

13. Participation of the Poor

The above-mentioned prevailing philosophy indicates that the poor are to be contained, pacified, and provided with services in order that they will not feel the need to make demands by forceful and disturbing collective actions. Policy states that the poor may participate as staff members, as clients, and as board members, but resident activity seems to reach its ultimate level only in their roles as Center employees. All community representative jobs and many of the clerical and supportive positions are filled by the poor from the Center area.

As previously discussed, the outreach of the Center I programs is considerable and the poor are being affected and that they are participating as clients in increasingly significant numbers.

Creative action and planning by the poor is non-existent at Center I and probably throughout the city. Advisory Council activity is limited to its nominal function—precisely that of giving advice, and it cannot even be assured that the Council is representative of the area residents; its members are not elected but merely appointed by the Center Director who, in reality, represents the composite CAA-city establishment. The poor are recipients of services and employees.

CENTER "J" (II)

14. Target Area

The second center in the city under study operates in an area with a population of almost 140,000 persons, three-quarters of whom are white and the balance Negro. Approximately four percent of the population is of Puerto Rican birth or parentage and almost a third are either foreign born or children of foreign born parents. Approximately nine percent of the labor force is unemployed and twenty percent of all families have incomes less than \$3,000 per year. This area is much more heterogenous than the predominately Negro area described in the previous section.

Center II is located at the edge of its target area in a manufacturing and business district with the homes of its residents located several miles away. The Center neighborhood including the building in which the Center is situated is old and dilapidated and despite renovation attempts is still ugly and run down. In contrast to Center I, there is little pleasant about the atmosphere.

15. Relationships With Other Organizations

Center II is to function as a coordinating and referral agent to many established community organizations and it appears that it is serving this function satisfactorily. Public agencies and churches appear to work in harmony with the Center. Among these groups there was only one strong dissenter—the Salvation Army, which feels that the Center is an absolute failure in its function, as a coordinator, and that its program has not even attempted to reach those who are most in need of their services—the alcoholics and skid row derelicts who number prominently in the Center II neighborhood. Businessmen and local merchants of the neighborhood view the Center with some alarm as it occasionally attracts a number of young people who loiter in the surrounding area outside the Center.

16. Center Programs

The primary role of all Centers in the city is that of a clearing house for service referrals to other agencies. Center II is no exception. Within the Center are located the following agencies: Association for Retarded Children, Welfare Council, and the Department of Public Aid. The Board of Education conducts Americanization classes and the State Employment Service offers a Youth Opportunity Center.

A Leisure Time program has been set up by the Center offering dance classes, cultural activities, grooming, and team sports. Homemaking classes, small business opportunities, and health programs are now offered to adults. To combat housing problems, the housing surveys are made to report building violations, vermin infestation, and lead poisoning. To appeal to the elderly, a Senior Citizens' Club has been formed.

It is apparent that a great deal of activity occurs at the Center and that programs aimed at almost every conceivable community need have been envisioned here. However, the actual implementation and effectiveness of these programs have drawn complaints from all sides. The Center Director complains of an impossible snarl of red tape in the directives from the CAA and the staff complains that they are not given enough time to put a program into operation before they