

myself from the report as released, and submit herewith this minority report, upon the ground that I do not agree with many of the assumptions stated in the report, nor do I agree with the recommendations or conclusions contained in the report.

Perhaps my view can be best understood by reflecting some of the areas in which I am in disagreement with the report.

The preface of the report suggests that poverty is " * * * a state of mind * * * an abstraction * * * an idea * * *" I cannot accept this thesis. To me, poverty is a reality which is much more accurately described in the Annual Report, 1965, of the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity, as submitted to Governor Richard J. Hughes by John C. Bullitt, the Director, in which he stated:

"Poverty in New Jersey has many faces. It is a mother with six children living in one small room with no heat or running water—and therefore no toilets; it is a man who hasn't held a job in three years; it is an eighteen year old who doesn't know how to give change for a one dollar bill; it is the young mother sitting up at night with a broom handle to keep the rats from biting her children; it is a middle-aged couple who can neither read nor write; it is a child with rickets; it is a sense of hopelessness and alienation and despair."

Representing the people of the Central Ward of Newark I know that this reflects poverty as it is in our community. These are the problems of my people.

I agree with the fundamental principles expressed in the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964":

"The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty . . . by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity."

I agree with the basic philosophy of the United Community Corporation as reflected in the words of Dean Willard Heckel, President of the UCC, when he appeared at the first hearing of the committee and stated the belief of UCC to be:

" * * * the right of the poor to participate in Anti-Poverty Programs, not only as recipients of a service, but as program developers, employees, and policy makers."

I endorse the concept that the War on Poverty must be waged by a total community effort which should include the poor, the elected city officials, the heads of appropriate city departments, and community people representative of all forces in the community. It is my belief that no ally can or should be overlooked. Indispensable to any community action program is that portion of Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act which defines a "Community Action Program" as one,

" * * * which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served * * *"

Based upon the foregoing, I cannot agree with that portion of the report which urges that the Mayor and Council should "exercise substantial administrative and financial control over the community action agencies." That kind of a conclusion rejects the poor as participants in the development and administration of programs, is contrary to the basic philosophy of the Economic Opportunity Act and the United Community Corporation by rejecting the War on Poverty as a total community efforts and substituting for it an effort to be *controlled* by political leaders. I believe we as political leaders have a right and a duty to share in the direction of the War on Poverty, but I reject the thesis that we alone are to control it.

The report attacks Mr. Cyril D. Tyson, the Executive Director of UCC as having "singular and exclusive control . . . detrimental to the best interest of the community", and whose status is conceived of as "autocratic."

Tyson is a highly skilled technician, imaginative and creative and a man of substantial experience and training in dealing with problems of poverty. Many of the approaches he evolved in his experiences in New York City in developing the Hargou Program found their way into the concepts enunciated in the Economic Opportunity Act. Based upon his outstanding records and experience, he was selected as the best man to head the Newark program. Further evidence of his outstanding qualities as a technician and leader in the War on Poverty is reflected by his designation by the Mayor-elect of New York to participate as a volunteer with leading figures from all over the country to help New York review its