

THIS OUR CITY

KENNETH B. KEATING

In recent years two types of segregationist have made themselves heard in Washington. The older variety consists of men who are frankly and proudly opposed to integration, and believe Negroes to be an inferior race. These men are gradually committing themselves to a position of armed revolt against this country, but at least they are frank about it. But also represented is a hypocritical sort of man, who states for the record that he favors integration but is always opposed to any specific plan to make it possible. The chief man of this view is Senator Goldwater, who in his book Conscience of a Conservative announces approval of the idea of school integration, but who has opposed every step to bring about school integration, from the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 to this year's Civil Rights Act.

Another such man is Senator Kenneth B. Keating of New York. His voting record and his public statements show that he is all in favor of integrating schools which other people's children attend in states a thousand miles away. But when it comes to the New York City Board of Education's plan for the integration of public schools in this city, he has announced his opposition. Like Senator Goldwater, he supports school integration as a matter of abstract theory, but opposes the concrete steps necessary to implement it.

Another issue of vital importance to the people of New York is the question of legislative reapportionment. As was shown in POINTING VECTOR #17, p. 7, the present apportionment law openly cheats New York City and its suburbs out of 6 seats in the State Senate and 10 in the Assembly. The United States Supreme Court has ordered the states to rectify such imbalances, and to apportion legislative seats on the basis of population alone. Senator Keating opposes this ruling, and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse it. Such an amendment would have the effect of continuing the intolerable situation whereby a resident of Schuyler County casts a vote worth those of ten Brooklynites.

Senator Keating is soliciting votes from Democrats on the grounds that his opponent, Robert F. Kennedy, is not "really" a New Yorker, and that he (Keating) ought to be rewarded for not endorsing Goldwater. The first argument is particularly pointless. One of the greatest Senators in New York's history, Robert F. Wagner Sr., was born on the other side of the Atlantic. The state which sent him to three terms in the Senate need feel no compunctions about sending a native of a neighboring state, who has long and close ties with New York.

Keating's ambiguous attitude towards Goldwater arises from no serious disagreement with the Goldwater position, as can be seen from the views of the two men on practical steps towards school integration. He merely feels that Goldwater is doomed to defeat, and that he will share that fate if he supports him. In 1926, the Republican Senator George Norris of Nebraska felt that Herbert Hoover's policies were unacceptable, and openly campaigned for his defeat. George Norris's name will still be a symbol for statesmanlike integrity when Keating's is forgotten.

In fine: Kenneth Keating is against the New York City school integration plan, and against legislative re-apportionment.

Robert F. Kennedy is for them.

These are the issues.

ELECTION ENDORSEMENTS

-----This year the voters of New York City will elect all their representatives in the state's Senate and Assembly. They will also fill three vacancies in the City Council, and elect several judges and district attorneys. On the national scene they will join with the rest of the nation in voting for the President, Vice-President, and members of Congress. The publisher of the POINTING VECTOR makes the following recommendation among these candidates:

- * - Election of this candidate is particularly important.
- # - Defeat of this candidate's opponent is particularly important.

D - Democratic L - Liberal R - Republican

PRESIDENT: Lyndon B. Johnson, D-L #
 VICE-PRESIDENT: Hubert H. Humphrey, D-L ##
 U. S. SENATOR: Robert F. Kennedy, D-L

Amendment 1, state constitution (housing) - Yes
 Amendment 2, state constitution (technical changes) - Yes
 Proposition 1 (housing) - Yes

REPRESENTATIVES FROM NEW YORK

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Otis Pike, D-L | 22. Joseph Mazur, D-L # |
| 2. Edwin Silberling, D-L | 23. Jonathan Bingham, D |
| 3. Lester Wolff, D-L # | 24. Sylvia Bloom, L |
| 4. Stanley Levy, L | 25. Richard Ottinger, D-L * |
| 5. Herbert Tenzer, D-L | 26. Frank Conniff, D-L |
| 6. Seymour Halpern, R # | 27. John Dow, D-L # |
| 7. Joseph Addabbo, D-L | 28. Joseph Resnick, D # |
| 8. Benjamin Rosenthal, D-L * | 29. Leo O'Brien, D-L |
| 9. Howard Rudner, L # | 30. Joseph Martin, D-L |
| 10. Emanuel Celler, D-L | 31. Raymond Bishop, D-L |
| 11. Eugene Keogh, D-L | 32. Robert Castle, D |
| 12. Carlo Colavito, R # | 33. John Joy, D-L |
| 13. Gerald Weisberg, L | 34. James Hanley, D-L # |
| 14. Victor Tirabasso, R # | 35. Samuel Stratton, D-L # |
| 15. Hugh Carey, D-L # | 36. Helmut Zander, L |
| 16. John Murphy, D-L # | 37. David MacAdam, L * |
| 17. John Lindsay, R | 38. Robert Kelley, D-L |
| 18. Adam Clayton Powell, D | 39. Richard McCarthy, D-L # |
| 19. Leonard Farbstein, D | 40. Wesley Hiltz, D |
| 20. William Fitts Ryan, D-L * | 41. Thaddeus Dulski, D-L |
| 21. James Scheuer, D-L * | |

STATE SENATORS FROM NEW YORK CITY

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 5. Jack Bronston, D-L * | 14. John Bennett, D-L # |
| 6. Irving Mosberg, D | 15. Anthony DeBenedetto, L |
| 7. Seymour Thaler, D-L * | 16. William Rosenblatt, D-L |
| 8. Thomas Duffy, D-L | 17. Samuel Greenberg, D-L |
| 9. Thomas Mackell, D-L | 18. Edward Lentol, D-L |
| 10. Simon Liebowitz, D-L | 19. Joseph Holzka, D-L |
| 11. Clarence Norman, L | 20. Frederic Berman, D-L * |
| 12. Jeremiah Bloom, D-L | 21. Constance Baker Motley, D-L * |
| 13. Guy Mangano, D-L | 22. Jerome Wilson, D-L * |

- Joseph Zaretski, D-L
- 20. Leon Becker, L
- 25. Manfred Ohrenstein, D-L *
- 26. Harry Kraf, D

- 27. Ivan Warner, D
- 28. Abraham Bernstein, D
- 29. Rose Fromowitz, L

ASSEMBLYMEN FROM MANHATTAN

- 1. William Passannante, D-L *
- 2. Herman Woskow, L
- 3. Jerome Kretchmer, D-L
- 4. Jerome Marks, D-L
- 5. Albert Blumenthal, D-L *
- 6. C. Joseph Hallinan, D #
- 7. Daniel Kelly, D-L
- 8. Bruno Cappellini, D-L #

- 9. John Heimann, D-L
- 10. Carlos Rios, D-L *
- 11. Percy Sutton, D *
- 12. Clifton Moore, L
- 13. Orest Maresca, D-L
- 14. Jose Ramos-Lopez, D-L
- 15. John Walsh, D
- 16. Frank Rossetti, D-L

ASSEMBLYMEN FROM BROOKLYN

- 1. Max Turshen, D-L
- 2. Fabio Schettini, L
- 3. Joseph Dowd, D-L
- 4. Harold Cohn, D-L
- 5. Leonard Yoswein, D-L
- 6. Bertram Baker, D-L *
- 7. Louis Kalish, D-L
- 8. Marian Mase, L #
- 9. William Garry, D-L #
- 10. Walter Cooke, D-L
- 11. Milton Michaelson, R

- 12. James Buccellato, D-L
- 13. Lawrence Murphy, D-L #
- 14. Frederico Narvaez, L
- 15. Alfred Lama, D-L *
- 16. David Schukin, L
- 17. Simoon Golar, L *
- 18. Stanley Steingut, D-L
- 19. Joseph Kottler, D-L
- 20. Joseph Corso, D-L
- 21. Bertram Podell, D-L
- 22. Anthony Travia, D-L #

ASSEMBLYMEN FROM THE BRONX

- 1. Donald Sullivan, D
- 2. Seymour Posner, D
- 3. Jerome Schutzer, D
- 4. Frank Torres, L *
- 5. Joseph Rodriguez, L
- 6. Murray Lewinter, D

- 7. John Satriale, D *
- 8. Eugene Kaufman, L
- 9. Sheldon Horowitz, L
- 10. Harvey Davis, L
- 11. Aileen Ryan, D
- 12. Fred Eggert, D

ASSEMBLYMEN FROM QUEENS

- 1. Thomas LaFauci, D-L
- 2. Thomas Cullen, D-L
- 3. Marcia Steinberg, L
- 4. Jules Sabbatino, D-L
- 5. Martin Psaty, D-L
- 6. Don Blauweiss, L #
- 7. Moses Weinstein, D-L *

- 8. Michael Capanegro, D-L
- 9. Sol Karp, L #
- 10. Martin Rodell, D-L #
- 11. Kenneth Browne, D-L #
- 12. J. Lewis Fox, D-L
- 13. Hyman Kaplan, L #

ASSEMBLYMEN FROM STATEN ISLAND

- 1. Ferdinand Cubas, L

- 2. Herman Engelman, L

CITY COUNCILMAN (By-election)

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

- 5. Edward Pastel, L
- 6. Leonard Vaughan, L
- 29. Simon Beagle, L

Brooklyn: Aaron Koota, D-L

SURROGATE

Brooklyn: Orrin G. Judd, R

In other judicial elections, the interest of the Liberal Party in court reforms deserves votes for their candidates.

Two congressional candidates from New York City are on record in favor of book censorship. They are Emil Levin (D) in the 6th district, and Luigi Marano (R-C) in the 15th. Marano has served four terms in the state Legislature, during which he has made himself particularly obnoxious in advocating the suppression of literature which he believes to be "obscene". Several censorship laws, written by him and passed through his campaigning, have been overturned by the U. S. Supreme Court.

Voters wishing further information on the election, and where they should go to vote, should call one of the following New York City numbers:

League of Women Voters, OR 7-5050
Citizens Union, BA 7-0342

*

THIS.OUR CITY is published by John Boardman, 592 16th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11218. It appears at irregular intervals, usually shortly before a primary or general election. It is a supplement to POINTING VECTOR, and this issue will also be distributed at APA-F Mailing #17, 23 October 1964.

This is

O At
P Great
E Intervals
R This
A Appears
T To
I Inflamm
O Optic
N Nerves

THE WAR ON THE WAR ON POVERTY

The right-wing New York Daily News is conducting a campaign against a program to combat poverty on Manhattan's Lower East Side by training the area's youth in the skills needed for employment. The newspaper has employed one of the oldest tools of conservatism - red-baiting. They allege that this program, Mobilization For Youth, is infiltrated by Communists. (From time to time the accusation varies, and attributes the infiltration instead to Trotskyites or the Progressive Labor Movement.)

103

The goal, of course, is not whatever Leftists may be doing MFY's legwork, but the program itself. Despite minimization of the accusations by an investigation, the News is still plugging away with its red-baiting. An article about the work of MFY is enclosed, so that New Yorkers may know the worth of the program which is threatened by these irrelevant and insatiable attacks. If the News's McCarthyism succeeds in its aim of forcing a cut-off of funds to this program, President Johnson's war on poverty will have suffered a serious setback.

GOLDWATER - IN YOUR GUTS YOU KNOW HE'S NUTS

Needed: A Sense of Proportion . . .

The New York Times
NEW YORK, N. Y.
August 22, 1964

Youth Mobilization's Militant Projects Stir Debate

By MARTIN TOLCHIN

Charges that left-wingers have infiltrated a welfare agency on the Lower East Side have stirred a debate on just how far a militant social program can go without alienating community leaders.

The charges threaten to produce a demand for controls that could cripple the agency's social-action program, according to many of those engaged in the discussion.

The controversy began last weekend with accusations that leftists had used Mobilization for Youth, a \$12.99 million anti-delinquency project, to foment racial unrest.

Specifically, the agency, which operates largely on city and Federal funds, was charged with having encouraged and assisted the Harlem and Bedford Stuyvesant race riots; as well as rent strikes and school boycotts.

The agency denied that it sanctioned unlawful activities, such as race riots, but pointed out that one of its major goals is to help residents of slums disrupt the existing patterns of poor housing and inferior education.

Local Leadership Sought

To this end, Mobilization for Youth encouraged groups protesting local conditions to use its facilities and resources provided that their activities were lawful, consistent with the agency's over-all goals and that the groups were made up of low income people.

Thus, the agency aided rent strikes, school boycotts and protests by Puerto Rican mothers that their children lacked textbooks. To the question of whether such programs can be carried on without alienating established community leaders, George Brager, a director of Mobilization for Youth, had this answer:

"It can't be done. These programs involve shifts in power and prestige. If somebody's gaining something, somebody else is giving something up."

His view is reflected somewhat in a comment by City Council President Paul R. Screevane. Mr. Screevane said the main issue in the controversy over Mobilization for Youth was not the charge of leftist infiltration but rather the agency's role in encouraging social reform.

"The city government," he said, "does not sanction or agree that lawless and disruptive activities should be encouraged by any organization that is financed by public funds."

Mayor Notes Irony

Mayor Wagner is aware of the irony involved in using city funds to help an agency develop local leadership that will challenge the existing political structure.

Mitchell Ginsberg, associate dean of the Columbia University School of Social Work and a board member of Mobilization for Youth, touched on this subject when he asked:

"If I were the Mayor, how would I feel about giving money to an agency that might turn around and be highly critical of my welfare department or my school system?"

The heart of Mobilization for Youth's antidelinquency project is its social-action program; it was explained by Dr. Leonard S. Cottrell Jr., a sociologist with the Russell Sage Foundation, who is chairman of the technical review panel of President Johnson's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

"In areas of heavy delinquency," Dr. Cottrell said, "the community itself is disorganized and incapable of taking joint action with respect to any

of its problems. We felt that part of the work of these agencies was to discover a community's indigenous leadership and help people articulate their views and participate in community efforts.

"This doesn't mean that we should organize protests or any other action, but rather help people organize themselves to do whatever they feel is needed. When you deal in this way with a population that has alot of pent-up frustration, you're bound to have various kinds of explosions that are regarded as unfortunate."

Although the delinquency rate on the Lower East Side rose 70 per cent in the three years before the start of Mobilization for Youth, the agency was not welcomed by all factions of the community's leadership when it began in 1962.

Michael Bloom, the Democratic leader of the Fourth Assembly District, said yesterday that the "Lower East Side lived in harmony for years."

"Nothing was wrong," he said. "Then all of a sudden this rent strike. There were no problems."

Mr. Bloom added that he believed the agency had done a good deal for the youth and adults of the community.

'Nonsense' Denounced

"They should just take care of the youth and stop getting into some of this other nonsense the red infiltrators started steaming up, like rent strikes and boycotts," he said.

Last January, 26 public school principals protested that Mobilization for Youth had helped organize Puerto Rican mothers who were unhappy over the lack of textbooks. The agency's director, James E. McCarthy, said the mothers' dissatisfaction with the schools was "a healthy sign of an awakening community."

Yesterday, Alex Rosen, dean of the New York University School of Social Work, commented:

"If these mothers want to talk back to a principal, they have every right to do so as American citizens. The agency's goal is to involve them in the democratic processes.

"The attack on Mobilization for Youth is designed to embarrass efforts of pioneer social workers to change the status of the disenfranchised and lower-class groups."

Community Change Sought

Mr. Rosen stressed his belief that the agency's task was "to change the community's power structure."

"This means upsetting the stability of the community, and replacing it with a higher level stability, without delinquents, drug addiction and alcoholism," he said.

Many social workers express the conviction that virtually any welfare agency is vulnerable to attack on the basis of the former left-wing affiliations of its staff members.

Bertram Beck, associate executive director of the National Association of Social Workers, estimated that 50 per cent of the organization's 40,000 members have at one time belonged to groups that some would consider left-wing.

"I would hope," he said, "that every social worker at some time engaged in some social action that was nonconformist."

The biggest fear of agency officials is that the current attacks may curtail their program. In such a case, they said, residents might return to more violent expressions of hopelessness, defeat and despair.

"This is a conservative program," Mr. Ginsberg asserted. "The status quo isn't going to remain forever, and it's a question of changing it slowly instead of violently."

Staten Island Advance
STATEN ISLAND, N. Y.
August 22, 1964

Menace Or Scare?

For many years it has been standard political practice to stick a Communist label on any program the opposition favors. The old game still goes on,

as witness the current predicament of Mobilization for Youth.

We are all in favor of the investigation for two reasons: The public is always entitled to the facts, and, if the Reds are really trying to take the movement over, the sooner they are thrown out the better.

Let the probe go on, we say, to the bitter end. But meanwhile let us keep our shirts tightly buttoned.

There is no need to get excited because some of the staffers were affiliated in the 1930s and 1940s with organizations now designated as Commie-controlled or Commie-fronted.

There were so many organizations in those decades, each of them ostensibly designed to accomplish a necessary reform, that there is little wonder persons of generous impulse signed up without knowing what they were getting into.

Furthermore, in those years, many corrective movements were launched by non-Communists' only to be burrowed into and taken over by the Reds as time went on.

Certainly we want the Reds thrown out, or kept out, of Mobilization for Youth. At the same time, we want the movement analyzed at its real worth and real potential. We do not want to see a good idea beaten down because someone ties a Red tag on it, on the basis of guilt by association 20 and 30 years ago.

Attacks on Youth Agency

Charge of 'Communism' to Mask Opposition Assailed

TO THE EDITOR:

The current attacks on Mobilization for Youth, the Lower East Side agency set up to combat juvenile delinquency, confuse the issues and may confuse the public.

It is not improper to ask a public-supported agency to account for its acts to its public patrons. But it is misleading to suggest, as Council President Paul R. Screvane does repeatedly, that this agency has somehow failed to do so.

Mobilization is responsible to and under the scrutiny of three separate Federal departments, the City Administrator's office, a board of directors on which twenty city officials sit, and two quasi-public institutions—the Ford Foundation and the Columbia University School of Social Work. Very few tax-supported entities lead a more open life.

Nevertheless, if the Government wishes to investigate its own creation, it cannot be denied the right to do so. This is not to say, however, that public officials have the right to investigate for vindictive purposes, the purposes that seem operative in this situation.

Open Encouragement

Not deviously or accidentally, but openly and purposefully, Mobilization encourages local efforts to improve housing conditions, educational resources, occupational opportunities and the general welfare services of its area. Because local government is deeply implicated in the fortunes of a slum community, these efforts at times take the form of pressures exerted against City Hall.

But one would have supposed that if the City Fathers had wished to purchase popularity, they would have invested in a public relations project, not in a many-pronged assault on the conditions that breed delinquency. If the City Administration now places its own peace of mind above the chance of an ultimately peaceful community, it should say so—and put that preference to the electorate.

It would be legitimate to ask whether Mobilization's approach to community action (it offers facilities and moral support to lawful indigenous groups, but it does not determine their objectives) is altogether wise and effective.

On the one side, it may be argued that control is thus surrendered to a local citizenry that may not always be prudent and well informed. On the other side, it may be argued

that a more directed approach would not cure the cynical apathy that afflicts the inhabitants of such communities and that is remedied only when these inhabitants do things by and for themselves. This is a serious question, worthy of professional and political debate.

Technique Used

But it is dishonest to mask opposition to this program with charges of political disloyalty, and it is contemptible for the press to publicize these charges on the strength of minute and distorted evidence.

No one who has lived through the McCarthy period should have any trouble identifying the techniques being used: the application of the label "Communist" to those involved in a suspect organization twenty or thirty years ago; the assertion of a Communist "takeover" without proof that the small number of alleged subversives had any decisional authority; the calculated use of an unpopular name, like that of Jesse Gray, to squeeze the maximum adverse effect from a minimal and peripheral association.

It is too early to say that Mobilization has the answer to delinquency. But we may never be permitted to know, if public officials persist in attacking it for carrying out its mandate and newspapers continue to defame it with a meretricious hue and cry.

WALTER P. METZGER,
Associate Professor, American History, Columbia University.
New York, Sept. 2, 1964.

DOROTHY SCHIFF Editor-in-Chief and Publisher
JAMES A. WECHSLER Editorial Page Editor
PAUL SANN Executive Editor
ALVIN DAVIS Managing Editor

The New York Post is published six days weekly. It is owned by the New York Post Corporation, 75 West St., New York, N. Y. 10006. Dorothy Schiff, President and Treasurer; Sheldon L. Betens, Secretary.

Needed: A Sense of Proportion

Any young person who thinks the cause of racial justice or jobs for American youths can be advanced through communism is foolish and blind to the lessons of the past. All that he accomplishes by association with the Communists is to become a pawn in a worldwide power struggle between Russia and Red China.

It is equally true, however, that so long as there is racial injustice and economic deprivation, a small minority will have recourse to extremist programs. Given 100 years of neglect, apathy and active discrimination, the amazing thing is the failure of the various brands of communism to make more headway in the Negro community.

It may very well be that a few Communists have attached themselves to the Mobilization for Youth, but hardly enough, we suspect, to justify the screaming headlines of the Daily News or the initial jitteriness of City Hall.

We are all for an investigation. It will, we predict, uphold Winslow Carlton's contention that charges of a "leftist" takeover of this splendid on-the-job-training project have been "irresponsible."

Mr. Carlton and the other directors of the project, including James McCarthy, its administrator, are politically sophisticated men. They would no more lend themselves to promoting Communist influence than the directors of The News or the officials in City Hall.

A sense of proportion is needed.

The alternative to constructive social protest is the aimless violence of the race riot or gang warfare. Mobilization for Youth has encouraged young people to channel their frustrations and resentments into efforts to improve their neighborhoods. The approach is sound.

The Mobilization's facilities have been available to social action groups on the Lower East Side. They should remain so.

NEW YORK Amsterdam News



August 22, 1964

C. B. POWELL
President & Editor

P. M. H. SAVORY, Secy-Treas. - J. L. HICKS, Executive Editor
W. E. Best, Comptroller; K. A. Wall, Display Advertising Director; Warren Jackson, Circulation Manager; J. H. Walker, City Editor; J. W. Wade, Classified Advertising Manager; D. Sheppard, Brooklyn Manager, Dave Hepburn, Brooklyn Editorial Manager.

Published weekly by the Powell-Savory Corporation at 2340 Eighth Ave., N. Y. Telephone ACademy 2-7800. Brooklyn office, 1251 Bedford Avenue. Telephone ULster 7-2500

Who's Next?

First it was one daily newspaper jumping all over HARYOU and ACT and causing all sorts of repercussions uptown with the youth program and almost destroying it. (It still hasn't got its promised federal funds).

Now it is another daily which seems hellbent to destroy Mobilization for Youth, another non-profit agency which is engaged in the fight against social and economic causes of juvenile delinquency.

Why this concentration on agencies designed to combat poverty and the evils it brings?

Who's next? The Youth Board? Or should the Baptists watch their BYPU program?

The New York Times
NEW YORK, N. Y.

August 28, 1964

Seeing Red on Youth Aid

Last month President Johnson coupled an announcement of a \$1.5 million Federal grant to Mobilization for Youth, Inc., with a declaration that its program of job training for 2,000 out-of-school, out-of-work youngsters on New York's Lower East Side was one of the most promising antipoverty projects in the country. He assured the agency that it had his "deep interest and support." A similar expression of esteem came from Mayor Wagner.

This month, with the urgency of its goals undiminished and the nature of its approach unchanged, Mobilization for Youth finds itself under attack on a basis long familiar to agencies dealing with the problems of the poor. It is accused of being honeycombed with Reds—a charge for which the only substantiation thus far is a Federal Bureau of Investigation report that nine of its 300 staff members were members of the Communist party or of Communist-front organizations in the 1930's and 1940's.

The charges are being investigated as, of course, they should be. But the thinness of the evidence adduced up to now and the regularity with which such accusations have been made against administrators of home and work relief, unemployment insurance and every other newly established program for aiding New York's jobless argue against any overquick assumption that the youth agency does not deserve all the praise that was being heaped upon it so recently.

The bleakest aspect of the whole affair is that public officials who should be concerned with keeping the inquiry from wrecking public and staff confidence in the agency's essentiality seem much more concerned about divorcing themselves from potential political embarrassment. Representative William E. Miller, the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate, already has fastened on the charges as "very much a campaign issue."

This notice appears to be engendering a mild panic in both the Johnson Administration and City Hall, and the prospect is that some heads will roll, no matter how little the investigation turns up. Any program that aims at assisting the most deprived of our citizens is bound to generate some controversy. If panicky head-chopping is to be the answer to every attack, the entire antipoverty effort will soon run out of both vigor and leadership.

MFY IN PERSPECTIVE . . .

Mobilization for Youth is an action and research demonstration project on the Lower East Side of New York City. In conception, it is forerunner of the national anti-poverty program just now getting under way. It has already served as the model for demonstration programs in 15 other major cities, under the aegis of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

Mobilization's approach to the problems of delinquency and poverty stresses the importance of barriers to opportunity: opportunity to break out of the poverty cycle by becoming employable; opportunity to become employable through education; opportunity to become educable through services that enhance morale and motivation. In this framework, MFY developed programs which attempt to alter the circumstances of the poor and disenfranchised of our urban slums through work training, education, and social services. To date, its various programs have served well over 30,000 of the Lower East Side poor. Over 1,250 youth have been placed in work training or regular jobs, and approximately 700 served with job counseling; over 3,000 pupils reading below grade have been reached by remedial programs; 2,500 additional children in pre-school and kindergarten programs have been helped toward preventing future retardation; and thousands of the area residents have been given a wide range of services in local storefront centers to help them cope with the harrassments of slum life.

These are measures of Mobilization's impact on the Lower East Side community which it serves. Of perhaps more far reaching significance for the nation as a whole, however, is Mobilization's effort to structure its services so they they are accessible and meaningful for the impoverished, and to subject these services to systematic evaluation. Those served by MFY are approximately 70 per cent Negroes and Puerto Ricans, although these groups represent less than 36 per cent of the area's total population. This effort has required innovation and experimentation, both in the kinds of programs offered, and in professional practices. The success of many of these innovations remains to be determined, and Mobilization's outstanding contribution may be through its efforts to subject different action strategies to systematic research evaluation.

The nation is now mustering its public resources in efforts to solve the major social problems of poverty and discrimination. Yet we are sorely lacking in knowledge about the causes of these problems or effective solutions to them. It has become increasingly apparent that for our various "wars on poverty" to succeed, new techniques are required. The central task of Mobilization is in filling this gap by developing and testing experimental new strategies to cope with the blight of delinquency and poverty, strategies which may provide guidelines for social service in communities throughout the country.

MOBILIZATION FOR YOUTH
214 EAST SECOND STREET
NEW YORK 9, N. Y.

... I would hope that some of the many positive things which Mobilization for Youth has done could be spotlighted and recognized in much greater fashion than the few questions which invariably will cause us concern in a program of this size, working on such difficult and complex community problems ...

... As a former Board member of Mobilization for Youth I have been impressed with the seriousness, conscientiousness and dedication of the overwhelming majority of staff and board members ...

Whitney M. Young, Jr.
Executive Director
National Urban League, Inc.

... The right to organize, the right to petition, to criticize are the stuff of our American system of government. And every truly American leader has a solemn responsibility to give if need be his life to maintain these liberties. Mobilization for Youth then has acted in the finest tradition of American democracy. For this we ought truly to be grateful. And we ought hereto pledge our continuing support ...

Reverend Michael Allen
St. Marks Church-in-the-
Bouwerie

... We wholeheartedly endorse the concepts upon which Mobilization for Youth was founded. We enthusiastically support the goals and programs which it has fostered. Lawful, peaceful, legitimate demonstrations, such as rent strikes, boycotts and picketing are not only legal but they are traditional to the American democratic way of life. They are furthermore peaceful and positive alternatives to riots and disorder ...

The Board of the
Puerto Rican Forum

... There is a vital public interest in the competent administration of the public funds invested in the MFY program. But that public interest will not be vindicated by giving rumors and unsubstantiated charges the standing of responsible accusations, nor by reversing our traditions of presumed innocence and suspended judgment ...

... The greatest confusion arises from coupling subversive memberships with the actual conduct of unauthorized activity. The one legitimate inquiry which may bear upon the employability of present MFY staff members -- employees of an agency that is largely publicly financed -- is whether they have conducted themselves as required by the terms of their employment ...

New York Civil
Liberties Union

... We well know how easy it is for meritorious activity to be permanently crippled if real or alleged failings are magnified out of proportion and those in authority don't repeatedly and emphatically make their support plain.

... I urge that you take every reasonable opportunity to restate your basic support of Mobilization for Youth and of maximum freedom to express creativity in the quest of solutions to problems of our youth.

Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People

... When Mobilization for Youth was accepted for support by governmental agencies, it was hailed by civic leaders as well as members of the social work profession because it offered imaginative, new approaches for helping deprived persons in a deprived community.

... To place the entire program in jeopardy because of some real or alleged actions of an unpopular or even improper nature is a disservice to the entire city.

Mrs. Edith Alt, Chairman
NYC Chapter
National Assn. of Social Workers

... I believe that the inquiry presently being conducted should continue until the personnel of Mobilization is given a clean bill of health in order that the organization may continue with the programs which are laying the groundwork for similar community actions in other areas. I sincerely trust that this inquiry will in no way jeopardize its continued good work!

... It must not be forgotten that this is a pilot program and rough edges must be smoothed. The investigation should not be permitted to interfere with the good that the program can do.

... I have taken the floor on previous occasions on behalf of the program of Mobilization and expect that I shall do so again to publicize its achievements ...

Rep. Leonard Farbstein,
(19th C.D., N.Y.)

... What may have happened in respect of the agency should not in any way blind us to the good work which has been done, so we may have an assurance that the work may continue. The work is critically important in retraining youth for jobs, for which this agency has an extraordinary record ... indeed a much better record than can be shown in other instances under the Manpower and Retraining Act.

... By all means, we should not make the greatest mistake of hampering the agency, but, rather, our job should be to correct and revise in order to let this work continue ...

Sen. Jacob K. Kavits (N.Y.)

... The work done by Mobilization in our schools will in time reach far beyond the borders of the Lower Eastside. Already the Board of Education is interested in expanding on the fine work done in the field of education.

... I for one take off my hat to the entire staff of Mobilization for Youth and thank them for the fine work they have done so far.

Arthur Kugler, Chairman
Local School Board 1-2-3-4

... While the success of such undertakings may be difficult if not impossible to measure, yet there is no doubt in my mind that their effect on the people can be nothing but salutary.

Charles W. Tenney, Jr., Assoc. Dir.
National Council of
Juvenile Court Judges