

gram, as well as the compelling logic and inherent social justice of this modest proposal, he should now have no difficulty in recognizing the appeal it will have not only to prospective beneficiaries, but to fair-minded, democratic voters in general. He will also recognize that insuring the civil right to a livelihood is inextricably bound up with protecting the civil rights of ethnic minorities, and the drive for each must be mutually supportive.

Social workers have here the ingredients for effective social action—a cause to which they can dedicate themselves without reserve—a friendly administrative atmosphere, opportune timing in relation to the beginning reduction in expenditures for armament, and the “seed corn” resources to get things started. The National Association of Social Workers is now a larger, more complex organization than many of us are used to being in or using. By the same token, it has the potential resources in finances and structure to serve as at least the “secondary mover” in the process of

obtaining favorable public consideration of this proposal.

The prime movers in social action to abolish the means test and establish the right to a livelihood as a constitutional guarantee must be the individual members of the association, who can instruct their chapter and national officers, representatives, and delegates in the association to declare that as a result of the war on poverty the social work profession is in a state of emergency. Social work's contribution to the waging of this war can be fixing the highest program priority and the greatest possible focus of association financial and personnel resources on winning the battle to abolish the means test and to guarantee a fair livelihood to all the people of the nation.

We are aware that substantial gains in human welfare that require expenditures of public funds are hard to come by, but, if social workers do not fight for them, who will? And, if someone else does and we do not, then what are we?