

Therefore it is not only important to create "open ended" jobs which have vertical mobility as is generally associated with business and industry—but also a horizontal mobility in the non-profit health and welfare sectors. The potential for employment is not only vast but an absolute necessity as the population increases but the private and public agencies are not financially able to "create" new career positions. I foresee a time when there will be housing aides, welfare aids and so forth. The technical and advanced training personnel will be used to coordinate, supervise and administer these new careerists. The need to define these service vocations into *functional parts* simply must be done: The educational gap is so severe that a whole new fresh and innovative design must come to be—and OEO is taking the first steps in this direction.

*Conclusions:* Finally CAPs must begin to define and refine its program goals. Shall it be primarily concerned with improving individual skills? (Job training) Shall it involve the poor for the purpose of increasing collective power? or Shall it be used as leverage to Produce change in existing social institutions?

In many communities, like ours, all three have been used at one time or another. Is its purpose to compromise or to confront? Shall it stress stability or innovation? Shall it emphasize quality, or quantity? I realize I have raised more questions than conclusions.

From my observations, the questions and choices revolve around funding and the expanding opportunities this will provide. Then, training, employment, strategy for social policy changes, education, housing, ability to negotiate, perseverance to stay with persistent social problems, accountability and innovative program development and coordination begins to become clear and possible. Even with the rural-urban differences, centralized planning is an absolute necessity in order to stimulate change and innovate experimental programs tailored to local needs. The long-entranced public and private agencies will not easily modify, expand or give up organizational self-protection to provide broader services and programs for the poor. Programs and projects must be funded for more than year to year. The "one-shot deal" is penny-wise and pound foolish. It must be for at least 2 or 3 years to have any impact and to avoid shrinkage. The inordinate time spent in writing yearly proposals and giving detailed accountability for every paper clip is too wasteful and to me reenforces the basic mistrust of the poor. It is also unreasonable to expect that Boards and Advisory Committees populated with the poor (as it should be) will have the financial resources, know-how and capability of raising funds for the increased non-federal share in the future.

Lastly, the local and national acknowledgement that criticism, unrest and controversy are signs of change, and change is never painless nor does it necessarily mean failure, must be made clear. In any experiment not all methods and goals will meet with equal success. However the ability to endure all failures and all successes creates the climate for equal opportunity for all. I am saddened however, when I realize that funding for programs are also subject to "long-hot-summer" pressures instead of cool reason and economic logic.

I've been quite generous with words and I trust this will give you some ideas of the meaning the "War-on-Poverty" has had in this locale.

Cordially,

Mrs. SIBYL B. SILVERMAN,

*President, National Council of Jewish Women, Dayton Section.*

P.S.—I must add two "after thoughts". One is that OEO has for the first time in U.S. Social History made a "contact" with the people, especially the poor directly, which is tangibly seen, experienced and in which they participate. All previous social legislation has gone through "State plans". This unique difference has done more for national identity than any other innovation I know. It is often missed as a point of support by legislators.

Secondly, and the other side of the same coin, is that for this locale, the "state technical services" are not significant. Perhaps in other rural areas it may be—but I find no "assistance" of importance. What has made OEO effective was that it by-passed the State and went directly to the local community. I do see some merit in regional CAA, especially those which encompass areas having common problems. However, combining urban and rural communities has major drawbacks, unless one is willing to finance mobile units and develop technical teams for "circuit riding" in the identification and delivery of the range of services.

S. B. S.