

that those programs which received "poor" and "fair" ratings did so because staff was poorly trained, supervised and directed. (This illustrates the need for professionally qualified supervision and a need for in-service training on an ongoing basis.)

The second question asked of Urban League executives was, "*What results have been achieved in relieving poverty in your community?*"

It is fair to say that the overwhelming proportion of 39 Urban League cities reporting believe that anti-poverty programs, even where they are extremely effective, have only scratched the surface. At the outset of the anti-poverty program in 1964, it was estimated that there were 32,000,000 people in this country. No one has definitive figures today on what the reduction in total poor may have been but it is obvious to all observers that in two-and-a-half years while a program that has been begun demonstrates a viable format for ultimate success, it must be greatly expanded if it is to truly eradicate poverty in this land. This is the message from both large and small communities.

For example:

(1) In Omaha, Nebraska, the Neighborhood Youth corps is effective but it reaches only 500 out of 5000 eligible adolescents.

(2) In Los Angeles, California, the Urban League executives reports that fighting the war on poverty gives one the feeling of "standing still while accomplishing something." In Los Angeles, the problem is greatly complicated by the constant influx of immigrants, so that while anti-poverty workers are aware of helping a significant number of individuals, the rate of increase in the total requiring help leaves them with the feeling of being "on a treadmill."

(3) In Cleveland, Ohio, the Urban League executive reports that "poverty is more acute" now than it was in 1964, which, in this case, is to say that the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" is widening. The average annual income for families in the Hough section of Cleveland is not only relatively less than it was five years ago but is actually less. Needless to say, the contrast between the circumstances of those living in Hough and those in surrounding communities is greater than ever in this affluent society.

(4) In Phoenix, Arizona, it is reported that the war on poverty has had only a "trivial" impact on income.

(5) San Francisco, California, reports only "minimal" results.

(6) In both Birmingham, Alabama, and Memphis, Tennessee, a mood of "too little, too late," is reported in relation to the magnitude of the problem.

Other cities report a feeling that the anti-poverty program is best summed up as demonstrating "more promise than performance." On the other hand, there is general satisfaction with MDTA and OJT programs, the latter of which are funded in given instances by either OEO or the Department of Labor, because they are seen as definitely relieving poverty. To a lesser degree, the employment of sub-professional workers is considered to be having an impact on income levels.

Other cities report that results achieved by the war on poverty depend on the nature of the agencies involved in the CAP program. For example, if there is more concern with riot prevention than with solving the problems of the poor, little real gain is to be expected. One city reports that while the education and manpower programs are very successful, the community organization effort has failed because of a riot-prevention approach.

Some cities, notably Warren, Dayton, Springfield and Columbus, all in Ohio, report an increase in employment and the impact of a variety of programs.

By contrast, cities like Cleveland, as noted feel that poverty has become more acute. In the Mid-Eastern Region, which includes Ohio, 33 percent of the 17 cities reporting feel that there have been no significant results in the war on poverty or that the results have been limited. Another 33 percent of the same 17 cities feel that the results are meager compared to the immensity of the need. As noted above, both Birmingham and Memphis reflect a mood of "too little" and "too late."

In sum, the reports indicate that the results achieved in relieving poverty, while notable in many cases, constitute only a beginning. Unless this nation is committed to an all out effort over an extended period of ten to fifteen years, at minimum, with top priorities established for anti-poverty programs, the war on poverty will not succeed. In fact, the results may well be disastrous beyond our worst expectations.

To arouse the hopes of the poor for an escape from poverty, to set in motion programs ostensibly designed to enhance their dignity, to create an experience