

THE WAR OVER POVERTY*

CARL H. MADDEN†

The war *on* poverty is becoming a war *over* poverty. A struggle is being waged over the approach to alleviating poverty. The war over poverty could create a new social structure in our changing cities. Even more important, it could decide the fate of the developing revolution in our concepts of social welfare.

That revolution, not fully understood, would replace the relief dole as a major approach to treating poverty. It would substitute the positive policy goal of more human development, within a framework of rapid and stable economic growth, for the static or redistributive welfare concepts.

I

No one knows how many Americans are poor. It is most probably not two-fifths or even one-fifth of our population, as early writers in the current "war," such as Keyserling and Harrington, argued. Their numerical definition (Keyserling: family income under \$4,000 per year; Harrington: family income under \$3,000) of poverty was wrong. Their numbers were therefore wrong. And so, also, was the picture they created of America and American life. This is made clear by an authoritative interpretation of the 1960 census by the former director of the U.S. Census Bureau.¹

Poverty, a harsh word, is defined as "the condition of being poor: *lack of what is needed.*" This dictionary meaning is more accurate than any numerical definition. In terms of needs such as food, shelter, clothing, medical treatment, education, entertainment, and personal transportation, there is not as much poverty in the United States as has come to be believed.

This is made clear by Scammon's analysis of 1960 census data. Today few Americans suffer from lack of food because of deprivation. By 1960, only 6.8 per cent of American dwelling units were dilapidated. Even Michael Harrington

*The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity or the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

†A.B. 1942, M.A. 1952, Ph.D. 1954, University of Virginia. Director of Research, Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

I should like to acknowledge the valuable assistance of Mr. Richard L. Breault, Associate Director of Research, Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, in preparing this paper.

¹For Keyserling and Harrington's definitions, see LEON H. KEYSERLING, *POVERTY AND DEPRIVATION IN THE UNITED STATES—THE PLIGHT OF TWO-FIFTHS OF A NATION* (1962); MICHAEL HARRINGTON, *THE OTHER AMERICA* (1962). For the refutation of their views, see BEN J. WATTENBERG & RICHARD M. SCAMMON, *THIS U.S.A. 130-51* (1965). Keyserling's "under-\$4,000 per year" for families and Harrington's "under-\$3,000 per year" for families were both admittedly arbitrary; the point, however, is that, as Scammon, a former Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, writes, *no* numerical definition of poverty is correct.

acknowledged that the problem of lack of clothing is largely gone, in arguing that U.S. poverty is largely "invisible." Further, the 1960 census reports that almost three-quarters of families with incomes under \$4,000 per year have washing machines to wash their clothes.

Medical treatment is potentially available to Americans of all income classes; and the poor for the most part share in public health and sanitation programs, in effect throughout the country. From 1961 to 1963, ninety-nine per cent of thirteen-year-olds were in school, as were ninety-seven per cent of fifteen-year-olds and ninety-one per cent of sixteen-year-olds. A census study of October 1960 showed that nineteen per cent of youth from families with less than \$5,000 annual income got into college; this is about one in five, compared with a national rate for all incomes of thirty-one per cent or about one and one-half in five. As of May 1964, ninety-three per cent of American homes had television sets. By 1960, almost sixty per cent of families with less than \$4,000 annual income had automobiles available. All these facts and others reported by the 1960 census, now five years old, are analyzed by Scammon.²

This does not mean that the problem of poverty in the United States should be underestimated or that its alleviation should not be a major policy goal. It does mean that the problem has in fact been exaggerated and distorted in many people's minds. The fact that the nation can undertake the major effort of minimizing poverty with such a high probability of success is itself a blessing unique in the history of great nations. Even so, as Scammon puts it:

That poverty is not a major malignant disease, that the nation is not overrun by a huge, seething, hopeless invisible quintile of poor people—this, too, apparently needs public articulation. One of the reasons the "poor" are so "invisible," as Harrington states, is that there may be far fewer than have been written about.³

Harrington, associate editor of the socialist journal *Dissent*, was limited by lack of data in his interpretation. Poverty in the United States, as of now, is not measured accurately, and it could be measured much more accurately at low cost. This would require taking into account such variables as family composition, family size, age of family head, farm-nonfarm living, urban-suburban-rural living, size of city, and regional differences in living standards.⁴ Approaches by Orshansky and Friedman,⁵ admittedly still not adequate, are marked improvements over the faulty data that launched the war on poverty. Some government statisticians would suppress regional or other differences among families because they favor "national

² WATTENBERG & SCAMMON, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 135-37.

³ *Id.* at 138.

⁴ TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, *THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY 16-19 (1965)* [hereinafter cited as *THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY*] recommends a more careful definition of poverty.

⁵ Orshansky, *Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile*, Social Security Bull., Jan. 1965, p. 3; ROSE D. FRIEDMAN, *POVERTY: DEFINITION AND PERSPECTIVE (1965)*.

norms," similar to social security and the minimum wage. If this position does not implicitly violate the basic methodology of science, it at least begs the question of measurement.

U.S. poverty is not a mass phenomenon, but a problem of specific individuals, families, and groups with "poverty-linked" characteristics. Far from being a single problem, poverty is linked with other difficult domestic issues, such as race, discrimination by sex, unemployment, education, sickness-disability-old age, agriculture, depressed areas, and regional differences.⁶

The United States was making much progress against poverty before the war on poverty began. It is still doing so, and the major source of that progress has been and is economic growth at high levels of employment. Smolensky has shown that, using a variable definition reflecting the changing national consensus, poverty declined by more than thirty-five per cent towards complete elimination in this century. Smolensky found further that high growth and employment rates led to a more rapid rise in the definitional level of poverty, but also that poverty declines faster as the definitional level rises faster.⁷

It is elementary that when everyone's income rises, the gain of the poor is most significant in human terms. Says Scammon:

Much of our recent income revolution has involved precisely such [poor] families moving from the lower classes into the middle classes. . . . Thus, in 1947, 64 per cent of U.S. families lived on less than \$5,000 per year. In 1963, that figure was reduced to 37 per cent (constant 1963 dollars).⁸

Because the well-off have gotten better off, the fact that the poor have gotten better off is obscured.

The shift since 1947 in people occupying the lowest end of the income distribution casts grave doubt on the Harrington thesis of a "culture of poverty." People in this quintile, according to Scammon, are more likely now to be old people, two-person families, and young individuals. Some of these people, such as young students, both single and married, are themselves moving through the lowest quintile, not without hope for the future. Further, these are people getting better off, not worse off, but only at a slower rate than others. Finally, they are people whose needs, by and large, are less than families with children, whose place they have taken in the lowest quintile.

Before the war on poverty, large sums were being spent to help the poor. Some sources have estimated that in 1964 Americans earmarked \$31 billion for federal antipoverty programs alone.⁹ When one adds funds spent by states, counties, cities,

⁶ THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY 5-7. See also WATTENBERG & SCAMMON, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 138-39.

⁷ Smolensky, *The Past and Present Poor*, in THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY 33, 35-36.

⁸ WATTENBERG & SCAMMON, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 142.

⁹ THE WAR ON POVERTY: A HANDBOOK 28 (National Catholic Coordinating Committee on Economic Opportunity, 1964).

and philanthropies, it may well be that Americans, before the war on poverty, were spending more to help the poor than on any other single national purpose except national defense. In December 1965 the Office of Economic Opportunity released a 414-page inventory of federal programs totalling \$21 billion to help poor individuals and groups.

II

How can the poor be helped? First, it should be clear that the basic source of potential progress against poverty is an increase in per capita real output and income. This, in turn, means that output must grow faster than population; otherwise, no matter what measures are taken to help the poor, the real incomes of the society in general will not rise. Rising productivity in a society, therefore, is basic to its ability to reduce poverty.

Given rising productivity, national policy has available three basic ways to relieve poverty: income redistribution, area development, and human development.

To redistribute income is to transfer wealth or income from the nonpoor to the poor, however defined, for the purpose of providing living standards considered adequate by social norms. Income redistribution does not of itself increase the nation's total income; it reallocates what is available. An example is the Old-Age Assistance Program of the Social Security Act.¹⁰

Area development, as used against poverty, is an attempt to raise the income of poor people in a geographical area through raising total income in that area by investment in natural resources or physical capital goods without regard for market criteria. Area development rests on two assumptions which can be questioned. The first is that non-market investment in specific geographical areas will in fact be more productive in those areas than it would have been in market uses in other areas. The second assumption is that such investment in specific geographical areas will raise the incomes of poor people in those areas. An example of area development is the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.¹¹

Human development, as an antipoverty approach, tries to raise total income through investment in people, especially the poor, in order to increase their individual productivity. It rests on the assumption that investment in human beings will raise their income without reducing society's total income. An example is the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.¹²

A. Prevalence of Income Redistribution

By far oldest and most prevalent, income redistribution as the relief dole stems from our Anglo-Saxon heritage and goes back to the Elizabethan Poor Law. Its

¹⁰ Section 202, 49 Stat. 623 (1935), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 402 (1964).

¹¹ 79 Stat. 5, 40 U.S.C.A. App. A (Supp. 1965).

¹² 68 Stat. 652 (1954), as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 31-42 (1964).

motive was combined compassion and fear of disturbance,¹³ not economic reasoning. Poverty was viewed as derived either from acts of God, personal weakness, or personal wickedness. If the poor are themselves to blame for their lot in life, or if God's will is at work, it is wasteful for society to invest in human development programs; it suffices to provide such people bare subsistence as a matter of conscience and to prevent disorder.

Dominance of the relief dole approach in this country well into the twentieth century rested on several factors. Among them were the English poor law concept, the Puritan ethic, the rags-to-riches epic of European immigrants, the strong optimism of people of enterprise in a secure and developing subcontinent, the prevalence of jobs calling for strong backs, and a social milieu of swift upward mobility for most.

B. Impact of the Great Depression

Millions of proud and self-respecting Americans, thrown into poverty through conditions beyond their control in the Great Depression, began to see poverty differently. Clearly the culprit was management of the economy, not personal weakness. The new national attitude, that poverty was remediable, took shape in New Deal measures such as public works employment, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and others to treat remediable poverty, and Social Security to make irremediable poverty less onerous. Today, the personal weakness concept of poverty has all but received the coup de grace. The Second World War showed that only a tiny handful of able-bodied people refuse to work when jobs they can fill are available. It also showed paradoxical progress against poverty despite the enormous waste of war, as real living standards rose with total output.

Yet New Deal measures were experimental, often mutually inconsistent, and stemmed more from strong conviction of a need to act than from purposeful and integrated movement of thought. A deeper conviction, not yet firmly articulated, is based not only on progress since the Great Depression but also on growing knowledge of the economy. This conviction holds that the motive force behind economic growth is application of science and technology to a market-based economy. It holds that scientific methods of analysis and standards of data-gathering and use can be extended to social organization. It holds that policy-making based upon reasoned and informed consensus within such a framework can resolve problems of poverty by combining rapid and stable economic growth in the market economy with intensive development of productive potentials of human beings, viewed not only as human economic resources but also as ends in themselves.

C. The Scientific Revolution and Progress Against Poverty

When Malthus wrote about population, he assumed that it would increase faster than the food supply. The pessimistic conclusion from his theory for social policy,

¹³ See D. A. MACINTYRE, *PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE* ch. 2 (N.Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University Bull. 53-1, 1964).

leading Carlyle to describe economics as "the dismal science," was that attempts to increase the welfare of the poor were self-defeating. The poor, given more than bare subsistence, would only multiply until, by an iron law, they fell back to bare subsistence once more. The only hope for Malthusians was for checks to population growth through moral restraint rather than the wars, famine, and disease that were the only grim alternative checks.

The history of technology in the Western world since the early nineteenth century, when Malthus wrote, dramatically refutes the inevitability of his theories. Thus, today, the scientist Berkner can write: "Man now sees—almost within his grasp—the promise of a society beyond the dreams of the sage and poet."¹⁴

In the past century, advances in science and technology have brought revolutionary changes in the living patterns and social institutions of the Western world. New discoveries have given means to solve or alleviate a vast array of human and social problems while they have given men unprecedented power over nature, life, and death. They have reduced hunger and disease, increased the span and numbers of lives on earth, lifted the burden of hard manual labor, ended the economic need or benefit of slavery; and they have given man *the chance* to reach the age-old ideal of a life freed from base want and scarcity.

This science- and technology-based revolution has been led by nations whose social organization stimulates the application of technology to meeting consumer demands. In the United States, a free market system within a governmental framework of diffused political power and ideals of freedom provides the needed economic organization. The basic principle of a free market system is that people are free to buy and consume what they wish and to produce and sell what they wish. People as consumers try to maximize the satisfaction from their limited incomes; the same people as producers try to maximize their income gained from using limited resources and capabilities. The efforts of these two groups interact to set prices of consumer goods and productive services so that the relation between any two prices measures their relative scarcity or abundance in satisfying wants.

This system has achieved high productivity in developing economic innovations. Such innovations are not inventions but successful application of invention to meet people's needs as they are expressed in markets. Innovations in such a society are the result of people, acting in their self-interest, adjusting to complex relations between prices and costs, to change such relations to their own benefit. Successful innovations are subject to economic forces. In fact, the relations between prices give a strong incentive to producers to anticipate wants, to change their habits, to eschew complacency, and to use opportunities of whatever kind to meet market demands.

The use of new ways to produce goods and services leads to higher real incomes for society. The scientific revolution of today is marked by waves of innovation as

¹⁴L. V. BERKNER, *THE SCIENTIFIC AGE* 129 (1964).

new industries emerge and grow, displacing older ones with multiplied productive power. The record of history confirms this development. Populations are growing at rates of two per cent per year, a doubling time of forty years compared to 200 years at the time of our American Revolution. Science and medicine, joined together, have reduced death rates faster than birth rates can be checked, multiplying mouths to feed.

Yet standards of living have risen dramatically in industrial countries. U.S. agriculture is almost wholly mechanized, its productivity having risen many-fold through intensive use of biology, chemistry, and mechanics in farming. From 1860 to 1960 the farm population declined from seventy to seven per cent of the U.S. total. We enjoy enormously increased production of basic fuels and minerals, employ exotic ones, and create new ones. The ability to produce of industry gains steadily at rates estimated at 2.5 to 3.5 per cent per year.

The impact of innovation has produced great changes in the labor force. The service industries¹⁵ now account for more than half the nation's employment, now growing "far more rapidly than in the rest of the economy."¹⁶ As manufacturing becomes more efficient, the labor force shifts to the expanding services sector, providing more convenience, professional and personal care, and government services, including education, to our people.

Fears that automation will produce mass unemployment and new poverty are a will-o-the-wisp. After a year-long study, a blue-ribbon presidential commission on automation found that technological change presents no basic threat to employment that cannot be overcome by vigorous fiscal policies to spur economic growth.¹⁷ The commission's conclusion recognizes the basic economic lesson of the Great Depression: that to achieve full employment in a progressive society, the total monetary demand of business, consumers, and government must match the society's productive potential. Aggregate desired employment levels can be achieved by appropriate monetary and fiscal policies that match total monetary demand with productive potential at a stable price level.

The presidential commission's views are supported by many other studies.¹⁸

¹⁵ The service industries are defined to include wholesale and retail trade, finance, insurance, real estate, professional services, repair services, personal services, and general government.

¹⁶ Fuchs, *Productivity in the Service Industries*, in NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH FORTY-FOURTH ANN. REP. II (1964).

¹⁷ NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS, *TECHNOLOGY AND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY*, REPORT 189-92 (1966).

¹⁸ Such scholars include staff experts of *Fortune* magazine, in a series of articles on technology. "Technology and the Labor Market," Jan. 1965 to Aug. 1965; George Terborgh, economist of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, in his book, *THE AUTOMATION HYSTERIA* (1965); Ewan Clague, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics; and the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

According to Mr. Clague, for example, "Technology as such does not result in a net loss of jobs in the economy. It does destroy the jobs and occupations of individual workers; but it creates new jobs and occupations which require workers." See *What Employment Statistics Show*, Automation, April 1964, p. 95.

According to the Council of Economic Advisers, "Technological change permits any given level of

Those who, in wild exaggeration, have created an automation hysteria have done the nation a disservice by muddying thinking unsupported by factual evidence.¹⁹ The burden of proof that automation is a new threat auguring mass unemployment rests on those who claim it vitiates all past experience with technological change.

It must be recognized, however, that technological change involves inherent costs as well as benefits. Among these, such change in the short run and at the level of individual industries destroys jobs. If the shift from old to new industries is slow or inefficient, both economy and worker are penalized in loss of output and income. Therefore, it is sound public policy to improve labor mobility, job market efficiency, and structural adjustment of the labor force. Easing structural adjustments and keeping total monetary demand roughly equal with national productive capacity are closely related. It is important to promote the flexibility and adaptability of the work force. It is also important to provide for those unable to meet the demands of the labor market—the sick, the disabled, the aged.²⁰

And it is important to keep fiscal and monetary policies effectively matching total spending and productive capacity. There is no intrinsic reason that an increase in our ability to produce should not lead to an actual increase in production. Indeed, we need more and faster technological change in order to raise living standards; to provide more goods and services, more leisure, a more satisfying work environment; and to enable us to solve the problems created by technical advance.

Thus, the basic means of minimizing poverty is stable and rapid economic growth, with more emphasis on human development to provide skills needed in a scientific and service-oriented age, and with institutions that minimize disruptions caused by increased mobility. It is our capacity to grow faster that gives the sine qua non for

output to be produced with less labor and, in that sense, destroys jobs. But it also provides a significant spur to investment and consumption and thus creates jobs. . . . Historically periods of rapid technological change have generally been periods of high and rising employment." COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, ANNUAL REPORT 95 (1964).

¹⁹ Examples of wild exaggeration can be found in DONALD N. MICHAEL, *CYBERNATION: THE SILENT CONQUEST* 15 (1962); in *Hearings on the Nation's Manpower Revolution Before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 5, at 1649 (1963) (prepared statement of John I. Snyder, Jr., Chairman and President of U.S. Industries, Inc.); and *THE TRIPLE REVOLUTION* (reprint of a statement by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution, P.O. Box 4068, Santa Barbara, California, 1964).

The statement of the Ad Hoc Committee is perhaps the most extreme. The Committee includes W. H. Ferry, Vice President, Fund for the Republic; Michael Harrington, author, *THE OTHER AMERICA* (1962); Gunnar Myrdal, Swedish economist; Ben B. Seligman, Retail Clerks International; Linus Pauling, chemist-pacifist; and Norman Thomas, Socialist leader. The Committee states that because of the technical revolution, "the industrial productive system is no longer viable . . . the traditional link between jobs and incomes is being broken. The economy of abundance can sustain all citizens in comfort and economic security whether or not they engage in what is commonly reckoned as work." Committee proposals include "a massive program to build up our educational system . . . massive public works . . . a massive program of low-cost housing, and . . . the conscious and rational direction of economic life by planning institutions under democratic control." *THE TRIPLE REVOLUTION*, *op. cit. supra* at 10-13.

²⁰ See TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, *POVERTY: THE SICK, DISABLED AND AGED* (1965).

alleviating poverty; it is upgraded human skills that makes ability out of capacity. Further, as John Dunlop has pointed out, our productive potentials "underscore the common gains to be shared by increasing productivity and the possibilities of insuring adequately those who bear the costs of the adverse initial impacts of some technological changes."²¹

III

Human development to combat poverty is not a new concept in this country. From the vision of William Penn and Thomas Jefferson until today our public school system is an attempt to develop the human resources needed to build a great nation. And from the Northwest Territory Ordinance in 1787 until today, when ninety-nine per cent of our thirteen-year-olds are in school, Americans have followed the mandate laid down in that Ordinance, that "means of education shall forever be encouraged," as well as upholding—not without strife—its ideals of social and political democracy.²² The Morrill Act of 1862,²³ fathered by Michigan farmers, set up land grant colleges to develop human resources needed to tap our food-producing potential and provide needed engineering skills to supplement humanistic and scientific education in private and state universities. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914,²⁴ setting up the Agricultural Extension Service, and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917,²⁵ providing vocational education in agriculture, likewise fostered human development. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,²⁶ though it places the federal government into traditionally state areas of responsibility, recognizes the national interest in the education of citizens, poor as well as not-so-poor.

But early efforts to develop human skills were focused on opportunity, not deprivation. Only since the poverty concept revolution of the Great Depression have we given serious thought to developing human resources as a specific way to fight poverty. In fact, we see the first national application of this approach in the George-Barden Act of 1946,²⁷ the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954,²⁸ the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962,²⁹ the Vocational Education Act of 1963,³⁰ and certain programs since then. If poverty is, however, a problem of specific individuals, families, and groups with "poverty-linked" characteristics, and if science promises further economic growth for the society, giving means to alleviate poverty and insure against disruptions of technological change, it follows that antipoverty

²¹ Dunlop, *Introduction to AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE* 1, 3 (Dunlop ed. 1962).

²² Northwest Territory Ordinance art. 3, 12 *JOURNAL OF THE U.S. CONGRESS* 85, 90 (1787).

²³ 12 Stat. 503 (1862), as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 301-05, 307-08 (1964).

²⁴ 38 Stat. 372 (1914), as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 341-43, 344-46, 348 (1964).

²⁵ 39 Stat. 929 (1917), as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 11-15, 16-28 (1964).

²⁶ 79 Stat. 27, 20 U.S.C.A. §§ 234-44, 331-32b, 821-85 (Supp. 1965).

²⁷ 60 Stat. 775 (1946), as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 151-15m, 150-15q (1964).

²⁸ 68 Stat. 662 (1954), as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 31-42 (1964).

²⁹ 76 Stat. 23, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2571-2620 (1964).

³⁰ 77 Stat. 403, 20 U.S.C. §§ 15aa, bb, aaa, 35-35n (1964).

efforts should emphasize remedying personal deficiencies, imparting personal abilities, in order to help people become more productive and so share directly through their own efforts in society's economic advance. The purpose—as distinct from the programs—of the Economic Opportunity Act³¹ reflects this concept, which has considerable merit.

A. Human Development versus Other Approaches

The debate about the merits of guaranteed annual incomes—a sophisticated version of relief doles—whether as “negative income taxes,” for the poor, or “demogrants” making up universal grants to all citizens, or in other forms—challenges the human development approach. Proponents offer many reasons for such guarantees. Perhaps the most persuasive is that they are more efficient and less demeaning than present complex welfare programs with their often offensive and arbitrary eligibility conditions and hodge-podge benefit levels among states, counties, and cities.

Certainly, the need for such grants as a response to automation can be sharply questioned along lines argued above, and needs no further elaboration. Further, grants do not strike at today's poverty-causing conditions. Grants do not reduce job or union discrimination by color or sex, nor increase education, skills, or work discipline.

In effect, the guaranteed-income approach begs an important question if used for more than cutting red tape. The market system takes the individual as given—assuming the participants are rational, knowledgeable, and have initiative; and it promises favorable results on this assumption. Yet, in fact, individuals are complex and importantly influenced by their environment. It is callous to assume a degree of knowledge and initiative by today's poor which ignores environmental factors; to leave them isolated and dangling at the end of a new-fangled welfare check. Human development offers opportunity; while it is more expensive, it has merits recognized throughout our history.

Area development also challenges the human development approach. The Appalachian Regional Development Act sets aside eighty per cent of its authorized \$1-billion-plus for roads. This comes when Appalachia requires more than 100 more vocational-technical schools.³² The Appalachian Act concept raises several difficult questions. Why should high-cost roads in Appalachia, built in the hope of generating demand, yield higher returns to society than less costly roads built to meet pressing demands elsewhere? Why should road-building, that creates temporary jobs for skilled workmen and highly organized construction companies, help the *poor* in Appalachia? Indeed, why should the nation's poverty efforts go to help entire geographic areas and regions when it is specific people in them who are poor? Is it areas or people who are poor?

³¹ 78 Stat. 508 (1964), 42 U.S.C. § 2701 (1964).

³² See THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY 14.

Area development promises to become competitive for federal funds. Already, such regions as New England, the Ozarks, the Upper Midwest, and still others are prepared to follow the route of Appalachia. Government officials privately admit that in guiding the Appalachian act through Congress, roads were "easier to sell" than vocational schools. Current programs in urban renewal, farm subsidies, public works, and the like suggest that area redevelopment is far from taking a back seat. It hardly needs documenting here that public works tend to follow political influence. It is likely, indeed, that major federal subsidy programs have tended to redistribute income from the poor to the not-so-poor.

B. The Economic Opportunity Administration

As it is turning out, the Economic Opportunity Act may well be a poor vehicle for testing the human development concept. For one thing, it is not much of a test. Seen in the perspective of our country's great accomplishments in education, training, and welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), for all its strident publicity, is small potatoes. Beyond that, the act was hurriedly pieced together;³³ many of its offerings are old or duplicate existing programs;³⁴ it has spent its money mainly for administration;³⁵ it is deeply embroiled in what a former administrator terms "savage" politics;³⁶ it has been given a virtually impossible job of coordination;³⁷ its

³³ Reports in congressional hearings on the act indicate that it was drafted in six weeks; testimony of Sargent Shriver does not deny that it was put together in a hurry. A consultant serving on the task force that drew up the Economic Opportunity Act, in seeking cooperation from this author, replied to questions about the need for study: "We haven't got time to study; we have to act." The majority leadership of the House Committee on Education and Labor, when OEO legislation was reviewed and OEO's appropriation doubled in 1965, admitted that a complete study of the act was not possible—a study that had been assured the year before when the majority was pushing for quick passage of the act. 111 CONG. REC. 16872 (1965).

³⁴ The Job Corps duplicates in large part the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s; it overlaps current measures such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, 76 Stat. 23 (1962), as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2571-620 (1964), and the Vocational Educational Act of 1963, 77 Stat. 403, 20 U.S.C. §§ 15aa, bb, aaa, 35-35n (1964), which offer manpower retraining programs. The Work-Training (Neighborhood Youth Corps) program of the OEO also overlaps the same earlier acts. The College Work-Study program under OEO seems to duplicate the student loan program under National Defense Education Act §§ 201-03, 72 Stat. 1583 (1958), as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 421-29 (1964).

The Adult Basic Education program, the special programs to Combat Poverty in Rural Areas, Employment and Investment Incentives, and Work Experience programs duplicate in some degree programs existing before the act was passed. The inventory of programs to help people and groups in poverty, available from the federal government, released by OEO in December 1965, shows 57 separate federal programs for vocational education.

³⁵ Agency data are not available. This statement is based on the nature of the act and on press reports such as that in the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 23, 1965, sec. B, p. 4, reporting that of more than \$600,000 granted Fairfax County under its community action program, only \$20,000 was for nonadministrative expense, and in the Chicago Tribune, April 15, 1966, p. 5, reporting that 40% of federal war on poverty funds spent in Chicago is to pay salaries.

³⁶ See article by William F. Haddad, formerly assistant director and inspector general of OEO, *Mr. Shriver and the Savage Politics of Poverty*, Harper's Magazine, Dec. 1965, p. 43.

³⁷ The OEO enabling legislation provides that OEO is to coordinate all antipoverty efforts in the federal government. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, § 611, 78 Stat. 532, 42 U.S.C. § 2961 (1964). Since poverty is a problem closely related to employment, race and sex discrimination, education, agriculture, depressed areas, and sickness-disability-old age, responsibility at the federal level is scattered

purposes are by definition apt to be confused;³⁸ and its independent life as of now seems likely to be short.³⁹

Not only duplication with other federal programs but conflict with existing institutions and philosophy could lead to failure of the Economic Opportunity Act. Such conflicts are being more frequently reported publicly, ranging from views of Saul Alinsky⁴⁰ to Rutgers University consultants of the Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center.⁴¹ Largely unreported are conflicts with existing welfare, public health, and educational agencies that are nevertheless real.

Job Corps centers, both rural and urban, give remedial education and job training in residential camps to poor youth sixteen to twenty-one in age, out of work and out of school. The average cost in fiscal 1965 for 10,000 enrollees was \$8,000 per enrollee. For its second year the Job Corps plans for 30,000 and a budget request of \$240 million—that is, about \$8,000 per enrollee.⁴² There have been reports that Job Corps enrollments are lagging; whether its training is job-related for the forty per cent of enrollees required to be in rural camps, or indeed, for the rest of its enrollees, will be tested only with employment of trainees.

There may be deeper conflict than meets the eye in severe criticism by Rutgers professors of Camp Kilmer and its business-firm job-training contractor. The criticism came close to condemning the whole concept of residential, private-industry approach. It called for central leadership from education, youth work, or welfare to replace business leadership.⁴³ In effect, the Camp Kilmer approach implies failure by (and, hence, conflict with) schools and welfare agencies in dealing with poor youth.

The largest of OEO programs in human development is the Neighborhood

throughout powerful government departments responsible to cabinet-level secretaries. To anyone familiar with organizations, it seems impossible for an independent agency head to “coordinate” policy of cabinet secretaries. As one example, OEO personnel have been reported in the press as proposing that the target for full employment, set by the Council of Economic Advisers to the President at an “interim” four per cent in 1963, now be lowered to three per cent. It is difficult to believe that, among the conflicting responsibilities of what Walter Heller called the “troika” of the old line Treasury Department, the prestigious Federal Reserve, and the influential Council, the OEO would, in fact, carry much weight.

³⁸ As Sargent Shriver explained on “Meet the Press,” Dec. 19, 1965, the community action programs are locally directed by “some 700 or more” communities, and range from sponsoring newspapers (Ypsilanti, Mich.) to “work on beautification projects” (Providence, R.I.). As OEO says, “The door is always open for new programs with new approaches.” *Community Action Programs*, 1 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION 47, 48 (1965).

³⁹ In a front-page story, it was recommended by an inter-agency task force that the community action program should be transferred from OEO to the new department of Housing and Urban Development because of its deep involvement in the politics of cities. *The Washington Post*, Dec. 24, 1965, p. A-1.

⁴⁰ *The Professional Radical: Conversations With Saul Alinsky*, Harper's Magazine, June 1965, p. 37.

⁴¹ *N.Y. Times*, Nov. 17, 1965, p. 1, col. 2.

⁴² Address by George J. Vicksnins, *The War on Poverty and Federal Manpower Policies*, before the Washington chapter of the Industrial Relations Research Organization, Dec. 15, 1963, and *Community Development*, National Association for Community Development, Washington, D. C., March 1966, p. 2.

⁴³ *Trouble in the Job Corps—Report from a Showplace*, U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 27, 1965, p. 51.

Youth Corps (NYC), which served in its first year 278,000 teenagers at a cost of \$134 million.⁴⁴ It provides part-time work in "newly created jobs in non-profit or municipal agencies." By Labor Department administrative decision, the jobs pay at the rate of \$1.25 per hour. This means that some NYC youth may be receiving higher pay-rates than their parents, if parents are training under the Manpower Development and Training Act programs. The NYC programs, through the restrictiveness of work opportunities, are not immune from political abuse, inviting as they do municipal governments to hire young people in newly created jobs. Again, the existence of NYC implies failure of public schools in developing sound work habits and attitudes among poor youth.

The Work Experience program, for people on relief rolls, involved about 80,000 at a total cost of over \$100 million in fiscal 1965. An example of the program is given by a million-dollar grant to Rhode Island for 1,000 men and women to receive, among other things, "training in good work habits and attitudes . . . and training through beautification activity as nurserymen, gardeners, and truckdrivers."⁴⁵ While these are valuable occupations in an increasingly service-oriented economy, it is not yet clear that, in general, training in the Work Experience program is well matched with market needs.

The VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) program, with only about 2,100 enrollees, implies that a new corps of workers is needed to supplement the efforts of social workers, efforts that presumably fall short of the mark. However, VISTA has so far proved remarkably unsuccessful in attracting and holding volunteers, compared with initial claims.

If the above "war on poverty" programs are successful, they could lead to far-reaching changes in our traditional institutions. Buttressed by other federal manpower programs such as Manpower Development and Training, Vocational Education, and so on, the "war on poverty" programs could create a new educational and welfare concept and structure in our society. The controversy they create, even if moving in the right direction, could create formidable obstacles to OEO success.

An even greater source of conflict is title two of the Economic Opportunity Act,⁴⁶ the general Community Action Program (CAP), for here political organizations are being challenged. This is the title which, in many communities, is turning the war *on* poverty into a war *over* poverty. It is the title of the act which led Adam Olayton Powell to speak of "giant fiestas of political patronage," and which William Haddad linked with "savage" politics. To cost almost \$500 million in fiscal 1966, CAP gives financial support for specific local antipoverty efforts in rural and urban

⁴⁴ Vicksnins, *supra* note 42.

⁴⁵ *Hearings on Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1966 Before Subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 2, at 394 (1965).

⁴⁶ 78 Stat. 516, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2781-2831 (1964).

areas. What Haddad calls a "powder keg" is the provision that local programs must be "developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."⁴⁷ It could mean a blank check for communities, anything from family planning to cultural enrichment field trips. It could also mean that, from the politician's viewpoint, the poor would be given not only money—as in the past—but also a voice in spending it—which, translated, in politics means power for indigenous leaders of the poor.

Title two departs from the traditional federal welfare programs by placing main responsibility on local communities for programs and by setting up a direct channel for funds from Washington to local community action groups, bypassing, if needed, local government (and political) organizations. In the view of some, CAP could evolve into a mid-twentieth century equivalent for the central government of *The Last Hurrah*, the "beer-bucket and coal-scuttle" local politics of some nineteenth-century city life. Others see CAP as challenging a source of power valuable to big-city administrations for a generation—namely, the power of doling out welfare through existing agencies.⁴⁸

Reasons given for title two by its sponsors were the superiority of local leadership,⁴⁹ concern for the "state's rights" principle, and a desire to "unify" communities through broad local participation. Two "silent" reasons privately discussed were that the bill's drafters simply did not know what programs the war on poverty needed, and—perhaps more important—the act was designed as another layer of the Great Society's civil rights program. Because of growing distrust of established social and political institutions by increasingly vocal and powerful urban poor, particularly Negroes, such urban poor are to be the major beneficiaries, but under direct national administration leadership.

Few informed students can deny the ironic role of Negroes in the United States. European immigrants came here with the peasant's strength of family, full of hope in the land of opportunity, capable of "fading" into suburbs as language barriers fell before a new generation. The European belief that hard work could lead to fortune has been largely confirmed. Many urban Negroes, often of much longer American lineage and so more socially and politically sophisticated, feel trapped. Recognizing need for education and skills, they have been in the past frustrated by lack of opportunity and by unstable family life patterns set up purposefully earlier by the mores of slave ownership. Despite much progress in income that is closing the gaps between whites and Negroes,⁵⁰ the Negro faces the aroused expectations of mass media, on the one hand, and the realities of declining opportunities for the uneducated, on the other, all the while remaining "visible" on account of color.

⁴⁷ Haddad, *supra* note 36, at 44; §202(a)(3), 78 Stat. 516, 42 U.S.C. § 2782(a)(3) (1964).

⁴⁸ Silberman, *The Mixed-Up War on Poverty*, *Fortune*, Aug. 1965, p. 156.

⁴⁹ H.R. REP. NO. 1458, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. 10 (1964).

⁵⁰ WATTENBERG & SCAMMON, *op. cit. supra* note 1, at 130-51.

Many of today's poor lack provision for that education, training, and environment that are needed. Central Harlem and other city school children undergo declines in measured intelligent quotient from third to sixth or eighth grades.⁵¹ Urban renewal has often pushed urban poor into denser inner-core ghettos.⁵² Health of the poor is less robust; they are sick more and have higher infant mortality⁵³ and death⁵⁴ rates, suggesting preventive health care weaknesses.

Sophisticated leadership of urban poor—particularly civil rights organizations—know and protest such conditions. Equal opportunity is their main theme; relief programs of the past are considered an affront. The concept of economic opportunity has much validity, in line with the argument of this paper. Enhanced skills add to national output and income, to consumer buying power, to social and political stability—in short, to the means of reducing not only economic but also social, intellectual, and cultural poverty. This is why OEO has aroused interest and excitement.

In this context, the war *over* poverty is real and undeniable. It presses against the welfare and education status quo in cities, and thus also against city halls across the land. The U.S. Conference of Mayors noted last November that both “public and private agencies and interests are being combined and coordinated under community action program guidance”; and in view of this, the report said, “. . . the almost revolutionary potentialities of this new organizational unit become apparent.”⁵⁵

With the stakes so high, competition for CAP leadership is keen. Labor unions publish how-to-do-it pamphlets for their leaders;⁵⁶ Walter Reuther sets up a million-dollar “Citizens Crusade Against Poverty” to help involve labor. Austin Kiplinger writes that Reuther sees unions “as a vital cog in the coming power structure, with a unified voice, louder than any other, and able to run the show.”⁵⁷ Part of the show may well be the powerful poor.

⁵¹ Clark, *Education of the Minority Poor—The Key to the War on Poverty* (paper prepared for the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, Chamber of Commerce of the United States).

⁵² See MARTIN ANDERSON, *THE FEDERAL BULLDOZER* ch. 4 (1964).

⁵³ U.S. NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS, DEP'T OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, SERIES 10, No. 4, *DISABILITY DAYS, UNITED STATES: JULY 1961-JUNE 1962*, at 9 (1965); U.S. DEP'T OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, WELFARE ADMINISTRATION, DIVISION OF RESEARCH, *CONVERGING SOCIAL TRENDS, EMERGING SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, Chart 40, at 48 (1964).

⁵⁴ Handler, *Poverty No. 3 Cause of Death Here*, N.Y. Times, Oct. 10, 1964, p. 59, col. 2. The five causes of death included in the study were cardiovascular renal diseases, cancer, diabetes, pneumonia-influenza diseases, and accidents.

⁵⁵ Loftus, *Mayors Chide U.S. on Poverty Drive*, N.Y. Times, Nov. 28, 1965, p. 55. Last November's narrow re-election of Cleveland's Mayor Ralph S. Locher, who was nearly defeated by a Negro opponent, is possibly an example of what the Conference of Mayors was talking about. For months prior to the election, Locher, the OEO, civil rights groups and church organizations had been carrying on a battle over the composition of Cleveland's community action council. Until the election, the mayor had resisted demands that he increase representation of the poor. The groups that wanted more representation of the poor played active roles in the mayoralty election campaign and supported Locher's opponent, who came within 2,000 votes of defeating the incumbent mayor. Pincus, *Politics and Change in Poverty War, Interpretative Report*, The Washington Evening Star, Nov. 12, 1965, p. 2.

⁵⁶ See AFL-CIO, *LABOR'S ROLE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY* (pamphlet prepared by the AFL-CIO Anti-poverty Office, Washington, D.C., 44 pages, undated).

⁵⁷ The Kiplinger Washington Letter, Nov. 26, 1965, p. 1.

The war over poverty creates troubles for the Johnson administration. On one side, the administration faces the angry big-city mayors, mostly Democrats; on the other, there are the civil rights groups and others whom the "establishment" frustrates. The conflict surfaced last November with a news report alleged to stem from what was said to be an intra-office Bureau of the Budget memorandum. The report claimed the administration plans to de-emphasize CAP in favor of NYC and Project Head Start. The Vice President's "informal" talks to reporters were soon in print with a similar line—hardly a coincidence in such a tightly news-disciplined presidency.⁵⁸ Carl Rowan, Negro columnist, has since reported that to move CAP to the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, Sargent Shriver may have to be replaced.⁵⁹ Such a move, with what some hear as overtones of the Johnson-Robert Kennedy power struggle, would add merit to Haddad's appellation of "savage" politics.

C. What Is the Basic Philosophy of the OEO?

The real long-run weakness of the OEO is lack of a basic philosophy. In the absence of strong intellectual underpinnings or vision of purpose, the sponsors of the Economic Opportunity Act created what Silberman aptly calls "a mixed-up war on poverty."⁶⁰ Defenders of the act and of the OEO as "pragmatic" overlook the wide gulf which separates the pragmatism of confusion from the pragmatism of hypothesis explored through scientific analysis and testing.

Many of the troubles in the war on poverty stem from its clouded vision and activist posture: Weak and distorted factual bases are too often defended instead of probed. Legislative devices such as "coordination" are substituted for strong policy direction to federal antipoverty efforts, vastly overlapping and duplicative. Existing welfare and educational institutions and concepts are naïvely attacked rather than firmly challenged on logic, quality and results. Indeed, issues which are at base substantive and analytical are exploded into political battles, rather than the desired reverse "implosion" of potential political issues into technical and substantive questions.

A meeting on December 5-8, 1965 of 286 representatives of community action and development programs—the National Association for Community Development—reflected in its resolutions concern over the conceptual shape of OEO administration as follows:

⁵⁸ As two experienced newsmen on the Washington scene later pointed out:

"The Vice President and the Budget Director are anything but bureaucratic adventurers who go off on policy tangents. High officials here just can't believe Humphrey and Schultze have crawled out on a limb without a nudge from President Johnson."

Evans & Novak, *Inside Report*, The Washington Post, Dec. 1, 1965, p. 17.

⁵⁹ Rowan, *Shriver Likely Poverty War Victim*, Washington Evening Star, Dec. 22, 1965, p. A-15.

⁶⁰ Silberman, *supra* note 48.

Judged in the light of its CAP funding actions, the OEO has not recognized the centrality to the community action effort of manpower development and employment programs.

....

Attempts to carry out this [OEO coordinating] responsibility have proven especially difficult in the area of manpower development and employment programs in large part because this central planning and coordinating role is not afforded priority in federal bureaucratic practice.

....

... greater recognition than ever should be given . . . to the realities of the current and future labor market, occupational demands, and labor force. . . . These realities include . . . a heavy concentration of hard-core unemployed young men and women without the formal or the actual qualifications for acceptance by employers.

....

Almost one-half of those persons who make up the poverty population reside in rural areas and a large segment of the impoverished in urban areas have their origin in rural areas But only about 10 per cent of CAP funds have gone to rural programs.⁶¹

Too much of OEO efforts aim at offering people of good will a cause. John Fischer, editor of *Harper's* magazine, argues that since many of our youth lack substitutes for violence because of the comforts of modern life, we should start projects based on what William James long ago called the "moral equivalent of war." To some extent, Fischer points out, Project Head Start, VISTA, the Peace Corps, and such programs aim in this direction.⁶²

One cannot help a feeling of disquiet, however, with such approaches by central government in questions affecting the lives and hopes of the poor. For one thing, the moral issue insists on turning around—are these programs aimed at doing good to the poor, or at doing good for those doing good to the poor? Next, is the issue of fighting poverty only an issue of *doing good*? If rich men in India gave all their goods to feed the poor, perhaps moral wealth would be enhanced, but certainly poverty would not be conquered. To those who argue that such programs help both helped and helpers, one can recall the haunting remark of Jane Addams: "One cannot do good to the poor; one can only hope to do good with the poor." Historically the supply of saints has always been scant.

These unhappy questions need facing, above all, because the war on poverty could conceivably only mislead, misinform, and misdirect the hopes of our most inarticulate people. What could be more regrettable an outcome of the war on poverty than to turn the stigma of "deprivation" in a loosely-defined barrage across major groups, areas, and regions? In a recent article "A Federal Study Finds Unrest Among Negroes Rising in Many Cities," the *Wall Street Journal* reports: "Federal officials who have felt the pulse now possess a closely guarded list of 'high tension' cities where

⁶¹ NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, EIGHT RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT NACD CONFERENCE (Dec. 5-8, 1965).

⁶² Fischer, *Substitutes for Violence*, Harper's Magazine, Jan. 1966, p. 16, at 19, 24.

it's said the threat of violence is raised by Negro resentment over lack of jobs, inadequate schools and housing, and the attitudes of police and local officeholders.⁶³ Is mounting resentment and frustration, is more disrespect for law and order, either a desired or necessary result of antipoverty efforts? It would not appear so.

Lacking a clear philosophy, the war on poverty has nonetheless created a powerful rhetoric. No one who reads newspapers can escape realizing that the war on poverty has yielded tons of news releases. OEO has had more than one hundred ex-newsmen in its evaluation unit, to check complaints, while its research staff amounted to about forty. The public information staff of the war on poverty includes federal, state, and local manpower, throughout the country. The danger of powerful public information is that its output can be no better in the long run than its input. Thus, powerful rhetoric amplifies trouble with the war on poverty as much as accomplishment. It also runs the risk of demeaning its clients with the stigma of deprivation, while blotting out solid news of progress against poverty (in facts about income, jobs, and wealth) with the minutiae of OEO grants and administration.

D. Toward a Philosophy of Overcoming Poverty

The National Association for Community Development, earlier quoted, held in one of its resolutions:

. . . we feel that the private and public institutions of America must not be led to believe that the usual market mechanisms and general fiscal and monetary policies can be expected to contribute *a direct or even an indirect* solution to these [hard-core unemployment] problems. Specific, tailor-made programs of manpower development, job development, and economic development must take up the attention and energies of employers, unions, and government in order to provide solutions and techniques congruent with the realities of the labor market today, and in the future.⁶⁴

It is puzzling to determine who it is that contends that the market plus monetary and fiscal policy—alone—solve hard-core unemployment. It has been the National Chamber view that much unemployment in recent times is structural—that is, the result of job-upgrading not yet matched by skill-upgrading, or of other shifts in employment producing mis-matches of jobs and skills.⁶⁵ Further, businessmen have historically supported both public and private education and its expansion, as well as spending perhaps today as much as \$15 billion yearly for training on-the-job.

The National Association for Community Development seems to raise a straw-man issue in its premises. Signs of progress in education led *Time* magazine to write of "the education explosion." A few sentences put its essence briefly:

⁶³ Wall Street Journal, Jan. 5, 1966, p. 1.

⁶⁴ NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, *op. cit. supra* note 61. (Emphasis added.)

⁶⁵ See CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, UNEMPLOYMENT: THE NATURE OF THE CHALLENGE (1965).

Sixty-five years ago, when the U.S. population stood at 76 million, a thin 6% of the nation's 17-year-olds graduated from high school, and only 4% of the college-age youths were in college. Today, with the U.S. population grown by nearly 40% [*sic*], to 195 million, an impressive 71% of the 17-year-olds are getting their high school diplomas, and about 30% of the college-age population is in the classroom.⁶⁸

The market mechanism and general fiscal and monetary policy have never alone solved human development problems in this country. They create conditions of high employment; the educational system, stimulated by a free and enterprising people bent on a better life for their families and children, has done so.

And given our great educational plant, still abuilding, why should we not ask about its quality in serving the poor? Is the issue not falsely drawn which leaps from hard-core joblessness to OEO-type programs, bypassing schools?

In seeking a philosophy of overcoming today's remediable poverty, are not probing questions needed about our concepts and practices in this great educational system? For example, might we not require schools to develop, use, and report on measures of their own productivity? We need a system of testing which would serve as a quality control for local school boards. Might public schools be subject to more competition, to improve quality for children of the poor? Why should educators not be required to produce results?

Indeed, if we are serious as a society in striving to enter the age of science—wherein results are tested formally and self-consciously—might we not also demand higher standards of accomplishment in government welfare-type programs such as OEO? Most such programs report results in numbers of cases served or in dollars spent, rather than in the achievement of specific purposes. Industry and commerce cannot survive through such primitive reporting methods.

Social innovations at once consistent with our ideals of freedom, enterprise, opportunity—and at the same time fit for the coming age of science—will require unleashing the mind of our age from depression-born manacles still evident in the war on poverty. It is hard to hear America singing tunes of negative income taxes, guaranteed incomes, or songs written by federal bureaus of economic opportunity, in such an age. A clearer theme emerges from phrases such as “the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” Ours is the semantics of individual opportunity and know-how—not of individual dependency and deprivation. Those who write the new philosophy of poverty must hear America singing.

⁶⁸ Time, Oct. 15, 1965, p. 60.