather, the Republicans plan to seize the initiative in political thinking from their foes and build a positive image for themselves.

At bottom, there's a sense that momentum from last week's big election gains may enable the GOP to break loose from its long defensive stance in Congress. By quickly advancing a new political motif of their own, Republican leaders, especially in the House, hope to shift the public focus away from the standard measure of the past generation: Namely, how liberal or conservative is the GOP's stand on Democratic welfare programs.

With the 1968 Presidential election in mind, moreover, these Republican strategists think they've hit on a theme that can unite party liberals such as New York's Sen. Jacob Javits, middle-roaders such as Gov. George Romney of Michigan and conservatives such as governor-elect Ronald Reagan of California.

#### Goldwater Goals, Reverse Reasons

In capsule form, the emerging strategy consists of pursuing many of the goals Barry Goldwater advocated in his 1964 Presidential bid but reversing the reasons for doing so.

The object will still be a much bigger role for state and local government and private enterprise in combating the country's ills. But instead of invoking the need "to preserve the tried and true solutions of the past," the stress will be on "modernizing" and "energizing" governmental structures to cope with the problems of the future. And instead of leaving an impression that they would dismantle parts of the Federal Government, the GOP strategists in Congress intend to project a vital role for Washington—in pumping back its revenues to the states, in promoting interstate compacts to deal with regional problems and in fostering "Comsat-style" corporations to enlist private enterprise in the war on poverty.

"We aim to turn the political frame of reference in this country upside down," declares one of the most active of the youthful House GOP "activists" who helped install Rep. Gerald Ford of Michigan as House Minority Leader two years ago. "Creating new techniques and providing new resources for localities to take the governmental lead is going to be the progressive course, and reliance on an ever-growing Federal bureaucracy will be the hidebound, reactionary approach."

#### Several Possible Moves

To exploit the election's stimulus, House GOP leaders hope to move rapidly on several fronts:

—As the cornerstones of their domestic program, they're toiling to prepare a blueprint for a lump-sum, no-strings-attached distribution of Federal revenue to the states. After years of talking wistfully about such a scheme (along with former Johnson economic adviser Walter Heller) they finally have in hand a detailed draft that was prepared on commission by a Brookings Institution scholar, Richard Nathan.

This plan would pump out to the states a specified percentage of Federal income tax collections—perhaps 2% or 3% initially. The distribution formula would be weighted to favor poorer states, provide bonus money for states making the greatest revenue-raising effort of their own, and earmark 5% of the funds for administrative uses to "improve the leadership and overall policy formulation role of state government."

—As a way to get an opinion-holding jump on the Democrats, there's talk of presenting a Republican "State of the Union" message in advance of Mr. Johnson's. Last January Mr. Ford and Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois managed to get a half-hour of national television time to respond to the President's annual discourse. But several top strategists now believe the party's new, offensive posture would best be dramatized by going first. There's also strong, surprisingly widespread sentiment in these Congressional circles for sharing the talking-time with one of the GOP's progressive governors, perhaps John Love of Colorado or Daniel Evans of Washington, as a symbol of a party commitment to greater state-level vitality.

As a device to make their new theme stick in the public mind, party hands are groping for a catchy slogan. In a talk yesterday to the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders here, the House GOP's No. 2 man, Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, made a tentative move to preempt one of Mr. Johnson's own concoctions: "Creative federalism." In urging the state legislators to promote "a climate in America that enhances and encourages creativity and solution-finding at the state and local level," he proclaimed that "history can yet record that the decade of the 1960s was the period in which Americans rededicated themselves to the attainment of new heights . . . through a creative federalism that kept in step with modern times."

#### Mr. Johnson's Weapons

How much headway the GOP can make under any slogan remains to be determined. Despite Democratic Congressional losses, possession of the White House still gives President Johnson abundant resources for blunting the GOP thrust.

He could set a somber, wartime tone for the coming Congressional session and ridicule any GOP revenue-shaping plan as the height of fiscal folly at a time of overriding need to finance Vietnam fighting and to fight infla-



# GOP on the Offense: Party Hopes 'New Federalism' Will Help Image

*Continued From Page One*

tion at home. Or he might strive to persuade the electorate that he's better at "creative federalism" than the GOP, by pointing to such steps as a grant of broad latitude to the states in use of Federal public health funds and efforts to tailor the new "model cities" slum-rebuilding program to each locality's special needs. Or Mr. Johnson could deride the Republican offensive as warmed-over Goldwaterism, impractical for dealing with today's complex urban problems.

Within Congress, moreover, Democrats still hold the seats of power; by pushing bills to provide funds for Great Society programs which the GOP opposes, Democratic leaders could make the Republicans once again look like "aginners."

Nor is there any certainty that GOP forces will get or stick together on the course now projected. While Michigan's Gov. Romney is currently just as bent as Congressional party leaders on enlarging the sphere of state and local government, he could well decide next spring that immediate needs, say, for Federal school construction funds outweigh any distant commitment to an alternate, tax-rebate plan that can't be implemented until the GOP regains control of Congress.

Jockeying for the GOP Presidential nomination also could precipitate a party split. Romney men already suspect Messrs. Ford and

Laird of private collaboration with former Vice President Richard Nixon, and at some point this could provoke a Romney denunciation of their legislative course. Within Congress, too, the GOP's old liberal vs. conservative animosities could boil up at any point.

For now, though, the Congressional GOP appears more nearly united on a course of action than at any point in recent years.

"When I came back to Washington after the election, I was fully resigned to hear the conservatives talking up the returns as a mandate for putting a legislative blockade on everything," relates one self-styled House GOP moderate. "To my delight, though, many of them were just as revved-up as I am to launch a program of our own."

## Committees and Cohesion

Organizational and staff build-ups launched two years ago have played a big part in fostering this cohesion. In the House, a GOP planning and research committee has reached consensus on numerous position papers, many of them developed with academic help. In addition, the new Republican Co-ordinating Committee has brought together Congressional leaders, five GOP governors, the party's former Presidential nominees and National Chairman Ray Bliss for numerous skull sessions and position-charting.

"After two years of sitting next to George Romney at the Co-ordinating Committee meetings, we find ourselves agreeing on practically everything that comes up," remarks Rep. John Rhodes of Arizona, chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, who's generally considered an ardent Goldwater conservative.

Moreover, the party's capture of 47 more House seats solidifies the position of House GOP Leader Ford and gives him more freedom for taking the initiative; incoming freshmen lawmakers, by all initial soundings of Ford men, are mostly quite ready to follow the leader who has helped to brighten the party's face.

"If we'd only picked up 20 seats or so, Jerry Ford would be looking over his shoulder every time he made a move, but now he's in position to get together with Ev Dirksen on a State-of-the-Union plan, say, and then sail right ahead with it," calculates one senior House Republican who opposed Mr. Ford's leadership bid two years ago.

## The "Generational Gap"

In the Senate, the arrival of such engaging faces and articulate voices as those of Illinois' Charles Percy, Oregon's Mark Hatfield and Massachusetts' Edward Brooke may be worth more than all the organizational and tactical innovations combined. "Most of the things we're talking about are aimed in es-

sence at meeting the so-called generational gap. And I, for one, think the big bloc of younger, unaligned voters is going to identify just as much with a Percy or a Hatfield as a Bobby Kennedy," asserts one seasoned House hand.

When it comes to legislation immediately at hand, the GOP probably will go strong for curtailing Federal spending to deter inflation. Many party liberals, as well as conservatives, hit hard on this theme during their campaigns. There should be general agreement on curbing such "lower-priority" programs as rent subsidies, the national teacher corps and highway beautification as well as resisting any major expansion of school or antipoverty aid.

"I'm confident I can identify \$5 billion or so to cut by breakfast-time the morning after Johnson's budget comes up," says a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Aside from such bipartisan undertakings as raising Social Security benefits or overhauling the draft, GOP lawmakers don't see much immediate chance of actually framing major legislation. As various Great Society programs come up for extension, though, there's hope for using the party's added voting power to give states and localities a bigger role. In the case of Federal school aid, which comes up for renewal in 1968, current thinking is to press for giving communities much more leeway to set their own priorities.

As for revenue-sharing with the states, few Republicans entertain any serious hope of getting such a program off the ground in the next two years. "We'll hold out revenue-sharing as the first order of business after we regain control of Congress in 1968," says a top party planner.



# SHRIVER PROPOSES WIDE SCHOOL PLAN

11/20/66 *McL...*

## Seeks to Help the Poor by Making Permanent the Gains of Head Start

By HAROLD GAL

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 19—Sargent Shriver has proposed a broad program to help underprivileged children retain the gains they make in the Government's Head Start project.

The director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administers the program for pre-kindergarten children, warned that the present elementary school system was "critically inadequate to meet the needs of children of poverty." He urged educators across the country to do the following:

¶Provide one teacher for every 15 children.

¶Utilize new sources of educational manpower, such as teacher aides, "subprofessionals" and volunteers.

¶Establish a program of tutorial assistance in which older students from high schools and college would take part.

¶Establish neighborhood councils and community associations, outside of parent-teacher groups, that would get parents involved in the activities of every public school.

¶Provide an adequate supply of all necessary supplies, including toys and films, and make broad use of electronic learning aids.

¶Initiate programs to train "childhood development" specialists who would work exclusively in early primary grades, diagnose obstacles to a child's progress and prescribe help by other professions, such as psychologists, sociologists and reading specialists.

Mr. Shriver put his proposals forward in an address yesterday before the opening session of the annual meeting of the Great Cities Research Council at the Pfister Hotel in Milwaukee.

The session was attended by top educational officials and other leaders from the 1 largest cities in the United States. Mr. Shriver spoke from notes, and the official text of his remarks was made public in Washington today.

The Shriver program, which he called Project Keep Moving,

# SHRIVER PROPOSES WIDE SCHOOL PLAN

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

was inspired by a major study made public on Oct. 23. That study found that the educational advantages gained by a preschool child in the head start program tended to disappear six to eight months after the child had started his regular schooling.

The study was directed by Dr. Max Wolff, senior research sociologist at the Center for Urban Education in New York. It was sponsored by the Per-Kauf Graduate School of Education at Yeshiva University and supported by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

### 'One Grade at a Time'

Mr. Shriver conceded that his proposals could not be accomplished all at once. He said, however, that "any urban school system with imagination and a reasonable use of resources could tackle the job one grade at a time."

He called Project Head Start "a short-term experience, and a shot of educational adrenalin whose effects can wear off in the grinding boredom and frustration of slum classrooms."

Acknowledging that it would be difficult to provide one

teacher for every 15 children, Mr. Shriver said that putting teacher's aides and other adults into the classroom could make up for any failure to achieve a 1-to-15 ratio.

He urged that the neighborhood be drawn into the school so that children and parents alike could feel that education was a basic part of their total environment.

Mr. Shriver said that electronic aids had already proved their effectiveness in Head Start classrooms.

He did not say in his address where funds for Project Keep Moving would come from. An aide in the Office of Economic Opportunity said in Washington today that Mr. Shriver believed that funds would be made available through Federal and state agencies if there was enough pressure from communities throughout the country.

Pointing to the Wolff study, Mr. Shriver said that "the readiness and receptivity" that many children "gained in Head Start has been crushed by the broken promises of first grade." Project Keep Moving, he said, could stir "a revolution in education from preschool through college."

"Only if we maintain the pace of Head Start throughout the school system," he said, "can we create an educational process which will give every disadvantaged child in our nation a chance to obtain the highest education level in his power."



POINT OF VIEW

# GOP Bares Economic Plan

By MARY McGRORY  
Star Staff Writer

Rep. Melvin R. Laird, chairman of the House Republican Conference, has unveiled the principal economic provision of the GOP "State of the Union" message, which the newly revived minority party plans to repeat—January.

He expounded at length on a federal-state tax-sharing plan which was originally pushed by Walter Heller, who served both the New Frontier and the Great Society as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Congressional Republicans are putting a major effort into their minority declaration this year. With 47 new House members and a brilliant array of new faces in the Senate, they hope their "State of the Union" which was somewhat facetiously received in 1966, will be taken seriously in 1967.

Laird told the press he thinks the real action in the coming year will be in the House, where the swelling of Republican ranks means that some of the legislative goals might actually be accomplished.

In drafting the "State of the Union," the views of the newly elected governors and legislators will be consulted, but Laird said he hoped the House Republicans "would not get involved in presidential politics."

He and House Minority Leader Gerald E. Ford already are involved to some extent, since they raised the money to finance the highly successful 30-state campaign tour of Richard M. Nixon.

They sought and received clearance from Ford's governor, George W. Romney, the leading contender. They said they were working not for the candidacy of Nixon but for the congressmen whom he was boosting.

The drafters of the "State of the Union" paper foresee little difficulty with the domestic proposals. The Republican governors went on record in July 1965 in favor of the tax-sharing scheme.

But if Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen

reserves for himself the right to speak again on foreign policy, as he did in 1965, the Republicans will find themselves in difficulties.

Dirksen pleased neither hawks nor doves of his party with his previous declaration. He will again fail the hard-liners like Nixon and Rep. Ford, who favor increased air and sea power use and the soft-liners, like Sen.-elect Charles H. Percy of Illinois and Sen.-elect Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, who emphasize negotiation.

The Senate minority leader is a law unto himself, and none of the technicians in the House leadership can appeal to him to shape his views to theirs.

Dirksen's thinking on loyal

opposition were formed during the Eisenhower years, when the then Senate Minority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson took the position that partisan differences stopped at the water's edge.

The rule was observed, except in 1954 when Johnson, in concert with several other Democrats, took exception to the Eisenhower policies in Viet Nam.

Dirksen initially made a few noises about Viet Nam last year, but refused the language provided him by the Joint Minority Conference and went all the way with LBJ in his portion of the "State of the Union."

Romney is both vulnerable and defensive on foreign policy. He revealed in his first post-election national television appearance Sunday that he not only has no position but no views he dares express.

It is this weakness that may prove to be the opportunity of 48-year-old Sen.-elect Percy, who proposed the all-Asia peace conference, which he insists, despite the presidential trip to Manila, has never occurred.

Percy makes no secret to fellow Republicans of his feeling that he is far more informed on questions of war and peace than the governor of Michigan.

He has one other advantage over Romney. He supported his party's nominee in 1964 and Romney did not, a circumstance for which the Goldwater wing of the party has not yet forgiven him.

If Percy—no matter what Dirksen says in the "State of the Union" message—forges out a peace position, then it could mean problems, not only for Romney, but for President Johnson as well in 1968.



# Teachers Seen Using Slums as Excuse

By Henry W. Pierce

PITTSBURGH, Nov. 18 — The Nation's schools are using lower-class children's "poverty culture" as an excuse for not educating them adequately, a leading social scientist charged here today.

Dr. Estelle Fuchs, anthropologist at New York's Hunter College and author of the controversial "Pickets at the Gates," said schools tend to freeze underprivileged children into a lower-class way of life.

Washington schools are a prime example of this, she said.

She also cited schools in Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, Boston and New York.

## Anthropologist Dissents

But a Washington University anthropologist, Dr. Charles A. Valentine, disagreed with her.

Dr. Valentine charged anthropologists with failure to live among underprivileged groups as a means of studying them.

"Anthropologists can study a South Seas culture and find order, but they go into Harlem and find nothing but disorder. They study our own slum-dwellers with questionnaires and interviews; they are apparently too afraid to go and live as one of them," he asserted.

He added: "It boils down to this: we are good anthropologists overseas and bad anthropologists at home."

Dr. Valentine said he intends to "live among the poor" as part of a study he is undertaking next year in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

## Four-Day Meeting

Dr. Fuchs and Dr. Valentine

were among more than 2500 persons attending the four-day American Anthropological Association meeting here.

Anthropologists, who traditionally have studied such things as tribal cultures and man's remote past, have shown a spurt of interest in poverty groups within the United States. A session on poverty drew a standing-room crowd here, while sessions on tribal customs and on baboon behavior drew only scattered attendance.

Dr. Fuchs, one of six speakers on "The Culture of Poverty," said schools are hardening many of the differences between middle-class Americans and lower-class groups.

"School administrators are using the 'culture of poverty' concept to absolve themselves from responsibility," she declared.

Teachers, she said, often use in such terms as "psychologically unready" and "culturally impoverished home life" to

excuse their own failure to teach the youngsters properly.

## Cites Example

She told about a New York City teacher in an underprivileged school district who took her students to the airport as part of a class project.

"It was the first time those children had been out of their own neighborhood," she declared, adding:

"They were amazed when they got their first glimpse of an escalator. One of them asked whether it tickled if you rode it. That teacher used the incident to prove her students hadn't the intelligence to learn."

Dr. Fuchs called this attitude "typical" among many teachers.

## Not Scheduled

At the end of the session, Dr. Valentine, who was not a scheduled speaker, stood up and declared:

"It seems to me there has been a common thread running through these discussions

which is incorrect. All the anthropologists here have maintained that the culture of poverty concept has been misused. But perhaps it's our own point of view that needs changing."

He charged that anthropologists are "very much involved in their own middle-class cultures."



CHARLES BARTLETT

## Poverty Program to Test Johnson's Intentions

The available insights indicate that President Johnson has been more than slightly surprised and discomfited by the election returns. Predictions are rife within the bureaucracy that he will "hunker up" and play a more cautious lead for the next two years.

Johnson has conjectured to associates that they all may have erred in bragging excessively about their legislative triumphs. He talked even before the election of being

finished with the Great Society because its legislative foundations had been enacted.

Such hints of an intention to embark on a new tack of leadership are bolstered by polls, which show that a significant segment of the voters, about 48 percent in one Republican survey, would prefer him to be more conservative. A much smaller group, 19 percent in the Republican poll, wants a more liberal President.

One crucial test of the President's direction will be the anti-poverty program, which is certain to founder in the next Congress unless he wraps a strong, protective arm around it. Johnson applied the Gavin plan to the war against poverty at the same time that he rejected it for the war in South Viet Nam. The domestic war has been a holding operation and its enclaves are on the verge of being overrun.

The tentative guidelines on which the Budget Bureau has shaped its hearings foreshadow no significant change in next year's poverty package. The total appropriation will be approximately the same and the Office of Economic Opportunity will not be stripped of any of its programs, as the Republicans proposed last spring.

But this in itself is not enough to save a program so close to being destroyed by its enemies. The poverty warriors have been left almost defenseless by the President's failure to translate the enthusiasm with which he declared war on poverty in 1964 into the funds and support needed to sustain an offensive.

Johnson did almost nothing to help Sargent Shriver and

his associates in the past Congress and he may well intend to let them be devoured by the next Congress. The blood will not be on his hands but he will be rid of a Pandora's box of embarrassments.

The President may have underestimated the implications of his promise to stamp out poverty in 1964. He probably did not realize that he was launching a social revolution that would cause old-line social workers, bureaucrats, mayors, governors, senators, congressmen and the poor themselves to rise up in noisy, intermittent indignation. As an old New Dealer who likes programs that kindle gratitude, Johnson may well be mystified by a welfare program capable of causing so much dissent.

The troubles arise because Shriver and his cohorts have unflinchingly declared war against all the forces which submerge the poor. Convinced that this was more than a matter of putting federal money in poor men's hands, they have poked their way deep into the subterranean caverns of the social structure, roused all kinds of bats, and raised new questions.

Johnson undoubtedly envisioned something more like the Labor Department's Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is a simple, almost a leaf-raking type of program that funnels more than one-quarter of a billion dollars into kids' pockets without teaching them much or raising many

issues. It is a safe, unimaginative welfare program and it is extremely popular with Congress.

The war on poverty will settle into this comfortable pattern if Congress abolishes the OEO. The bureaucrats know the New Deal techniques well and they will back away from contentions like the current one that sandwiches Shriver between the liberals who advocate sterilization and the Catholics who oppose birth control.

George Bernard Shaw wrote that "nothing is ever done in this world until men are prepared to kill one another if it is not done." The kind of all-out war that the President declared and Shriver has waged may involve too many basic changes to be accomplished in a tepid political climate.

But Pandora's box has been opened. "The rich man thinks of the future," according to an old proverb, "but the poor man thinks of today." Johnson has raised hopes that are unlikely to subside because of a conservative tinge in the election returns.

© 1966



# Lawyers Begin Drive Against Poverty

By SIDNEY E. ZION

Special to The New York Times

CHICAGO, Nov. 19—A major effort to develop "new and imaginative" legal remedies to combat poverty was started here this weekend by the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

"We are moving into an era of poverty law which in some sense is comparable to the civil rights law of the mid-1930's," Jack Greenberg, director-counsel of the fund, said.

Mr. Greenberg called on the 200 lawyers gathered at the University of Chicago Law School to benefit from the "best thinking" on the legal aspects of slum housing, welfare, consumer fraud, and the farm and migratory workers.

"Those of us who years ago were concerned solely with orthodox issues of civil rights," he said, "have little by little and for a time not fully realizing it been dealing more and more with questions of poverty and issues affecting all Americans."

## New Techniques Sought

Virtually all of the lawyers here for the weekend conference on law and poverty are actively engaged in representing poor persons, either through federally funded organizations such as the Office of Economic Opportunity or through legal aid societies, or as private lawyers cooperating with the Legal Defense Fund.

Essentially, the purpose of the conference is to expose the lawyers to new thinking on old subjects, and to explore various novel legal techniques that might be used on behalf of the disadvantaged.

In the opening address yesterday on slum housing, Prof. Julian Levi of the University of Chicago, said:

"In essence our task is as ancient and honorable as the

legal profession—the fashioning of legal remedies to achieve human rights through the application of imagination scholarship."

For example, he said that class actions by slum tenants could succeed even in states where there was no legislation providing for this right. The class action, which is a lawsuit brought by a number of persons acting together, is "a descendant of the 17th century," Professor Levi said.

Similarly, he suggested, a tenant could force a landlord to rehabilitate an apartment on the basis of "the ancient doctrine of abatement of a nuisance."

## A Charge to Lawyers

In most states, Professor Levi said, there is no effective legislation to require landlords to repair rundown apartments. But, he said, by the use of traditional legal doctrines, "fashioned with skill," the goal can be accomplished.

"The charge to lawyers in our generation," he concluded, is to throw open the doors of the courtroom where traditionally we have searched for truth and equity, so that rights long recognized can be effectuated."

Mr. Levi is professor of urban studies at Chicago.

This morning a welfare law expert, Edward V. Sparer, warned the lawyers that there was increasing resistance in the country to the "basic premise" that the indigent have a right to assistance.

Mr. Sparer, who is legal director of the Center of Social Welfare and Public Policy at Columbia University, noted that some welfare departments and courts had recently taken the position that persons might be denied aid even though they met the eligibility requirements of the law.

"It all started," he said, "in the Elizabethan days when there

were the deserving poor and the undeserving poor."

"As a practical reality," he continued, "we are still living with that today."

He pointed to states that deny aid to dependent children because the mother, whose husband has deserted her, is suspected of having sexual relations with another man.

## Compilation of Cases

A 216-page book, prepared by the Legal Defense Fund, was distributed to all the lawyers here. The book, which will be expanded periodically, contains court decisions, legal essays and forms that lawyers can use in preparing cases. The subjects covered are consumer credit, slum housing, problems of farm and migratory workers, and welfare laws.

"If we could mobilize the people here," said Michael Meltzer, a lawyer for the legal defense fund, "there would be a tremendous exposure of the problems of the poor to the Appellate Court and to the people of the country."

He continued: "The trouble now is that there is not a general understanding as to how people live in slums, what happens to the migratory worker, the credit abuses that afflict ghetto people, and the way the poor are treated in the lower criminal courts."

Mr. Greenberg said that the conference here was "the first of its kind in the country" and that he hoped it could be set up on a national and regional basis in the future.

The Legal Defense Fund is not a part of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It is an independent, nonprofit corporation with its own board, budget, and a staff of attorneys devoted to providing assistance in legal action.



## WIDER URBAN ROLE URGED FOR STATES

### U.S. Report Scores Lag in Facing Cities' Problem

WASHINGTON, Nov. 20 (AP)—A report issued tonight by a House committee predicted that the Federal system might be gravely weakened unless states increased their role in solving the problems of metropolitan areas.

It said states had lagged far behind Federal and local governments in dealing with such problems and that, as a result, cities had bypassed states and gone directly to Washington for help.

"Minimizing state participation in urban affairs is tantamount to removing state influence from a critical range of domestic issues," the report said, adding that without state participation it is doubtful whether local government can be reorganized to meet its growing responsibilities.

What is seen as an urgent need to re-establish a role for the states is a principal theme of the 168-page report, a product of seven years of work by the bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

It notes that with metropolitan areas growing so fast that some 75 per cent of the nation's population would live there by 1980, the Government would have to provide many of the services individuals could furnish themselves in a predominantly rural economy.

But the report asserted that "poor coordination and conflicts of interest among governments often block effective action to deal with metropolitan problems."

"Changes in the structure of

government within metropolitan areas, and innovations in relations between the Federal Government, the states and local communities are needed to overcome these obstacles," it said.

The report was prepared for the commission by Bernard J. Frieden, associate professor of city planning at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and issued by the House Government Operations Committee.

Much of the report was devoted to the need for state legislation providing greater home rule, metropolitan planning and strengthening of general governmental units, as opposed to school districts, water and sewerage boards and other single-purpose groups.

But it noted that the vast increase in Federal programs aimed at metropolitan areas should serve as a basis for encouraging metropolitan planning for both the central city and surrounding suburbs.

"The Congress and executive agencies should authorize and encourage responsible joint participation in urban development programs by local governments having common program objectives in metropolitan areas that overlap political boundaries," the report said.

William G. Colman, the commission's executive director, said in a statement accompanying the report that "the solutions to metropolitan problems can be developed by the states, by the Federal Government, or by both."

Although the report made it clear that the commission favored such development at all levels, Mr. Colman said that "the decision as to which it will be rests to a considerable extent with the state governments, because if they choose not to act, the metropolitan problem by default, becomes largely a Federal problem."

The report suggested that this had already happened, and said that "the state role has

been lagging far behind both local and Federal activity."

"Yet," it went on, "the states occupy critical position within the American Federal systems and possess the power and resources to strengthen local capacities and stimulate greater cooperation within metropolitan areas."

#### Specific Proposals

Many of the commission's specific proposals, such as state legislation to limit zoning powers of smaller suburbs and to limit incorporation of separate units within metropolitan areas, have been issued in earlier reports.

Members of the commission include Govs. John N. Dempsey of Connecticut, Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York, Carl F. Sanders of Georgia and Robert E. Smylie of Idaho; Secretaries Henry H. Fowler of the Treasury, Orville L. Freeman of

Agriculture, Robert C. Weaver of Housing and Urban Development; Senators Sam J. Ervin Jr. of North Carolina, Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota, and Edmund S. Muskie of Maine; Representatives Eugene J. Keogh of New York, L. H. Fountain of North Carolina and Florence P. Dwyer of New Jersey; and Mayors Neal S. Blaisdell of Honolulu, Herman Goldner of St. Petersburg, Fla., Richard C. Lee of New Haven, and Arthur A. Naftalin of Minneapolis.



# POPULATION ISSUE PERTURBS WIRTZ

## He Discerns Inadequacies in Birth Control Discussions

By IRVING SPIEGEL

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz observed critically yesterday that the controversial question of birth control had not been discussed openly—"unless to be derided"—at the recently held election campaigns throughout the country.

Noting that some population experts predict there will be three billion people or more by the year 2,000, Mr. Wirtz added that "there is a growing awareness that centuries after Malthus's warning—that there may not be food to feed so many."

His reference to Malthus referred to Thomas R. Malthus, 18th century economist who was author of the theory that population tends to increase faster than the food supply, and that war, disease and famine are necessary to keep the population in balance with the food supply. Population Malthus said, must be checked by moral restraint.

Speaking at a special convocation at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the upper Bronx, Secretary Wirtz used the birth control question as an example of the failure of, in his words, "the majority" to face up to the knowledge science is constantly developing.

"There is, at least," he said, "a rough equivalent between both the nature and the infinite importance of two pursuits: that by the life scientist of the method of creating life, and that by society of how to control birth."



The New York Times

**VIEWS BIRTH RISE:**  
Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said birth control issue should have been discussed more openly in the election campaigns.

### Dangers Foreseen

"Just as science has made war too dangerous to be left to the generals, Mr. Wirtz said, "science, when it unlocks the arcane of thought and life will either have made science too dangerous to be left to the scientists or will have made government too dangerous to be left to the governed."

The Einstein College, which is part of Yeshiva University, began yesterday a \$120-million development program over a 10-year period to strengthen and extend the medical school programs of education and research and the development of extensive facilities.

Jack D. Weiler, chairman of the Medical College's Board of Overseers, announced that the campaign had started with preliminary pledges of \$15-million.

One of the highlights of the convocation was the presentation of honorary degrees to four prominent Americans for various achievements in their fields.

Cited were Mr. Wirtz, who was awarded the degree of doctor of laws; Charles H. Revson, chairman of the board of Revlon, Inc., doctor of humane letters; Dr. Albert B. Sabin, who developed oral polio vaccine, doctor of science, and Dr. Sidney Farber of Harvard Medical School, doctor of science.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, who awarded the degrees, observed that the recipients represented the "creative partnership of government, science and philanthropy in the growth and development of American medical education and research."

The new program, Mr. Weiler said, would strengthen medical

training in two ways by providing an across-the-board increase in medical training and by providing a \$30-million fund to establish 60 academic chairs to stabilize the college's long-range educational program.

He indicated that medical student enrollment would increase from 96 to 120 a class, that enrollment for doctorates would double from 45 to 90 and that there would be a substantial increase in the number of intern residents and post-doctoral fellows trained.

To provide facilities for its expanded enrollment, the Einstein Medical School is planning a 15-story Educational Center for Health Sciences on its campus.

The building would provide classrooms, lecture halls and laboratories, as well as other facilities, including a two-story computer center and headquarters for a greatly expanded program of preventive medicine and community health.

Three large middle-income apartment houses will be built on the campus site to provide residential quarters for nurses, house staff, married students, post-doctoral fellows and junior faculty.



*Allen*

November 15, 1966

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of Task Force  
From: ArDee Ames

At the direction of Paul Ylvisaker, I am attaching a copy of the memo prepared by Mr. Chapin on long-range issues for consideration by the task force.

If you would send your memo to this office as soon as possible we will take care of distributing it to the other members.

STATEMENT ON LANDLORD-TENANT RELATIONS

For a tenant who is poor and lives in a slum, the balance of power in landlord-tenant relations is an unequal one.

The slum dweller's ability to compete in the market place by moving elsewhere is sharply limited. His ability to seek legal redress is hampered both by his level of poverty and the lack of an adequate framework of legal protection. His ability to obtain protection from government is limited by inadequate code enforcement programs and a lack of effective governmental sanctions in dealing with major code violations.

Reformation of landlord-tenant law is a state and local government responsibility, but of major importance to the national welfare. The federal government already has substantial authority to help protect the rights of tenants through better code enforcement. The steps taken by the federal government, while indirect, can be of decisive importance.

Recommendations: The Task Force therefore recommends:

1. That a National Institute of Urban Housing Law be established and adequately funded on a long-term basis. The Institute should be empowered to prepare model statutes, develop briefs, and serve as a clearinghouse of housing law information.



2. That the administration of HUD's "Workable Program" which now statutorily calls for an effective program of code enforcement, be strengthened (a) by giving the matter highest possible priority in the Department, (b) by clarifying regulations and developing specific criteria on what constitutes an effective program, and (c) by requiring uniform statistical reporting to determine comparable rates of municipal performance.

3. That HUD's program of aid for concentrated code enforcement (Sec. 117) be revised to allow the use of such funds in hard core slum areas to cope with most urgent code violations, or new legislation should be sought to provide a new aid program for urgent repairs and intensified municipal services in such slum areas.

4. That HEW should be directed, either by legislation or administrative action, to require as a condition of continued welfare payments that state and local governments establish a program that: (a) provides a system for the inspection and certification of major code violations and the opportunity for welfare recipients to elect to withhold their rent where justified, (b) allows rent to be placed in escrow for the repair of such violations, and (c) requires enactment of appropriate legislation prohibiting summary eviction of such welfare tenants.

5. That all federal departments concerned with property acquisition prohibit payments for values represented by the amount of code violations.

6. That federal departments dealing with the audit and verification of real estate and mortgage loan assets require certification, for each property concerned, that no official complaints of code violations are presently pending.

December 1, 1966

SUMMARY REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT  
BY THE TASK FORCE ON THE CITIES

INTRODUCTION

The Task Force was convened on October 28 to give consideration to issues and proposals in four areas: (1) neighborhood centers, (2) homeownership by the poor, (3) Urban Development Corporation, and (4) landlord-tenant relations.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Neighborhood Centers: A federal inter-agency program should be initiated on a demonstration basis. But the goal should be to shape the total service system of a city, so that it effectively meets needs from the individual's viewpoint and not just to test out different kinds of "models" as though neighborhood centers are ends in themselves rather than the delivery arm of the city's service system.

Homeownership by the Poor: Is a good idea and well worth trying on a pilot program basis. But it is no panacea. It should be made part of a larger neighborhood improvement program. It should make ownership possible outside the slum as well as in it. Dwellings should be rehabilitated prior to assumption of ownership. Low interest loans and rent supplements or other subsidies from owners will be necessary.

Urban Development Corporation: As a means of stimulating technological and other cost-saving innovations, it is an attractive idea. But it must be done on a large enough scale if it is to have any impact. A number of risks are involved. Firm commitments on the availability of low-interest loans and rent supplements must be made.

Landlord-tenant relations: The federal government has present authority, and can issue additional administrative regulations, to help tenants by requiring vigorous code enforcement as a condition of federal assistance. In addition, consideration should be given to using welfare payments as leverage to correct serious code violations by landlords. HUD's aid program for code enforcement should be used in slum areas. A National Institute of Urban Housing Law should be established.

# # #



## SUMMARY STATEMENT ON NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

The Task Force is concerned over what appears to be a tendency to look at neighborhood centers through the wrong end of the telescope.

The question is not how many centers we need, nor whether they should be pure information centers, diagnosis centers, one-stop multi-purpose centers, or other combinations.

The question is how to take the bewildering maze of present social services (broadly defined) and develop a system for delivering those services in a manner that makes sense from the standpoint of the men, women, and children who need help the most.

Neighborhood centers can serve as the delivery arm for the city's system of social services.

They can serve effectively, however, only if the city's system is rationally organized to provide coordinated and mutually reinforcing services in a manner that genuinely meets the consumer's needs.

They cannot -- and should not -- become small replicas that simply mirror and seek to compete with the larger institutions that make up the present disorganized system. In the long run that would only add one more twist to an already tortuous maze.

Unless there is reorganization at the federal, state, and local level to develop a system that is tailored from the viewpoint of the individual's needs, the establishment of neighborhood centers in every ghetto of America will have little lasting value.

Recommendations: The Task Force therefore recommends:

1. That the proposed inter-agency demonstration in 14 cities negotiate only with cities willing to develop plans and mechanisms for the coordination and rational delivery of its service system.

2. That, to the extent possible, this inter-agency demonstration be carried out in cities participating in the Model Cities Program.

3. That the inter-agency steering committee be directed to study and make recommendations for revision of federal statutory and administrative regulations that would contribute to the development of a coordinated system

4. That, to provide greater funding flexibility, legislation should be sought to enable HUD to use present funds for services as well as physical facilities.

5. That any neighborhood centers established be equipped with the mandate and resources to serve as an effective catalyst, influence and advocate for making the total system more responsive to individual's needs.

6. That the program be carried out with maximum participation and involvement of the people to be served.

###



SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON PROMOTING HOME  
OWNERSHIP AMONG SLUM RESIDENTS

---

I. Factual Background

1. The federal government already provides a very significant subsidy for home ownership among middle-income and upper-income groups through income tax deductions for interest and property taxes.
  - a. In 1962, this subsidy amounted to a \$2.9 billion tax saving for middle- and upper-income groups.
  - b. The uppermost 20% of all families (with incomes over \$9,000) received a subsidy of \$1.7 billion in 1962 — or double the total 1962 housing subsidy given to the lowermost 20% in the form of public housing costs, welfare housing payments, and tax deductions combined.
2. In general, owner-occupied homes in slum areas are in better physical condition than renter-occupied homes. However, this may result from the fact that owners generally have higher incomes and more assets than renters, rather than from ownership per se.
  - a. The proportion of substandard units among families with incomes below \$4,000 in central cities in 1960 was 8% for owner-occupied units and 21% for renter-occupied units.
  - b. The proportion of unsound dwelling units among all families in central cities in 1960 was 11% for owner-occupied units and 33% for renter-occupied units.
  - c. There is a strong consensus among housing experts and social workers experienced in slums that providing families who want to own homes with a chance to do so would induce significantly greater responsibility on their part toward maintenance of both property and general neighborhood conditions.
3. Low-income residents get less quality per dollar of rent than higher-income residents, and non-white get less than whites.
  - a. In Houston, 80% of low-income families paying \$40 to \$60 per month rent lived in deteriorating or dilapidated units, as compared to only 21% of families with incomes of \$3,000 to \$6,000 paying the same rents. Similar findings (but less extreme) were made in all cities recently studied.
  - b. In Chicago, whites and non-whites both paid a median rent of \$88 per month in 1960, but the median unit for non-whites was smaller and more crowded, and 30.7% of all non-white occupied units were deteriorating or dilapidated, as compared with 11.6% of all white-occupied units.

4. Absentee ownership is higher in slum areas than in non-slum areas for comparable types of property. However, this could be a result of slum conditions (for example, many people wealthy enough to be owners may not want to live in slums) rather than a cause of them.
5. Residents of poverty areas and racial ghettos consider obtaining decent housing to be one of their most significant problems. Yet they often feel frustrated by their apparent inability to improve their housing conditions through their own action.
  - a. Most social workers and other observers of slums believe that many very low-income families have a strong desire to own their own homes.

## II. Objectives of Programs Encouraging Home Ownership

1. Providing more persons living in slums with an opportunity of shaping their own destiny regarding the nature and condition of their housing. This would help them (a) develop a stake in society, (b) derive significant benefits from governmental and other institutions they now regard with suspicion or hostility, (c) learn how to make good use of such institutions, and (d) increase the feelings of self-esteem, pride, and adequacy which are so battered by life in slum areas.
2. Improving the quality of housing occupied by slum dwellers, and the quality they receive per dollar of expenditure on housing.
3. Providing a greater incentive for slum dwellers to better maintain the property they live in, and to generally improve their own lives.
4. Improving landlord-tenant relations among slum dwellers by shifting from absentee to resident landlords.
5. Providing easier and more widely accessible means for some slum families to "escape" from slum areas by buying homes in non-slum and non-ghetto areas which are nearer to new sources of jobs and have better-quality environments and government services.

## III. Constraints Under Which Any Programs Should Operate

1. Programs encouraging home ownership among persons now living in slums should involve two major facets: improving housing conditions and household morale in slum areas, and helping households now living in those areas move to better neighborhoods. Neither of these facets should be neglected.
  - a. Those parts of any program concerned with slum areas themselves should be linked with rehabilitation of housing in such areas.
  - b. Those parts of any program concerned with helping people move out of slums need not be linked with rehabilitation.



2. Home-ownership-encouraging programs should be tried and developed only in three types of areas:
  - a. Slum areas where the entire environment is being upgraded through other programs, such as improved government services, better schools, intensive social work, etc. Ownership alone is not a panacea and cannot cope with all the depressive factors in slums. Hence slum ownership programs should be tied in with Model Cities Programs.
  - b. Older but well-established and stable neighborhoods generally in good physical condition and supplied with good-quality government services. In such areas, programs could be both linked with rehabilitation of the few run-down structures present, or carried out with housing already in good condition. The units involved would be occupied by either new owners moving in from slum areas, or present renters in the neighborhood assuming ownership.
  - c. Newer and outlying and suburban neighborhoods in excellent condition and supplied with good-quality government services. Here slum dwellers would assume ownership of housing already in good condition.
3. Programs encouraging home ownership by slum dwellers must not work to their disadvantage. These programs should neither cause such households to invest in property likely to depreciate rapidly in value, nor "lock them into the slums" and block their chance to move out into better neighborhoods. Therefore:
  - a. Such programs should not be undertaken in slum areas where conditions are so bad that most of the dwellings will eventually be demolished and replaced.
  - b. Such programs should not be undertaken in any slum areas unless "all-out" environment-improving programs are also currently underway.
  - c. Such programs should embody a "take-out" feature. It would consist of a guarantee by some public agency to buy the unit back from its new owners within a certain time period at no loss to them in case they decide (1) they would rather move out of the slum area altogether, (2) they cannot handle the continuing burdens of ownership, or (3) they do not want to own this property because of continuing decline in the quality of the neighborhood as a whole. However, owners would be allowed to keep at least a portion of any capital gains resulting from their selling their property to other persons likely to maintain the property adequately.
4. Ownership-encouraging programs linked to the rehabilitation of slum properties should require it to occur before those properties are transferred to their new owners. The costs of rehabilitation can then be built into the debt structure of

these properties. Such costs can then be subsidized through (a) elimination of any required down-payment, (b) use of below-market-interest-rate loan funds, (c) provision of rent subsidies to tenants in resident landlord buildings, and (d) provision of ownership subsidy payments to new owners who are not landlords.

5. In order to make even the lowest-income groups eligible for these programs, it would be desirable to change public aid regulations so that welfare payments for housing could be applied against debt service and other ownership costs as well as against rent.
6. Such programs should not result in the reaping of large profits by absentee owners who have refused to keep up their properties, but who are required by these programs to sell their properties to others.
7. Ownership-encouraging programs for slum dwellers must embody significant pre- and post-ownership counseling and financial help administered by organizations located in the slum areas themselves. These supplementary programs are essential to help the new owners with the legal, financial, maintenance, and rehabilitation problems they will encounter after assuming ownership.
8. Such programs should not require either the new owners or their tenants to raise significantly the proportions of their incomes they spend on housing, since that proportion is already high.
9. Because of the uncertainty concerning the possible success of ownership-encouraging programs, and the particular forms of them which will be most effective, they should be started on an experimental basis. This implies that:
  - a. Several different formats should be started simultaneously, and each should be tested under a variety of conditions.
  - b. Such programs should be started on a relatively small scale, and expanded to larger-scale operations only after some experience has been gained about which formats are most effective.
  - c. Each experiment should be designed so that its effectiveness can be accurately evaluated within a relatively short time. The objectives which should be weighted most heavily in such evaluation should be those concerning the program's impact upon the individual households and families involved, rather than its impact upon the physical condition of housing, or the fiscal status of the cities concerned.
  - d. The federal agency sponsoring such programs should develop a set of specific formats which it seeks to test, and should be sure that each of these formats is given an effective test in one or more cities.



- e. Individual experiments should be incorporated in the Model Cities Program in many cases, since this program has been created to stimulate and test innovations in coping with slum conditions.
9. Programs encouraging home ownership among slum dwellers should not be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness at saving money in relation to other housing programs (such as urban renewal or public housing). They will probably cost no less than such other programs, and perhaps more. But they can be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness at saving money in the long run by reducing the costs of other programs aimed at coping with the impacts of slum areas upon individuals. Examples are welfare programs, police action, and anti-delinquency programs.
10. Ownership-encouraging programs can be best undertaken when normal market forces are bringing about a rapid expansion in the total supply of housing through extensive construction of new multi-family and single-family homes. Otherwise the additional demand for housing generated might simply aggravate any existing shortages and drive up prices and rents, rather than increasing the supply available to low-income families. This means such programs will function best when interest rates are relatively low rather than in a "tight money" climate.

#### IV. Suggested Programs

1. A program to locate slum dwellers now renting in absentee-owned buildings who might become successful resident landlords, to find buildings appropriate for conversion from absentee- to resident-landlordship, and to assist the persons found to assume ownership of those buildings.
  - a. The program would involve full subsidies for down payments where required, and would finance on-going operating expenses and debt amortization out of rents.
  - b. Costs of any rehabilitation necessary to bring the buildings up to conformity with relevant codes would be capitalized into the debt structure.
  - c. Below-market-interest-rate loans would be used to finance purchase.
  - d. It would concentrate upon buildings now in poor condition, but still capable of satisfactory rehabilitation without enormous costs. These buildings could be acquired from their absentee owners through a "squeeze-out" process of code enforcement with minimum public investment.
  - e. This program would be applied only in "minimum-sized pieces." Each would involve a certain minimum number of buildings located close together in a single block or a few adjacent blocks. The number of units would be of sufficient "critical mass" to affect the entire environment of

the block or blocks involved. Moreover, each such "critical-mass-sized piece" would be processed simultaneously and as a whole by the government agency handling the program, rather than one building at a time.

- f. The families seeking to become resident landlords under this program would not have to remain in the specific buildings they now occupy, but should be allowed to assume ownership in the neighborhoods where they now reside.
  - g. In cases where recovering the cost of rehabilitation required rents in excess of the ability to pay of local low-income households, rent subsidies would be linked into the ownership-encouragement program. The combined effect would (1) provide rehabilitated units for low-income renters and (2) allow some low-income families to become resident landlords in these rehabilitated buildings.
  - h. The program should be run by new, locally-officed organizations operating under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Demonstrations and Research.
    - (1) Because the basic objective of this program would be a change in the social conditions and mental attitudes of slum dwellers, it would be desirable for primary responsibility to rest in some agency other than FHA. This would allow FHA to retain its basic "prudent investment" orientation without conflicting with the objectives of this program, which vary from "prudent investment." As long as this program is much smaller than FHA's other activities (and it must be at least to start), it would be difficult for FHA to generate the necessary enthusiasm and outlook to encourage the high-risk and frankly experimental operations essential to success.
    - (2) The Assistant Secretary should set general standards of performance and evaluation for the program. However, he should be free to create a variety of specific organizational arrangements with local groups to operate the program in different metropolitan areas. Examples are non-profit corporations, church groups, unions, or city departments.
    - (3) Each such organization should operate local neighborhood offices to assist new owners with (a) pre-ownership training in housekeeping, making minor repairs, and legal responsibilities, (b) counseling on maintenance and financing during the initial ownership period, and (c) follow-on counseling as necessary.
2. A similar program to help renters in slum areas take over ownership of individual units in multi-family buildings on a condominium basis (but not on a cooperative ownership basis).



- a. This program would have all of the attributes of the first program described above except the use of rent subsidies (part g).
  - b. If the incomes of the potential owners were not sufficient to pay the carrying costs of ownership, then an additional continuing subsidy could be used. This subsidy would be considered the equivalent of the interest and property-tax deduction subsidy enjoyed by middle-income and upper-income households. Since low-income households do not have enough income to benefit from such deductions, they would be given direct cash equivalents. The higher the income, the lower the equivalent; the larger the household, the higher the equivalent -- other things being equal.
3. Another program to help renters of single-family dwellings in slum areas (like Watts) take over ownership of their dwellings or of other similar single-family dwellings nearby. This program would also have all of the attributes of the first program described above except the use of rent subsidies. It would make use of income-tax-deduction-equivalents, as described under the second program set forth above.
  4. A fourth program designed to encourage slum dwellers to move into non-slum areas by buying single-family or two-family buildings, or individual units in condominium buildings, in such areas.
    - a. This program would involve full subsidies for downpayments where required.
    - b. It would be focussed upon buildings already in standard condition and therefore needing very little rehabilitation.
    - c. It would involve individual buildings scattered throughout neighborhoods containing socio-economic levels above the slum areas, but not as high as upper-middle-income areas. However, the condominium parts of the program would involve entire buildings operated under the program.
    - d. It would incorporate the aspects of the first program described above set forth in paragraphs IV, 1, f-g-h. It would also incorporate the continuing subsidy based upon income-tax-deduction equivalents described in paragraph IV, 2, b above.
    - e. The organization operating this program should have a metropolitan-area-wide jurisdiction rather than covering only the central city therein. In fact, it should emphasize placement of former slum dwellers in suburban areas where possible. Yet this organization should be the same as, or closely linked to, whatever organization administers the other programs described above.
    - f. The exact locations of the housing selected for use in this program should be based upon the following considerations:

- (1) The housing units selected should be in sound neighborhoods but should not be far beyond the economic capabilities of the households moving out of the slums. Hence these households might be expected to assume full ownership without a continuing subsidy after a certain period.
  - (2) There should be a mixture of Negro and white households involved. Some of the slum move-outs should result in relocation of Negro families in previously all-white or predominantly-white areas, and some should result in placement of Negroes in previously Negro areas and whites in previously white areas.
  - (3) In no cases should the households moved out of slums under this program be concentrated together in the receiving neighborhoods to such an extent as to become a dominant group in any given block or elementary school district.
  - (4) If possible, the neighborhoods chosen should be close to the type of jobs possessed by the families moving out of the slums, and to sources of new employment opportunities being created in the metropolitan area.
  - (5) If possible, the neighborhoods chosen should be parts of cities benefiting from other federal programs (such as urban renewal, the Interstate Highway Program, or federal aid to education) the continuance of which might be linked at least informally with willingness to cooperate with this program. Similarly, this program might be linked with defense procurement activities in communities benefiting from defense production contracts.
- g. This program would not involve the creation of resident landlords (except in two-unit buildings) by elimination of absentee landlordship.
- h. It might be desirable to link this program with the other programs encouraging ownership of buildings in slums by slum-dwellers. This could be done through some type of formula which would require provision of a certain number of "slum-escape" units for each set of "slum-renovation" units involved.
5. All of the above programs should be linked to a number of other federal programs or policies aimed at reducing the impact of ethnic discrimination upon housing markets. Discrimination creates a "back-pressure" in areas readily available to minority groups which tends to raise prices therein. This makes it harder for residents to own their own homes, and reduces the incentive of absentee landlords to improve deteriorated slum properties. Among the possible ways to counteract these forces might be:
- a. Requirement that any dwelling units financed with mortgages furnished by institutions supported by federal agencies (such as banks and savings and loan associations) be sold or rented on a non-discriminatory basis.



- b. Creation of public housing on vacant land, particularly in suburban areas, preferably on scattered sites in relatively small, low-rise projects. This assumes that the housing so created would be integrated, preferably with a Negro minority, rather than 100 percent Negro.
- c. Subsidization of private groups designed to help Negro households move into previously all-white neighborhoods in suburbs and peripheral neighborhoods in central cities. (An example is the group of this type in Hartford, Connecticut). Such subsidy could consist of granting of tax exemptions, or allowing the sale of tax-exempt securities, as well as provision of grants to cover capital or operating costs.

V. Estimated Costs of Ownership-Encouragement Programs Undertaken at Various Scales

1. Basic assumptions underlying these cost estimates are derived from FHA experience and census data. They are as follows:

- a. The total cost of acquiring and rehabilitating either single-family or multi-family housing will be \$12,500 per unit.
- b. Total per-unit monthly operating expenses are \$48.46 for single-family houses, and \$49.42 for multi-family buildings (including a \$9 allowance for vacancy and contingencies but no allowance for management fees).
- c. Household incomes have risen about 25% since 1959, when the income distribution among occupants of substandard housing units who earned less than \$6,000 per year was as follows:

Under \$2,000	51.9%
\$2,000 - \$2,999	17.2%
\$3,000 - \$3,999	13.5%
\$4,000 - \$4,999	9.3%
\$5,000 - \$5,999	6.4%
Total	100.0%

- d. The proposed programs will extend assistance to members of all these income groups proportionately. Hence calculations about the total subsidy required can be based upon the weighted average 1965 income of the entire group, which is \$2,840 per year.

- e. Households can devote 25% of their incomes to housing. This amounts to a weighted average of \$59.16 per month for the entire group involved.
- f. All costs of acquisition and rehabilitation will be incorporated into the total initial loan and amortized over a 30-year period on a no-down-payment basis.
- g. Multi-family programs will utilize 12-unit buildings and provide no explicit allowance for owner profits.

2. These assumptions lead to the following conclusions:

- a. The annual rate of direct subsidy per unit, not counting administrative costs or losses of interest from below-market rates, would be \$504 for a single-family program and \$516 for a multi-family program at a 3% interest rate. Hence direct subsidies per unit are very similar for the two programs.
- b. Direct subsidy costs are very sensitive to changes in interest rate. For a single-family program, the variation is from \$772 per unit per year at 6% to \$504 at 3% and \$288 at zero interest. However, if losses in interest are counted as costs, this sensitivity drops to zero.
- c. Direct subsidy costs are also very sensitive to changes in the income-composition of the groups served. Excluding families with incomes below \$2,000 raises the weighted average amount available per month for housing from \$59.16 to \$94.88. This reduces the annual single-family subsidy at 3% interest from \$504 per unit to \$75 -- a drop of 85%. However, it also excludes 52% of the households with incomes under \$6,000 living in substandard housing.
- d. Total costs at various scales of operation (excluding administration) are similar for both single-family and multi-family programs. Hence they can both be illustrated by the following table for single-family programs, assuming a 3% interest rate:

<u>Number of Housing Units</u>	<u>Annual Direct Subsidy Charges (\$ millions)</u>	<u>Required Initial Loan Fund Allocations (\$ millions)</u>
5,000	\$ 2.520	\$ 62.5
10,000	5.040	125.0
25,000	12.600	312.5
50,000	25.200	625.0
100,000	50.400	1,250.0



- e. The above table is based upon proportional participation by all income groups under \$6,000 per year. Variations in total costs at these scales resulting from changes in interest rates or income-group composition can be roughly estimated from points (b) and (c) above.
3. The significance of the scale of home-ownership programs depends upon the total number of slum families living in substandard housing who would like to become owners.
    - a. In 1960, there were 6.9 million renter households living in central cities. About 818,000 (12%) lived in substandard units; 508,000 of these had incomes under \$4,000. Another 992,000 (14%) lived in standard but crowded units; 390,000 of these had incomes under \$4,000. Hence the potential central-city "universe" consists of 1.8 million renters in substandard or crowded units, of whom 898,000 had incomes under \$4,000 in 1960. Of course, nowhere near all of these households wish to become owners.
    - b. There were actually more renter households in substandard units outside central cities than inside them in 1960: 1,923,000 vs. 818,000. However, except for 205,000 located in the urban fringes of metropolitan areas, these households should perhaps not be considered as "slum residents."
  4. The cost of home-ownership programs is similar to that of rent supplement programs, counting only direct subsidy payments. The direct rent supplement subsidy averages about \$600 per unit per year, as compared to \$504 per unit per year for single-family home ownership at 3% interest. However, if interest losses due to below-market rates are counted, then another \$268 per unit per year must be added (if the market rate is considered to be 6%). This increases the per unit per year cost of the home-ownership program to about 29% above that for the rent supplement program, excluding administrative costs from both.

## VI. Recommended Additional Research

1. Some of the concepts and quantified estimates set forth above have been based upon admittedly inadequate or unreliable data. Therefore, we recommend that additional research be undertaken before the programs described herein are given final approval in concept or designed in detail.
2. Consequently, reliable information about the following should be obtained:
  - a. Accurate estimates of total operating costs for multi-family housing to be developed under any ownership program. The operating cost estimates and contingency allowances used in the above calculations were supplied by FHA. However, we believe they may be low, because operating costs normally run 60% of total gross revenue, and not all funds available for debt service are actually applied to debt service.

- b. The required attributes of home owners in slums. Probably they revolve around steady employment, the availability of multiple family members some of whom are home and can keep track of the property, reasonably good character record, etc.
- c. The specific urban areas classified as slum areas for purposes of these programs, and certain data about them.
  - (1) Number of dwelling units by type of structure: small multi-family, large multi-family, and single family.
  - (2) Number of households living therein and their major income, ethnic, and family size characteristics.
  - (3) Condition of structures.
- d. The number of persons or households in these areas who have the required characteristics for ownership, absolutely and as a percentage of the total.
- e. Ways in which ownership programs can be tied into over-all strategies concerning low-income housing and the amelioration of ghettos so that they do not merely perpetuate slums by "locking in" the new owners of old buildings.



NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER PILOT PROGRAM

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of the pilot program

On Friday, August 19, the President in his Syracuse, New York, speech asked... "the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set as his goal the establishment -- in every ghetto in America -- of a neighborhood center to service the people who live there."

Accordingly initial steps toward fulfilling this goal were taken when, under Executive Order 11297, the Department of Housing and Urban Development convened a meeting on August 30, 1966, of Federal agencies to develop a report to the President and initiate a program of action to meet the President's request.

As a result of a series of inter-agency meetings a plan for a program of pilot projects, which would become the first step toward the President's goal, has been developed. This program will be designed and carried out along the following lines.

\* \* \* \* \*

II. Purposes of a Neighborhood Center

A neighborhood center should facilitate the deliverance of services to people in low-income neighborhoods and provide a broad range of health, recreation, social and employment services.

More social, health, employment, recreation, and education services are needed in the poverty areas; these services need to



be decentralized to such areas to be most effectively used; and these services should be provided to the greatest extent possible in the context of One-Stop or Neighborhood Center. Such a center would provide adequate delivery of these services in a coherent, coordinated manner, reach the uninformed, the isolated and alienated and provide a forum where the needs of the neighborhood can be expressed.

### III. Criteria for a Neighborhood Center

Many variations are possible in the design of neighborhood centers; and local conditions, resources, needs, choices, and programs will determine specific solutions. To be considered a neighborhood center for this pilot program, however, the facility must provide at a minimum a program for the following services:

1. Information on citizens' rights and on how and where to get services and assistance.
2. Diagnosis of problems and referral to service agencies.
3. Follow-up or outreach for continued counseling and services.
4. Co-ordination among agencies (Federal, State, local-public and private) supplying services to the neighborhood.
5. Involvement by the neighborhood residents.

Whenever feasible the program for these minimum services should be expanded to include other types of services and activities, depending on the needs of the particular service area. Among them are:

1. Social services.
2. A broad range of active and passive recreational facilities.



3. Employment information, referral, counseling and training facilities.
4. Housing assistance.
5. Activities directed to the needs of senior citizens.
6. Health services including examination and consultive services.
7. Cultural enrichment.
8. Non-curricular and remedial education.
9. Decentralization of many City Hall service functions to the neighborhood.

The physical size of the neighborhood center will depend on the scope of the service program it is to house. In addition to the concept of the neighborhood center as a single building, consideration may be given, where the neighborhood is small in area but dense in population, to the concept of a structure having many services supported by other offices or structures providing supporting services.

#### IV. A Neighborhood Center Example

Although a center will have many components, such a facility must be organized and administered in a coherent fashion. This would require that:

1. Reception, referral, diagnosis, follow-up, outreach, and related generalized services be performed through a common reception and administration system.
2. All or most of the community's social service agencies providing services of need to the neighborhood should be located in one building or within walking distance of each other.



- 3. If smaller information, and referral or service centers are located in the neighborhood, they should be related to the larger one-stop service center.

A center would be designed in a flexible manner so that the space can be utilized to the optimum and space areas would be designed to serve multi-functions. The space would include meeting areas, offices for counseling services, specialized service areas, and recreational facilities. A neighborhood center might contain:

- 1. A CAA program component which would focus on the organization and participation of the residents of the neighborhood. It would be responsible for insuring that the other components of the Center work to the benefit and satisfaction of the neighborhood. Local CAPs might also provide services such as legal aid.
- 2. Recreation services and facilities. This might include a small outdoor recreation area, with a swimming pool when warranted, and a multi-purpose gymnasium which could also be used for large gatherings, including theatrical productions.
- 3. A preventative program of health services which might include a prenatal clinic, a well-baby clinic, a mental hygienic clinic and an ambulatory health services clinic.
- 4. An educational and cultural component which would include a pre-school program of the Headstart variety, adult literacy, special adult classes as well as special library, music, art and drama programs.



5. Employment services would be an integral part of the Center. Information would be provided on the job opportunities; testing services and limited job training services should be available. In addition, special job oriented programs such as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Work and Training Program for public assistance clients might also be coordinated through this part of the Center.
6. Assistance with respect to housing and relocation should be provided in the Center. Information should be available on relevant local housing programs, and assistance should be offered to clients on how to improve their homes, how to secure adequate financing, and the availability of public housing and integrated housing.
7. Family services and home management is another important component. Public welfare case workers might operate from the Center and provide advice and counseling to the neighborhood. Family and marital counseling might be offered as well as consumer education, money management, and homemaker services.



## PLANNING FOR NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAMS

### Introduction

A neighborhood program will ordinarily be one part of a larger city-wide community action program. Thus questions must be asked about the city at large and the whole community action planning, along with an inquiry into the neighborhood program itself.

Funds are likely to be limited so that in most cases a choice of some neighborhoods must be made, either to start the city's program or to be used as a "demonstration."

At the outset, reasons for preferring certain neighborhoods over others should be explored. In some cities past social disturbances or chronic trouble may dictate the choice of a neighborhood for concerted social effort. There is a caveat: A city may prefer to choose neighborhoods with problems that can be dealt with rather quickly because success will be more certain and visible. Unfavorable comparisons should not be made once programs are initiated between the more easily solved neighborhood problems and the knottier ones. The preference of one kind of neighborhood over another may result from wise and responsible political decision, but the basis for decisions should be understood both by the community and by the federal agencies.

In the attached outline we have asked a series of questions designed to offer some guides for those evaluating neighborhood programs. Because these programs are so frankly experimental, no such outline can provide more than a general approach. More reliable criteria will emerge from concrete experience with actual programs, their inevitable failures and successes.



A detailed knowledge of the city, the sponsors, and the over-all political context will be necessary for judgment in each case. Still, it may be a useful exercise to try to articulate in advance some of the factors that should enter into evaluation, even though judgments are likely to be intuitive.

The discussion that follows is divided into two parts: (1) criteria for defining the appropriate neighborhood; and (2) criteria for judging the substance of programs for a neighborhood.

It is not inappropriate to point out that some decisions to accept or reject a proposal for neighborhood programs must be made on a primarily political basis. The Federal program needs Congressional support and it needs the support of all the traditional agencies in the Executive branch with which it must cooperate. Further, the over-all political situation of any city is an essential ingredient in the success or failure of a community action program and of the neighborhood program which is its natural offspring. This point is probably understood, if not articulated, by applicants and evaluators alike.

The forms to be filled out for the Dept. of Housing & Urban Development may set up standards and expectations, but they are not like aptitude tests. A high score does not imply automatic admission to "school." As long as funds are insufficient to permit every sound program to be accepted, it should be understood that choices involve a variety of factors, not the least of which is political.

There is another risk. The existence of complicated forms, the promulgation of standards and the common knowledge that choices have to be



made, may lead cities to imitate slavishly the type of programs that have been accepted before. This could lead to rigidity -- a calcification which is the enemy of innovation and imaginative use of these special local characteristics of a city and neighborhood.

### Neighborhood

The limited experience thus far with community action programs and the longer history of settlement houses have led those working with problems of organization to insist upon a small local area as the lowest common denominator for any new social programs. The word "neighborhood" is used to mean a relatively compact geographical area and also an area which has some sort of functional cohesiveness. Before the concept of neighborhood program becomes a cliché easily glossed over, it may be important to ask some questions about what may or may not be defined as "neighborhood" and for what purposes.

### Reaching out:

It is fairly well accepted now that any program of social action must be broken down into local units so that it can reach out to those people who are unwilling or unable to go very far for service, either because of fear, inexperience or lack of basic skills to make use of available services, on their own. Thus the very first criterion of any neighborhood program is that it be sufficiently local to achieve this end.

### Elasticity:

The kind of services offered, and the characteristics of the people



served will affect the definition of "neighborhood." For example, a mother with a small child has a far greater physical-geographical limitation than does an adolescent who is used to wandering the city with a gang. Could you serve them both in a neighbor center? The unit for physical health care might be quite different from the unit for mental health care, in part because of the degree of education needed before the patient wants the services offered. A context of multiple services, or even services to a wide age range, indicates both elasticity of the concept of neighborhood and the arbitrariness of any definition. The very fact that one center may offer a multiplicity of services will also affect the delineation of "neighborhood." Even a single person may define his neighborhood very differently for different purposes -- church, school, or socializing, for example. The situation becomes infinitely more complicated when the "target population" encompasses many groups.

A neighborhood may exist because of preexisting services or grouping of services, for example, an effectively functioning settlement house with a long tradition, as in the North End, Boston, or a clinic. The Peckham Health Center in England created a very cohesive neighborhood for many purposes. A preexisting sense of community often grows up because of ethnic similarities or racial isolation.

The sense of community, however, may be a deceptive factor on which to rely. An effective preexisting service may provide a community on which broader services can be built and should be built. On the other hand, the invisible walls which create a ghetto like Harlem, create a "community" but one frayed with strife and hostility which may have to be broken down



into very small units to penetrate resistance that the larger community reinforces. In other words, a neighborhood has to be a manageable unit. If there had been trouble, hostility, delinquency or a high crime rate, the negative aspect of a community may argue for the arbitrary creation of very small neighborhood units for certain kinds of services, in order that the population can really be reached and involved.

#### Use of Personnel Affects Delineation of a Neighborhood

The availability and training of the personnel to staff a neighborhood program will affect the parameters of a neighborhood unit. More is meant here than the ratio of professionals to "client." It goes without saying that one doctor in a clinic will serve a far smaller population than ten. But personnel can be important in a qualitative sense, as well. The supporting worker can serve as connective tissue among professional services. This is the worker who knows the language of the neighborhood and who is able to direct the people in it to needed services, provide follow-up, and help the person coordinate the various services that may be assembled to meet his particular needs, whether welfare, medical, educational, or employment, or a combination of any or all of these, in any problem or crisis. Such personnel make up a psychological transportation and communication system. An example may make this more concrete: A store-front room may serve a block. In it may be neighborhood workers or urban agents who can take information from those on the block and steer them to adult education, employment training, work crews, mental health clinic, the hospital, a local lawyer, the housing authority, etc. All of these services need not be represented in the store-front room, but



they must be made accessible by effective workers who can communicate with the people the program is designed to serve. The urban agent becomes a pathfinder for the individual in need, to all the agencies and services required. Thus the concept of "neighborhood" is in part defined by the kind of staff available, because those who help people find their way through a labyrinth of services make the programs really accessible.

Actual transportation is of great importance, since the inability to find one's way is so characteristic of the poor. Their neighborhood, for many purposes, is walking radius. Here again workers can help make existing transportation usable and thereby make far-flung programs accessible to a neighborhood.

We have stated earlier that one variant of the definition of neighborhood is the kind of service that is offered. We are assuming that one goal is comprehensiveness - the offering of a group of interrelated human services that will raise the aspirations and the opportunities of the people to be served. It is understood, then, that different services will serve different geographical areas. As pointed out, the lowest common denominator may have to be the workers who can link physically separated services.

But this is only one alternative. There are others. For example, the creation of a new institution designed to have such great impact that it defines the neighborhood. Consider the Community School as it exists in New Haven, Connecticut, and Flint, Michigan. They draw upon the neighborhood of the families whose children attend the school. In New Haven, Conte School is made as attractive with a center for senior citizens,



an auditorium, bocci courts, a park for young mothers, and so on - that a sense of community is created by the very fact of the institution. Other neighborhood services, legal, public health, welfare, etc., are then brought in to this "neighborhood." Other kinds of institutions may define the neighborhood by their creation. Probably this is what the multi-service center in Boston (Roxbury) is attempting to do. In such cases the neighborhood is geographically larger than that served by the block store-front with the "pathfinder" personnel. With a large center, staff may literally walk the streets to bring the people to the services concentrated in one building. There is no a priori reason to prefer one structure of a neighborhood program over the other.

So many neighborhoods are natural neighborhoods, defined by geography, tradition, or other boundaries that they can be seen quite readily. In the end, high deference should be given to the local definition of a neighborhood. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity can and should insist that the city consider the many variables, including history and tradition, which go into the delineation of a neighborhood unit. It should ask for careful consideration of demographic data, for detail about the ethnic background of the people in the neighborhood, the economic and educational level, employment opportunities, housing, recreation and social outlets. A well-thought out proposal is likely to be rich in this kind of detail.



### THE PROGRAM

The substance of the program is no less important than the delineation of the neighborhood, and must be adapted to this delineation.

The first overall requirement for any program is the involvement of the people to be served in the planning and then the operation of the programs designed to serve them.

It is not easy to involve the inarticulate poor, for whom organization is not a familiar phenomenon, but it is possible and it is essential. One clear goal must be to reduce dependency in all areas, not to increase it. This means that any "tender plant" of a neighborhood organization must be built upon -- any indigenous leadership that is at all constructive must be involved in the planning process.

A list of needs outlined in the program planning stage, health, education, jobs, etc. should indicate how these needs are felt by the population. It is difficult to establish criteria from Washington to assure this, but there must be some warning signal of local indifference to neighborhood participation in a program. Furthermore, it is so important that if there is any doubt, a field trip might be worthwhile. We can anticipate antipathy and resistance to the organization and voice of the poor. But these are risks that must be accepted as natural and inevitable and perhaps even welcomed as evidence of involvement.

#### Survey of Existing Services

A proposal should include a survey of existing social services and education, including, if possible, cost statistics and the ratio of professional and supportive personnel to the neighborhood population. It



would be useful to learn how accessible existing services are which reach the segments of the neighborhood population. Is the new plan going to build on preexisting services, and if not, why not" Often there are good reasons, but as often, a natural center for people, for example, a priest whose church has become a focus for informal social services, may be ignored and a new artificial center created.

#### Relations with Existing Agencies

In some cases there may be value in by-passing existing social service agencies. In other cases this may be politically unwise or unwise because of the strength of an agency. In the case of a strong well-supported agency, it is entirely possible that a neighborhood program should develop from one discipline or area of service. For example, if the Board of Education were strong and innovative, the idea of a community school might be the basis for the neighborhood program and education would then be the nucleus. If there were already a community mental health center with local support, mental health could be the nucleus of the community action program. Thus, in the Bronx, New York, a community action program is emerging from a mental health center out of the Albert Einstein Medical School (Dr. Harris Peck). In other cities, the Youth Employment, or Opportunity Center has already become a familiar and accepted part of neighborhood and so a comprehensive program emerges with the employment or job training at its core. The judgment probably should be made "on the ground."

Although comprehensiveness of services may be the goal, it is entirely possible that as a beginning strategy for political, financial, or even



social reasons, a simpler or even segmentalized program should be created. In other words, a city might want to start with health and education only, and slowly add employment and perhaps much later deal with teenage recreation. Or, there may be an assault on the problem of teenage delinquency which required an across-the-board approach directed to that age group only, leaving families and senior citizens for later. It is possible to choose to work only with the families of very young children or those children themselves, on the theory that the very young are the most salvageable part of the population.

The reasons behind any of these or other choices may have validity, in terms of short and medium range strategy, but they must not become the excuse for abandoning the objective of a comprehensive program.

The planned use of staff, including provision for training should be examined carefully. To what extent does a neighborhood program plan to search out indigenous workers, to what extent rely on outsiders? How have connecting links to outside services been planned? Are they sufficient to make all of the services truly accessible to the population of the neighborhood?

Some provision should be made for working out a relationship of cooperation and connection among the traditional agencies and institutions which will either work with, control in part, or impede a neighborhood program. Friction may be inevitable, but its destructive aspect should be minimized at the planning stage. A very current example of this is the creation of neighborhood legal services in New Haven and in Washington, D.C. In New Haven, at present, there is serious opposition from the



organized bar which has slowed down the program seriously. In Washington, the Bar Association and Legal Aid were involved at each step of planning and have thus far given strong support. Including the traditional service agencies in the planning process as much as possible and drawing upon their skill and experience may substitute cooperation for friction.

The interrelationship of citywide or even state agencies is a question more directly related to the evaluation of an entire community action program than for judging the specifics of the neighborhood proposal.

Also a larger matter is the area of the whole question of information gathering and disseminating devices, communication, data and collection, both formal and informal. There are more ways of assuring effective communication than can be listed here. Citywide newspaper coverage, radio, TV, are the ones first considered. The functional illiteracy of many of the people who most need to be reached means that person-to-person communication, and contact through the places most frequented, whether bar or church, is the basis for an effective communications network that ought to be in every neighborhood picture.

#### After a Program has been Accepted

The style of initiation of a program is something that should be regarded with great interest. In some situations a quiet launching might be preferable to one with fanfare. Crisis exploitation, crisis creation, and timing must all be considered.

We would want to know early what obstacles are anticipated and which obstacles are in fact faced. Illiteracy, lack of social cohesiveness, and apathy may be prevalent almost every place that a program is contemplated.



What are the plans to deal with them? How are some of these obstacles considered in the attempt to involve the neighborhood in planning its own program?

It is hard to anticipate whether a program will become rigid or calcified. We have already indicated the possibility that application forms, or rumors of hard choices among cities, may cause a proposing community to take a "safe route." If it is made clear from the outset that all of these programs are frankly experimental and that innovation is desired and that constant feedback and evaluation, as well as program initiative at lower levels, are desirable, rigidity may be avoided in many places.

There should be mechanisms for anticipating crisis or resistance that may come from the mobilization of a neighborhood. Program effectiveness often means the assertion or creation of a political force which will be fought. There are ways to lay the ground for significant changes, although resistance or even outcry may be inevitable. The situation of the rent strikes in Mobilization for Youth and the political repercussions, raise the question of what kind of preparation might be most effective.

### Evaluation

Plans for evaluating a neighborhood proposal must be built into the proposal from the beginning. This is a subject for another document. The whole area of community action is too new for us to be aware in advance of the many causes of lags in progress or even failure. Feedback must be rapid and constant.

We would want to know who is evaluating the neighborhood program and against what criteria. Is it part of a larger evaluation scheme of a



citywide community action program? Are there any plans to test theories and conclusions against other neighborhood programs in the same and other cities?

Long-range goals should be broken down into sequential steps. Each must have a planning period beyond the first allocation of funds. But detailed plans should be worked out at shorter intervals than overall plans and broken down in such a way that parts of a program can be looked at separately from other parts of the overall structure. We would want to know how often, what kind, and to whom reports are made; how much personal contact is there by the evaluators; how are they treated at program headquarters, - ignored, exploited or self-supported? Are periodic reviews carried out?

Are the goals sufficiently formulated in the beginning so that we could ask later on whether the plans were fulfilled? Whether they were amended? How recent and how severe and how frequent were the amendments? We would want to know whether the evaluation is set up in such a way that side effects could be anticipated or observed, if they occurred.

We would be loath to set up any mechanical criteria for judging the effectiveness of a comprehensive neighborhood program. There are some, of course, each with some limited value. For example, the concept of increasing life-long earning power, or, a reduction in unemployment, the increase of staying power (retention) of young people in high school drop-outs, in illegitimate births, lowering crime rate, family break-up, hospital admission, and so on. Probably all of these statistical measures must be employed, but each should be looked at quantitatively to see



whether, in fact, it tests the social condition we think it does. For example, an increase in employment is a good thing, but if the Negroes continue to hold only menial, lower paid jobs, the employment program is no success.

If our goal is the fullest development of the resources and capacities of each human being, then we will not be satisfied with any simple statistical measures. These will be only our mechanical starting points. The aspirations of any neighborhood program should escalate with success.



## OUTLINE

### Neighborhood Programs: Some Questions

#### A. Social Framework

##### 1. Emergence of planning

- a. In general, what conditions led to the emergence of this specific neighborhood plan?
- b. Who wrote the proposal?
- c. What is his (their) relation to the neighborhood?
- d. Were neighborhood people involved in the planning?
- e. If so, how were they involved?
- f. To what extent have planning concepts or methods been borrowed from other proposals?
- g. What attempts have been made to adapt transplanted concepts to the neighborhood?
- h. What is the role of the outside advisor in the neighborhood planning?
- i. What opposition has there been?

##### 2. Social and political environment

- a. How is the neighborhood defined?
- b. What criteria were used to determine the limits of the neighborhood?
  - physical geography?
  - population to be served?
  - service proposed?
  - combination of above?
- c. Has an inventory been made?

Geographic

Historic



Demographic (length of residence; population turnover; commuting patterns for work, play, health; education; etc.)

Ethnic

Health

Mental health

Economic (individual family income; places of employment: Do dollars circulate in neighborhood or flow out, etc.)

Housing

Social (numbers and types of organizations, churches, neighborhood groups, etc.)

Education (education of people, number and types of schools, etc.)

Power structure (formal and informal)

Values and morale (e.g. suspicion; what ability does the neighborhood have to cope with its problems?)

Mobile ability

- d. To what extent is the neighborhood dependent upon outside resources for jobs, medical care, welfare, education, recreation, inspiration?

3. What social services are now available to the neighborhood?

- a. What is the per capita dollar amount for social services?
- b. What is the ratio of social service personnel to the neighborhood population?

B. Goal formation

1. Hierarchy of goals

- a. What are the overriding goals and how are lesser goals subordinated to them?
- b. What criteria were used to establish priorities of goals?
- c. What do the neighborhood people think their needs are?



d. What are the needs for:

Health

Education

Work, jobs, income

"Skills-of-living"

Social cohesiveness

Advocacy: legal and consumer

2. Have the neighborhood people been involved in establishing the goals?
3. Are the programs intended to make the people less dependent and more able to cope, or are they merely hand-outs which will keep the people dependent?
4. Are long-range goals and purposes for the neighborhood specified?
5. How does this specific proposal fit into the long-rang objectives?
6. Does it meet Federal criteria of desegregation?

C. Decision-making

1. Institutional network

- a. Do neighborhood organizations already exist?
- b. Is there an identifiable central neighborhood authority responsible for this program?
- c. What is the relationship between this authority and the existing service agencies -- Federal, state, local, public and private?
- d. Should this program be part of an already existing agency?

2. Process of decision-making

- a. What are the attitudes of the traditional agencies to this program?
- b. Are there any institutional mechanisms for consulting other agencies and pressure groups (trade unions, churches, business organizations, political parties)? What are the mechanisms?



ACU  
7837

6. Does it meet Federal criteria of desegregation?

C. Decision-making

1. Institutional network

- a. Do neighborhood organizations already exist?
- b. Is there an identifiable central neighborhood authority responsible for this program?
  - a
- c. What is the relationship between this authority and the existing service agencies-- Federal, state, local, public and private?
- d. Should this program be part of an already existing agency?

2. Process of decision-making

- a. What are the attitudes of the traditional agencies to this program?
- b. Are there any institutional mechanisms for consulting other agencies and pressure groups (trade unions, churches, business organizations, political parties)? What are the mechanisms?
- c. What are the mechanisms used to recognize and handle frictions among the agencies, groups and this program?
- d. What are the differences in goals and methods between this program and other agencies and groups?
- e. Are the people involved to whom the program is addressed?
- f. Is the factual material on which the plan is based accessible to the public?
- g. To what extent is planning and decision-making public?



3-7-66

CONFERENCE ON HOUSING FOR THE POOR

HUD and OEO would invite twenty of the most knowledgeable people in the field of housing the poor, to a two-day conference. The meeting is for consultation and the public will not be invited, although other Federal agencies will send observers.

The purpose of this conference is to evaluate the feasibility of providing an estimated 3.3 million additional standard housing units within the next five years, at prices the poor can afford. We are seeking from this conference (1) a summation of what we do and do not know about how the poor are housed, in physical, economic and social terms; and (2) identification of alternative programs or combination of programs and implementation strategies, that might make decent housing available for the 3.3 million poor households that would otherwise occupy substandard or overcrowded units by 1970.

More specifically there will be an identification of the obstacles involved with mounting a total housing program for the poor, and advice on how to overcome these problems. Immediate and long-range research and their priority will be outlined.

The conference will be centered around five issues:

1. Present housing conditions of the poor. The extent to which rehabilitation and/or clearance are needed; the costs involved; capability of occupants to pay; present locations of substandard units; composition of occupants by race, age, size, family composition.
2. Technical Issues. The type of housing required, its location and the availability of land; architectural and city planning concerns; the technological problems and opportunities of a large-scale building and rebuilding



program; the abilities of existing or proposed institutions (finance, construction, building, development, government) to implement the programs.

3. Economic Issues. The effect on the economy of a multi-billion dollar program: (1) to achieve the contemplated volume in five years, and (2) when the program begins to phase out; the effect on the total housing industry and construction costs; the effect on the values and condition of existing housing and neighborhoods; efficiencies that might result from a reevaluation of the economics of the housing industry; alternative means of financing the programs.

4. The Social Issues. The questions of ghettoizing or decentralizing the poor and particularly the non-white poor; the supplemental educational, counseling and back-up services required; the problems of installing a means test and establishing priority criteria; the attitudes of poor and non-poor to this housing.

5. Program Issues. The types of programs required to meet the objective; expansion or redirection of existing programs and the invention of new kinds of programs; the number of units to be developed from each program; the phasing and the mix of programs over the five-year period.

To make this a worthwhile conference, so that all participants are talking from knowledge of the situation to be dealt with, background papers should be prepared and distributed in advance on the first four issues.

One two-hour session will be devoted to each of the first four areas of concern, and a half-day will be left for the Program Issues discussion. One participant in each field would outline and chair each session. The moderator of each panel will be expected to subsequently prepare a summary.