

never seen a book. They had no idea, no comprehension at all of how you could take a piece of paper with some marks on it and get anything of value from it. In fact, they didn't even have any idea of why you should try to get anything of value. So, when she came to school, as some children coming from disadvantaged homes, she came into a totally strange world, a world she could not comprehend and a world she did not already know something about. I am satisfied, like so many coming from disadvantaged areas, that this little girl, unless she gets some kind of special attention, will simply go through two or three more grades of that strange world, failing to grasp the opportunities, failing to get anything out of it, and ultimately drop out, and ultimately because of dropping out and because of failing to understand, in her turn to become not a child of poverty but in her turn a parent of poverty.

So it was in that cycle of poverty, children caught up by these many disadvantages, that we wanted to try to break. We analyzed a couple of years ago what we called the dimensions of poverty in North Carolina. They are somewhat like the dimensions of poverty across the Nation, except they are worse. We took the figure—because I don't know how to measure poverty and I don't know whether poverty is 18 percent or 27 percent or 12 percent; but it does not make any difference which percentage you use, there is far too much of it, and there is something there to be done. In measuring poverty and trying to find out what we are talking about, we discovered—no new discovery; but as we attempted to define it, it came out this way—that these were multiproblems; there was no cycle problem, and therefore no single solution. And therefore anything we did would have to be done in a comprehensive way. These were the people of disadvantage, deprivation, disability, and people who lacked education and lacked skills and therefore had unsteady employment or unemployment, or low income.

For the most part they were people who lived in crowded, dilapidated housing; their physical health, many times, was poor; and all together they were caught up in a web of interwoven disadvantage.

Then we attempted to measure it by dollars, because this indicates one criteria, not necessarily the only and not necessarily always reliable, but a pretty good indication. First, we took the \$4,000 family income figure which was set by the Conference on Economic Progress as being the level below which you could consider a family living in conditions of disadvantage of poverty. We found that 50 percent of the families of North Carolina fell in that category, which amounts to about \$75 a week for a family, and we felt maybe that a more realistic measure would be to reduce that to \$3,000, because the costs were not all that they should be or are in other places.

We took the \$3,000 figure and found that 37 percent of our people were living on some \$58 a week. When you start trying to divide \$58 among the needs of a family, of parents and the children, it does not go very far. Then, just to see what our problem was, we took the figure of \$2,000 as an annual family income, and found that 24 percent of our people fell into this category; and I think that is about \$39 a week.

Then, to move it down one notch, we measured it at a thousand dollars, and found that 11 percent of our people fell in this category, and