

be indicative of not quite so much faith in the police among some of the citizens in Newark as the detective would indicate.

That is a tragedy. That is something which none of the gentleman before us I believe to be responsible for.

In conclusion, I thank them again and restate my conviction that there has been nothing here to indicate any participation by the poverty workers in the dissension and the actual rioting in Newark.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the testimony and the discussions we have had in the past few days in this committee have been characterized by efforts to prove that the poverty program is "responsible for the riots" and the argument to back up this contention rests on one very simple premise.

That argument seems to me to be summed up in the view that the poverty program stirs up the poor, that it makes them aware of their poverty by making them aware of their hopes for breaking out of it; that it encourages them to vote, and encourages them to criticize public officials; that the poverty program says to the poor, "This community belongs to you as well as to the bank presidents and the editors, and you have as much right as they to demand change in it." The argument then goes on to suggest that once you break this news to the poor, it is only a short step down the road to a riot. Once you tell the poor, the argument implies, that they, too, are human beings and full members of a community you are, in effect, encouraging them to make violent change, because, we are told, the community has no intention of allowing change under any other stimulus.

Mr. Chairman, by this same reasoning, the Christian Gospel and the Constitution of the United States are "dangerous, inflammatory documents." If bringing hope to the hopeless and freedom to those who have for years been locked in prisons of poverty and discrimination are conducive to riots and violence, then this country is sick indeed. If keeping the promises of the Constitution and spreading the good news of human equality were revolutionary, then I would say hooray for the revolution.

Mr. Chairman, this hearing has proven one thing to me beyond any doubt, that the poverty workers—paid and unpaid—may in fact be a stronger defense against violent revolution than those who want to abolish the poverty program in order to avoid "making the natives restless."

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to thank the gentlemen for the contribution they have made here today and I am very pleased that I was among those who called yesterday for them to be given a chance to appear before this committee today.

I am not sure if we were in a court of law that one would conclude decisively that they have made any case here that OEO personnel either precipitated the rioting in Newark or participated in it but this is one of the things which our staff, when the staff report is brought before us, will certainly help us to conclude.

I think what these gentlemen have demonstrated here today by their testimony is the extent to which local responsible elected officials lose control of a program like this.

Mr. Shriver has sent out directive after directive calling upon the immediate dismissal of people employed under the poverty program