

1025

# ERAP NEWSLETTER

January 7, 1965

1100 E. Washington, Ann Arbor

## ERAP MEETING -- January 1-3

The ERAP meeting that followed the December National Council was delegated by the NC to plan for the expansion of community projects. The discussion, however, ranged the full gamut of "field" problems and created some new ones out of its own dynamic. There's no easy or clear way to summarize the meeting except to say that there was complete consensus about the difficulty of explaining to people who didn't attend the post-NC gathering its significance to the ERAP staff. The meeting produced an incredible "socialization" of people and the most honest and searching confrontation of our organizing work we have had. Rather than attempt the task of summarizing the debates and questions of the three days, this report lists the decisions of the Committee. Hopefully the issues raised by the meeting will not be lost but can be continued to be discussed in correspondence in the ERAP Newsletter.

1. New Projects: New projects were adopted in Boston, Cairo, Illinois, Cedar Heights, Maryland, Knoxville, Tennessee, San Francisco, New Brunswick, and Texas. However, a distinction was drawn between projects for which the ERAP Committee assumes full responsibility and projects which participate in ERAP meetings and add to the community dialogue but are not dependent on ERAP for funds and staff. New Projects for which ERAP assumes full responsibility are Boston (Dudley Street Action Center) and New Brunswick. Projects to be included in the "ERAP forum" are Cairo, Illinois (Freedom House), Cedar Heights, Maryland, Hazard, Knoxville, San Francisco (Freedom House), and Texas.

2. New Jersey Project: It was agreed that ERAP should emphasize regional organizational development in the state of New Jersey. This is not to mean that existing projects are to close down or that they are not to expand in order that new resources may be provided to New Jersey. It is to mean, however, that in publicity, new staff and finances New Jersey is to be emphasized. Projects are to determine for themselves what implications a New Jersey project has for their organizing plans. If any project decides to close down, it would be assumed that the staff released by such a move would go to New Jersey, if possible. If no such decision is made, all existing projects (Chicago, Cleveland, Newark, Philadelphia, Chester and Baltimore) will be fully supported in their work by ERAP.

3. Staff Allocation: No attempt was made to make staff allocation decisions in the meeting. It was agreed that Boston and New Brunswick particularly needed one new staff person and that every possible effort should be made to meet "minimal" staff needs in every project. The ERAP director is to consult with each project about staff needs and arrange for new staff members

so lasting 64 → 65  
Chicago  
Cleveland  
Newark  
Philly  
Baltimore  
Chester

SERIES 4A - NO. 8

File

## PREP REPORT

to travel to projects where decisions can be made.

4. Mid-West Concentration: There was considerable discussion of consolidation of projects in the mid-West, but no resolution was reached. It was felt that insufficient evidence existed for saying that either Chicago or Cleveland were "better" cities to work in. And it was equally unclear that ERAP could not potentially service both projects. It was agreed that no assumption should exist that either project should close but discussion of mid-West concentration or consolidation should continue, particularly among the staffs of the Chicago and Cleveland projects.

5. Appalachia: Several members of the staff argued strongly that ERAP should give serious consideration to organizing in Appalachia. It was agreed that financial help should be given to Bob Smiddie to work in Knoxville in order to determine how readily a viable organizing project could be established in that area. Some suggested that Rennie Davis and possibly others should consider Appalachia as an area in which to work. Most of the staff felt that work in Appalachia at this time was premature or out of the question for ERAP: that it would drain limited staff away from vitally important work in the North and that other organizations should develop a program in Appalachia. It was decided that Rennie and other staff members, if possible, should attend the AEPOC meeting, but that there should be no assumption that ERAP is planning any organizational drive in Appalachia.

6. Democracy: It was agreed that democracy is sometimes painful and that it comes slow, but that for those who wait, it is beautiful.

*C.C. Success*

The following is mainly a report on the actions of the recent SDS National Council meeting which bear on the activities of PREP. The meeting gave fairly explicit directions for PREP activity for the winter and spring. A set of the working papers that we prepared, including prospectuses for action on South Africa, on summer economic conversion projects, and on what is to be done in a Crisis, is available from PREP.

1. South Africa. The Council endorsed the South Africa demonstration, proposed for March 21, to commemorate the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre with a sit-in dramatizing American economic support of Apartheid. Todd Gitlin will take major responsibility for planning it, researching it, etc. Local people and groups interested in working on it should write him; those in the New York area should get in touch with Kissinger to help work out the New York angle of it.

2. Vietnam demonstration. A long debate (7 hours) took place on how to respond to the War in Vietnam. Various proposals were debated, including an I-will-not-fight-in-Vietnam pledge, before a consensus developed around a proposal for an Eastern demonstration in Washington. Three important questions had first to be thrashed out. These were the division of responsibility, the sponsorship, and the demonstration's position.

The decision on preparation for the demonstration placed major responsibility in the New York office, supplemented by the Baltimore, Swarthmore, and Harvard chapters and the PREP office.

A long debate took place on the implications of SDS being the sole sponsor of the demonstration, and whether this implied "red-baiting," and how a demonstration could be structured to allow for maximum participation and at the same time avoid hang-ups of organizational jealousies and other phenomena that often mark demonstrations. In the end, the national office was instructed to invite all other organizations to endorse the demonstration, but that SDS would take sole responsibility for it.

The draft resolution on Vietnam, prepared by Booth and Gitlin, was rejected by the NC, primarily because it was felt to be a needless attempt to formulate a precise organizational "Position". Instead, the demonstration is being called simply to put forward the demand of withdrawal, on the ground that the war is causing untold harm to the people of Vietnam, and is also damaging American democracy. The major function of the PREP office will be to turn out a variety of position papers and studies, both before and after the demonstration.

3. Conversion Projects. The consensus at the meeting was that conversion organizing should be dealt with as part of general community organizing strategy, and that priority be given to organizing around conversion in present ERAP project areas. This seems fully justified in view of the hard facts of the seriousness of organizing work, and the shortage of skilled personnel to do that work.

SERIES 4 A - NO 8

work. ▲

There are two major implications of this consensus:

A. For the summer, in addition to the Boston Project, conversion work should be concentrated in either Baltimore, Chicago, or New Jersey, or two or three of those sites. (Inasmuch as the San Francisco project is now associated with ERAP, it would imply that effort to set up a conversion project in the Bay Area would also be appropriate.)

B. For those areas like Seattle, Brooklyn, Denver and Long Island, for which conversion projects had been proposed (due to the heavy incidents of unemployment resulting from defense cutbacks), some kind of program around the issue, and short of full-scale organizing commitment, has to be developed.

In order to follow up on the summer project angle, PREP will enter into discussions with the ERAP projects to find out the extent to which those projects feel conversion should be worked in to their ongoing, year-round organizing program. A meeting of the PREP executive committee in early spring should make final decisions on where conversion project work will be done starting in the summer.

The more difficult task is in evolving conversion program. Part of that can be done around the nexus of an expanding Conversion Report; the Boston project's monthly newsletter is prepared to go national and needs local correspondents. Secondly, the chapters in defense-impacted areas can work fruitfully on the issue through discussions with unionists, politicians, etc., through setting up research projects in conjunction with faculty, through holding of small-scale conferences on the area's economic problems, and through a number of other projects that must be dreamed up and experimented with.

4. Staff Time. Gitlin, as before, will be primarily involved in working out the South Africa action, in assisting on the Vietnam action, and in developing educational materials on the Third World. Booth will now devote energy to travel to the areas with ERAP projects to discuss conversion organizing, and to the other defense-impacted to discuss conversion campus-programming. In addition, he will be doing general campus travel for SDS.

Lee Webb concerning a discussion Mike had with several activists in the National Farmers Organization; it attempts to answer the question of whether we should try to relate to their movement).

Dear Lee,

Here are my impressions of the National Farmers Organization meeting. I assume you are familiar with the basic NFO goal to sign up food-processors with a "collective bargaining contract", which would commit the processors to pay a predetermined price to all farmers in an assigned marketing area. They are attempting now to sign such contracts, with the proviso that they will not be activated until 60% of the processors have agreed to a contract. (It is unclear whether this means 60% of the total number of processors or, more meaningfully, processors handling 60% of the total volume).

The problem they say they are combating is low prices--largely a result of corporate farming-- which lead to low incomes and then to the sale of small farms (which in turn strengthens corporate farming). This basically describes part of what is understood as "the farm problem" (or at least one of them); this further describes what has been going on in one form or another throughout the whole country. The basic complaint which the two members we talked to made about government programs was that they were not really stopping the process. The two of them were both Farmers' Union members also, and I gather that many Wisconsin members of the NFO are also FU members, who, while in the latter role are behind all government aid programs for farmers, belong to the NFO because they feel the ultimate solution can only come thru collective action. (NFO members in view on gov't aid, I suspect, enables it to consist of a coalition of farmers who agree on little beside the need for independent, militant, trade-union type action as the means to solve the farm problem. There is room for big and small independent farmers alike--liberals and conservatives alike-- and they will on occasion argue that there is no real difference in interests between the small farmer and the large farmer. (The real enemy is the consumer who pays only 19% of his income on food, an unheard-of low figure. You should hear the horror in their voices when they throw that figure around).

Now, how does NFO seek to deal with this problem? They are attempting to sign up the independent processors on a collective bargaining contract; but, it should be noted, at a price considerably above existing prices. However, as I understand it, the independent processors themselves face problems in their selling market because of integrated farms (vertically integrated so that they both produce the goods and possess the outlets for the sale of processed goods). If non-integrated independent processors were to agree to the NFO demands, they would find themselves in a squeeze relative to the integrated units. When I suggested to them that a processor who signed with them might find himself in a disadvantageous competitive situation, one answered that if such were the case, the processors should get together to prevent disruptive competition. (They really mean it when they talk about trade-union style solutions).

On the question of technology, I asked if they weren't tilting at windmills; because even with an initial NFO contract, advancing technology more suited to large scale operations would tend to undermine the contract. Their answer set me back on my heels. There were not, they argued, (or at least were no longer) any real technological efficiencies of scale. Large corporate farms had benefited predominately from pecuniary efficiencies, the advantages of buying in bulk, etc. They went on to talk about lack of incentive for labor, the problem of collective farms, etc., and settled the question with a discussion of how rainfall provided the ultimate check to advancing scale. I feebly

SERIES 4 A NO 8

RE-OUT FROM BOSTON

Notes of Meeting on WATERTOWN ARSENAL CONVERSION PROJECT (At MIT, Wednesday evening, December 2, 1964)

retorted that even at the moment of discussion, someone was probably up late at the US Agric. Dept. figuring out an answer but the rainfall controversy prevailed and there was no point in really fighting it. The crux of their position is: technology is not the bane of the small farmer; corporate farms gain from efficiencies other than technological ones; and the farmers real problem is unequal market power (according to them the cooperatives, the first attempt at countervailing power, are inadequate because of bureaucracy and corruption). I suspect technology is far more potent than they can admit. They see a great future for the small farmer if he can only hold out for about ten years. Perhaps.

Any illusions we may have salvaged were dealt a deadly blow when the two NFO members deftly deflected the conversation into a discussion of a chocolate milk company (in which they happened to hold shares) which was having trouble obtaining dispensing machines and locations because of the Coca-Cola interests and it really was a wonderful drink if it could be given half a chance and was there anything we could do to help them in Madison. (This produced the subsequent suggestion that, "scratch an NFO member and you'll find a small businessman"). Another thing that bothered me was the suspicion that one of them (who had been an unsuccessful candidate on the Dem. party ticket) really thought he was meeting the Young-Dems and was thus furthering his career. Enough. I don't think it would be a fruitful use of productive resources for SDS to get much involved with the NFO.

Best,  
Mike Lebowitz

The meeting was convened at 8:15 by James Morey, who acted as chairman. Twenty-five persons were in attendance. Mr. Morey began with some background on the meeting. He mentioned that the proposal to convert the Arsenal to an Industrial Conversion Technology Center was originally conceived by the Arsenal employees and was included in a Brief to the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation, published in June, 1964. Based on previous research, Boston PREP saw the proposed Conversion Centers as being an effective step toward solving conversion problems. The project's major interest, therefore, is two-fold: (a) to assist in efforts directed toward converting the Arsenal to an activity in which the valuable facilities and personnel skills would continue to serve the industrial development of New England and the nation, and (b) to develop the concept of a Conversion Center as one alternative activity at the Arsenal to the point where an assessment could be made of its technical feasibility.

Most people present had already read the written summary description of Conversion Centers, so it was not necessary to go over it. Mr. Morey did comment on the two separate but related aspects of conversion: (a) converting facilities and men previously engaged in defense production to civilian production, and (b) converting defense inspired and other R&D knowledge to the development of new and improved civilian products, production processes, and services. The latter, therefore, can often provide the means of accomplishing the former. Reference was made to statements by Senator George McGovern and others in Congress concerning the competitive disadvantage being experienced in international trade by certain American industries, due to a lag in the technological updating of their manufacturing processes and products. Such lags have been attributed to the relatively heavier emphasis on military, rather than civilian-directed, R&D in the U.S.. Conversion Centers were seen as one way of correcting this imbalance by encouraging the application of military R&D knowledge to civilian industries.

It was contended that Conversion Centers, by working on new manufacturing process of general interest to whole industries, would serve as a means of stimulating (rather than usurping) the commercial development of new products.

Reference was made to the draft State-Federal Technical Service Act, to be presented by the Administration in the next session of Congress, which would set up an Industrial Extension Service, with special attention to making the results of military and space R&D available to private industry. It was noted that there is a much larger gap between basic knowledge and its application to industrial processes than to farming. Conversion Centers were advanced as a method of bridging that gap.

The role of new products in stimulating economic activity was mentioned, with the automobile and (more recently) television as dramatic examples. If Conversion Centers were successful in making it easier for private industry to develop new commercial products, the contribution to economic growth could be substantial.

Discussion then turned to the present capabilities, activities, and physical and personnel resources at the Arsenal. Major capabilities were described as development (materials processing, tooling, prototype equipments, etc.), product

SERIES 4.A - NO. 8

engineering, and quality-control testing in the engineering division and an extremely diversified machine shop operation and technically-advanced welding, foundry, forging, and metal-treating operations in the Industrial Division. Engineering work centers on mechanical devices, although electrical engineering is required, especially non-destructive product testing. The activities of the Engineering Division are distributed (very roughly) across: technical consulting to private contractors on product development and production processes (25%), technical supervision of private contractors (specifying the work, monitoring and evaluating it, etc.-- 25%), and pre-production development work for the Arsenal's Industrial Division (50%). It was pointed out that over the years the Arsenal has applied the results of the materials research division (now separately organized as the Army Materiel Research Agency, AMRA) in developing many new military products. The steps and skills required in such development were seen as basically the same whether the end-product was for military or civilian use.

Turning to the personnel resources, it was stated that around 110 personnel are now involved in Arsenal R&D (around 35 engineers, 35 technicians, and 40 administrative workers), while there are 115 scientists and engineers (excluding supervisors) in AMRA, the latter consisting largely of physicists, metallurgists, and mathematicians. Since AMRA is scheduled to continue operations at the Arsenal (or possibly nearby), it would represent one of many sources of R&D knowledge from which a Conversion Center could work. Due to present Arsenal skills in materials applications, however, one could expect such work to continue as an important activity in the future.

The large pool of highly skilled machinists, welders, and other craftsmen from the Industrial Division were seen as a major (and unique) personnel resource. At least 450 technicians in the Division would fall into the category of possessing a level and breadth of skill that is rare in most private industries and is apt to continue to be in short supply in the labor market in the future. The Arsenal Apprentices Program, and its role in supplying highly skilled machinists to private industry in New England, was described. Over a period of years it was felt that the absence of the Apprentices Program would have strong adverse effects on the industrial development of New England. Several hundred graduates of the program are scattered throughout New England industries.

The discussion turned from the size of the capital investment. Arsenal personnel present stated that the replacement cost of the facilities (excluding buildings) has been estimated as between \$110 and \$125 million. Operating costs run around \$25 million a year with \$18 million in payrolls. Current practice is to make surplus facilities available to the General Services Administration for transfer first to other government agencies; that under this procedure, the return realized from dismantling the Arsenal would amount to a small fraction of the replacement value.

Discussion of other alternative uses of the Arsenal ensued. Professor Kevin Lynch, who is chairman of the Watertown Planning Commission, said that a small (necessarily limited) study was being made by a consulting firm on alternative uses of the land, or the facilities, by the town, the state, or private industry. The possibility, for example, of developing a private industrial park in the present reservation will be considered. He said he considers the Watertown study to be complementary to an investigation of continued Federal use of the Arsenal for non-defense purposes, such as a Conversion Center. In fact, many combinations would be possible, such as a Conversion Center on part of the reservation with the remainder being a private industrial park, with many of the firms working closely with the adjacent Conversion Center. Other uses by the Federal government were suggested. Professor Michael Brower raised the possibility that the Arsenal and its skilled technicians be used as a large-scale Retraining Center for those skill areas most highly developed in the Arsenal and in shortest potential supply in the labor market. Such a Center could be operated by the State, the Federal government

use. At the same time, the total facilities and personnel skills seem to offer strong potential for several different and independent types of activities of considerable economic worth.

The most important conclusion of these discussions is that one should probably approach the Arsenal conversion pluralistically, trying to break down the total facilities into several "functionally complete and workable packages" whose conversion and future operation would be economical and which would serve separate and distinct purposes of several different elements of government and private industry. Individual "packages" might be the exclusive province of the federal government, of the state governments, jointly of the federal and state governments, of private businesses, and jointly of private business and government. The facilities required for each "package" would be centralized. This approach is fully compatible with making some portion of the Arsenal Reservation into a private industrial park. Underlying this approach is the strong conviction that merely dismantling and dispersing more than \$100 million worth (current replacement cost) of modern industrial facilities in the Arsenal could be an irreparable loss to the future industrial development of New England.

Now what might some of the packages be? One can (and we will) certainly suggest some possibilities, but a sound answer can only come from an appraisal made by the private industries and governmental agencies themselves. Such an appraisal would involve an attempt to match creatively the industries' and agencies' operational objectives with what the Arsenal has to offer in industrial potential. To dismantle the Arsenal without having at least made this kind of appraisal appears to take lightly the responsibility to conserve public assets.

Examples of possible workable and economic packages are the following:

- 1) A non-destructive testing laboratory, serving as a regional "Bureau of Standards," perhaps under government operation but with private industry paying for the value of specific services received. However, the operation of the lab could fall under any of several other auspices: a state authority, a non-profit corporation or institute, a private company with some support from government contracts, etc.
- 2) A metals technology center, specifically for developing industrial applications of basic R&D knowledge from the Army Materiel Research Agency and other government-sponsored (e.g. NBSA) research on new metals. This center might be one of a whole series operated by the government and directed toward rather specific aims (e.g. improved water supplies, power generation, urban transportation, etc.).
- 3) A retraining center for a few specific industrial skills in which the projected future demands of the New England labor market clearly differs from current sources of supply. The center might be operated by a state, a non-profit, or a private agency, possibly with support from the Federal poverty program or the Area Redevelopment Act, etc. In view of the Arsenal's possession of a large number of the most advanced numerically controlled machine tools, for example, a training center on the programming, operation and maintenance of such machines might fill an important need. The ability of private companies to acquire skills in the use of the machines before receiving their own automatic machines would allow important economies.
- 4) The present Arsenal foundry might be sold directly to private business for continued operation as part of a private industrial park.
- 5) The Arsenal's unique collection of heavy machine tools might be retained by

SERIES 4A - NO. 8

(Labor Department), or even a quasi-private corporation (as with CCNSAT). The Center might also be used (or shared) by the State Department in a program of skill training for persons from underdeveloped countries. It was pointed out that a Training/Retraining Center could be combined also with a Conversion Center, particularly because the maintenance of vital skills in the instructors (and passing them on to students) may well depend on a continuing opportunity to employ those skills creatively as part of an ongoing productive enterprise.

There was unanimous agreement in the meeting that no matter what the alternative, there was very little time in which to develop a specific conversion proposal and gain its adoption. This urgency comes from the fact that the personnel resources of the Arsenal, its most precious asset in combination with the associated facilities, are already in the process of dissipation and will soon be decimated beyond recall unless current phase-out plans are suspended or dove-tailed with the phase-in of a new, alternative operation at the Arsenal.

From the discussion it was felt that Mr. McNamara would not consider a suspension of the phase-out unless some other governmental agency (Federal or State) expressed an interest in initiating an alternative program involving the Arsenal facilities and personnel. It was agreed that steps should be initiated promptly to determine whether there was interest in one of the conversion alternatives on the part of any department of the Federal Government (Labor, Commerce, Welfare, State, etc.) or some State agency.

Mrs. Jerome Wiesner suggested that an immediate attempt be made to form a volunteer group of persons with sufficient technical knowledge (collectively) to make a rapid "independent audit" of the feasibility of using the Arsenal facilities and personnel for the different alternatives that have been suggested. Those in the meeting agreed to assist in contacting qualified individuals who might serve on this group, with Mr. Morey serving as a coordinator of the effort.

It was agreed that after a rapid preliminary investigation it would be necessary to settle on the single most favorable alternative use of the Arsenal and then push the further development of that proposal--campaigning for public and governmental support at the same time.

The signature sheet was passed around and attendees were asked to record the areas of further activity in which they would be interested in participating. One area was to serve on a Steering Group to guide the continuing effort of a Watertown Arsenal Conversion Project. It was agreed that the membership on the Steering Group would be resolved quickly and the group would meet early next week, Mr. Morey coordinating a time and place.

#### Notes Based on Post-Meeting Discussions

Some additional notions concerning the conversion of the Watertown Arsenal have come out of discussions following the M.I.T. meeting. These were individual talks particularly with Mrs. Jerome Wiesner of the Watertown League of Women Voters; Mr. George Cuker, based on his experience in production management at GE; Mr. Herbert Weiss, Vice-President of Kennedy's Inc.; and Prof. Michael Brover, MIT.

First of all, there seems to be some degree of consensus that the Arsenal facilities are just too diverse, represent too great a capital investment, and have too high an operating cost to be converted in toto to any single alternative

the federal government either on contracts from private industries or from government agencies.

The examples above are meant only to suggest the kinds of things that might be done, if some thought were put into the ventures by the proper people and agencies.

We were told at the M.I.T. meeting that at two government installations (one a supply depot in South Dakota) a federal order (presumably from the Defense Department) was obtained by the state prohibiting the dispositions of any of the installations' facilities until a determination had been made concerning their possible use by the state or private industries. It would appear that if such an order were obtained for the Arsenal, time would be available to plan alternative uses. This type of order would not deal with the continued loss of personnel who possess the high degree of skills required to operate the many different facilities within the Arsenal.

## NEWARK REPORT

### BEATING AT KLEINS: FOLLOW-UP

Klein's Dept. Store refused to meet with us. They say Clyde wasn't beaten in their store. So we leafletted the store last Saturday? We told people what happened to Clyde in Klein's and asked them not to shop in Klein's. The manager looked very disturbed about us being there.

The program committee voted Dec. 8th to hold up action against Klein's until we could contact various groups in Newark about Klein's. So far the following groups have been contacted: Negro-American Labor Council, Business Industrial Coordinating Committee, Jewish Community Council, Councilman Bernstein, CORE, Councilman Turner, NAACP, Human Rights Council of Newark, Deputy Mayor Reilly, Americans for Democratic Action (NJ), American Civil Liberties Union. Also letters went out to 10 Northern cities where we have friends asking them to put pressure on their Klein's stores.

The Hunterdon Block Branch met Thursday night, Dec. 10th and decided to take action on Klein's if enough people wanted to picket. They were afraid that if we waited until Tuesday it would be too late to help Clyde. Tuesday the 15th the program committee decided to demonstrate against Klein's.

### BOARD REFUSES TO SEE MRS. GRACE

On Tues., Dec. 10, Louise Patterson, Terry, Jesse Allen, and Phil Hutchings went with Mary Grace to a Board of Director's meeting at the Shugard Shelter. The purpose of the trip was to discover why Mrs. Grace, a NCUP member from Hillside, was fired from her job at the shelter in September and to find out why she has received no benefits of any type since October. However the Board refused to meet with the group and only wanted to see Mrs. Grace alone. When Mrs. Grace refused, Mr. Messini, the president of the Board said that there was nothing to discuss and that he didn't want to talk with any "outsiders" from any organization. *Planned Board*

The next day, Tom Hayden and Phil went to see Mrs. Grace's lawyer to find out the legal aspects of the case. There will be a meeting Sunday afternoon at the office in order to plan future action against Shugard and to carry out the orders of the Program Committee.

SERIES 4.A - NO. 8

*leaflet*

IF YOU LIVE IN THIS AREA, YOU'RE IN TROUBLE

YOU'RE IN TROUBLE FROM THE "BLIGHT", FROM "URBAN RENEWAL",  
FROM THE CITY'S PLAN TO CLEAN UP NEWARK!

WHY?

When urban renewal started tearing up the Central Ward, our people moved across Clinton Avenue into this neighborhood. That was fifteen years ago, and the neighborhood was beautiful! But as soon as we got here, landlords put the rents up on us. And when some of us tried to buy houses, we had to take short-term mortgages at high interest rates. Well, we paid the rents and took the mortgages, and what happened? The neighborhood ran down all around us, and we couldn't stop it! Real estate agencies kept buying houses! Absentee landlords just kept pushing up the rents--and never making repairs, let the buildings rot--just kept packing the people in and getting their money out. Soon houses are looking bad all over the neighborhood. City garbage collection drops off. Inspectors come in, once in a while, but the city doesn't make landlords repair--so rats, roaches, bad heat, rotten plumbing gets worse. And while the apartments deteriorate, the rents keep going up. Three years ago the City Council said the area was "blighted"; after that we didn't have a prayer! No landlord would make repairs--all the agencies and absentee landlords just held on to their buildings, squeezing out the rents and waiting for the city to come in and buy up. And now, after all they did to our neighborhood, they want to knock it down for URBAN RENEWAL! And if we move out the same thing will happen to the next neighborhood we go to! URBAN RENEWAL just keeps moving 'round Newark.

WHAT IS URBAN RENEWAL, AND HOW DOES IT WORK?

Urban renewal means changing a city, repairing some parts, replacing others. Urban renewal can be good or bad. For our neighborhood, it means trouble. But Newark doesn't have enough money to tear down our neighborhood all by itself. It needs help from the Federal Government. But to get Federal money Newark has to do a survey, and have hearings, and pass an act in the city council and the city planning board declaring our neighborhood "Blighted." (They've done that.) Then Newark has to make a plan for "renewing the area", get that plan approved by the city council and the Planning Board, and send it to Washington. After Washington approves the plan, the city asks Washington for money. When the city gets the money, it starts buying up houses and knocking them down and we have to move out.

WHAT DOES THE CITY PLAN FOR OUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

The city keeps changing its mind. But the latest plan says: from Bergen St. to Pershing Ave. and from Hawthorne to Avon, all houses and buildings will be torn down. From Pershing to Belmont, from West Pedde to Avon, all houses and some factories will be torn down. A new State highway, New Jersey 78, will plow through the area south of West Peddie and Hawthorne. A new city highway will slice right through the central ward, using the block between Belmont and Hillside. And what's left of our neighborhood will be "rehabilitated" (fixed up.)

10.3

THE CITY HAS BEEN TRYING TO "RENEW" OUR NEIGHBORHOOD; but the neighborhood people have been fighting back. On November 28, 1961, the city council declared our neighborhood "blighted", although many neighborhood people, led by the Clinton Hill Neighborhood Council, fought the "blight declaration" and asked the City Council to save, not tear down, our neighborhood. But the Board of Education build Belmont-Runyon school like a factory, so it could be turned into a factory after the houses were destroyed and new factories built. But before the city could do more, the Clinton Hill Neighborhood Council fought the city in the courts, trying to wipe out the "blight declaration." Finally, the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled that the "blight declaration" could stand, and the U.S. Supreme Court didn't find enough reasons to look at the case. So now the court fight is over and the city has the go ahead. Unless we fight, we'll be wiped out; the neighborhood's gotten worse since they put the "blight" on us in '61. If we don't fight, the City Council will approve the plans, send the plans to Washington, and get the money to butt up our houses and turn us out.

WHERE WILL WE GO?

The city guesses that 100,00 people at least will be forced to move because of urban renewal. More than 60,000 of those people will be non-white. Where will they go? The city says, into new or existing private housing and into public housing. Will the rents be cheaper? Will conditions be better? The city doesn't say. But we know. That's why we don't want to move, even to clean up Newark.

CAN WE SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

We can try. The fight isn't over, its just started. Sure our neighborhood's gotten much worse since the City passed the "blight declaration", but they haven't bought the bull-dozed any houses yet. The City Council still has to approve the plans to tear down our neighborhood. Councilman Lee Bernstein says he opposes both the "blight declaration", and the plans to tear down our neighborhood. Congressman Krebs and his recent opponent, Mr. Weiner, both told the City Council that they opposed the "blight declaration" and support us. If we can raise and organize our entire neighborhood, we can demand that the city council tear up their plans. We can show the City that we want improvement but not removal!

WILL WE GET ANY HELP?

We've already got support from Bernstein, Krebs, the Hospital workers, and others. Bayard Rustin, nationally-known civil rights leader, came to Newark, toured our neighborhood, and met with us in the project store. He promised to help us. Rustin said he'd get the other big civil rights leaders to come to Newark, speak at our meetings, walk the neighborhood and meet the press. Rustin said the whole country's watching Newark, to see if neighborhood people can win their fight to keep their homes and improve their neighborhood. But with all the outside help, it's still our fight.

DCN'T TEAR DOWN-----FIX UP

# BALTIMORE REPORT

(This report was taken from JOBS NOW, the newsletter of UNION FOR JOBS OR INCOME NOW)

## THE PROGRAM THEY WON'T LET THE PEOPLE SEE

The same gang of social workers and politicians who have been around for years, have suddenly discovered poverty in Baltimore. Not only that, but they say they are going to do something about it. They have drawn up a program called "Human Renewal" which is to be the local version of President Johnson's "War on Poverty."

From all we can learn about this program, however, it promises little more than a few new social workers and bureaucrats for this neighborhood. The money will not go to the people on Baltimore Street. Instead, it will go into the pockets of various bureaucrats and politicians. For example, the man who will direct the program will get \$30,000 a year, and his helper \$18,000. Scores of officials will be sent into the neighborhoods to administer educational programs which, it seems are supposed to "teach us how not to be poor." They ought to know how, all of them together will be making between \$2 and \$3 million a year. It is clear that as far as fighting poverty goes this program is a fraud. It seems the city is more interested in passing taxes that will hurt the poor more than anyone else, than it is in getting money into the hands of those who need it.

On top of all of this, they won't let the people see this program. For some reason, the Health and Welfare Council, where the "Human Renewal" program was drawn up, doesn't think the "poor" ought to know what it's all about. From the way they have suggested the program be set up, it seems they want to keep it under wraps until the whole pie has been sliced and passed out to boys downtown. Maybe they're afraid if they show the pie to the people, the people might want some too.

Some people in this neighborhood have decided to do something about this. A group of people from Baltimore Street and some members of U-JOIN are going down to the Health and Welfare Council and demand that the people be allowed to see a complete copy of the program. They will tell the Health and Welfare Council that the people want to have a say in this program and not just have it imposed upon them. And if, after the people in this neighborhood have seen the program and it is as bad as we have heard, we hope the people will tell these bureaucrats two things: 1) we want decent jobs and better wages and not more bureaucrats to tell us what to do; 2) we think the money proposed to fight poverty ought to go to those who need it.

SERIES 4 A - NO. 8