

**NEW YORK CITY CONFERENCE  
ON COMMUNITY ACTION**



*November 20, 21, 1967*

**CONFERENCE**

---

**REPORT**

---

**NEW YORK CITY  
CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION  
REPORT**

*November 20, 21, 1967*

**Sponsored by  
CITY OF NEW YORK COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

**In Cooperation With  
BROTHERHOOD-IN-ACTION**

---

**CONFERENCE COMMITTEE  
FOR THE  
CITY OF NEW YORK  
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

**William H. Booth, *Chairman***

**Ramon E. Rivera, *Executive Director***

**Thomas H. Allen, *Director of Public Relations  
and Information***

**Joel W. Barkan, *Conference Coordinator***

**Mrs. Jimi H. Rodriguez, *Conference Coordinator***

**FOR BROTHERHOOD-IN-ACTION**

**Norman H. Perlstein, *Executive Director***

**Miss Ellen Leavy, *Conference Coordinator***

---

## PANEL CO-CHAIRMEN

Peter Lee Abeles  
*Mobilization for Youth*  
Saturno Diaz  
*Hunts Point Community  
Progress Center*  
Gilberto Gerena-Valentin  
*City Commission on  
Human Rights*  
Dr. David Haber  
*American Jewish Congress*  
Roy Innis  
*Harlem CORE*  
Ralph D. King  
*National Conference of  
Christians and Jews*  
Gloria Manago  
*National Association for the  
Advancement of Colored People*  
Arthur Marcus  
*Office of Brooklyn  
Borough President*  
Charles Moerdler  
*American Jewish Congress*

James D. Norton  
*Community Relations Service  
of the United States  
Department of Justice*  
Harriett Pickens  
*City Commission on  
Human Rights*  
Angel Rivera  
*New York City Youth Board*  
Lucille Rose  
*National Association for the  
Advancement of Colored People*  
Anne Shore  
*Local 1199, Drug & Hospital  
Employees Union*  
Muriel Silverberg  
*Operation Open City*  
Peter J. Strauss  
*American Jewish Committee*  
Arthur Wright  
*Catholic Interracial Council*

## Foreword

This report contains the complete, un-edited, un-varnished reports of the various work-shops of the November 20-21 Conference on Community Action.

Some of the recommendations for action are laudatory of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, some are damning of the Commission, some are laudatory and/or damning of other government and private agencies, some are mild, weak, or inconsistent, while others are strong, radical or worthy of consideration.

The sponsors of the conference did not exert any influence over the participants and do not hereby express any judgment on the recommendations; we present them for the consideration and action of interested agencies and individuals. The New York City Commission on Human Rights will consider all recommendations and will announce any action determined appropriate.

WILLIAM H. BOOTH  
*Chairman*

---

## **NEW YORK CITY CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION**

### **Conference Call, *November 20, 1967***

Leading spokesmen from every phase of New York City community life have been invited to join in seeking solutions to the urban dilemma which grips our great city. Those convening are committed to two basic principles: (1) that a crisis in our city does exist and (2) immediate steps must be taken to alleviate these stifling conditions.

The major thrust of the conference, therefore, is to seek solutions. Whether we label the situations, "racial discrimination," "class and caste distinction" or merely "a sick society," the essential subject matter—the afflicted persons—remains the same. The sordid history of oppression and deprivation are all too familiar to the conference delegates. Explanations of how and why the urban center has failed in responding to the needs of its citizens are not foreign. Affirmative action is thus the call of the day.

On May 3-5, 1967, the National Conference on Community Values and Conflict was held at the Brotherhood-in-Action center in New York City. The conference was called by Commissioner William H. Booth, Chairman of the City of New York Commission on Human Rights, and was sponsored by the Commission, the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence of Brandeis University and Brotherhood-In-Action. The Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice cooperated in the endeavor.

The purpose of the conference was to provide a forum in which representatives from the black ghettos of large, northern cities could meet with members of city administrations, civil rights representatives and concerned members of other organizations in a dialogue directed toward the solution of problems of racial injustice and tension.

A consensus was reached by the conference participants on conditions in urban ghettos that have led to dissatisfaction and protest. Among them were: a) poor and inadequate housing b) economic exploitation: underemployment, unemployment and employment under intolerable conditions; c)

inferior education; d) inadequate health and welfare services; e) inadequate recreational facilities and programs; f) inequities in law enforcement; g) police brutality; h) unfair treatment by the media of communication; i) inadequate economic measures affecting such areas as the general level of unemployment, social security, minimum wages and welfare; and j) disparities in municipal services in ghettos compared with other sections of the cities.

It was not the specific function of the conference to arrive at recommendations for action; however several proposals in the area of employment, poverty programs, city services, and police relations were projected. These are outlined in detail in the conference report to be released at the November 20, 21 New York City Conference on Community Action.

One most important recommendation did emanate from the three day conclave. The participants agreed that other conferences of this type should be held at the national level and in communities across the country. The New York City Conference on Community Action is a direct outgrowth of this suggestion.

The City of New York Commission on Human Rights, in cooperation with Brotherhood-in-Action, organized this conference to carry forth the objectives of last spring's meeting—to translate the hopeful dialogue into constructive action.

Thus, a cross-section of New York City's leadership will convene in an atmosphere of optimistic forward movement. Representatives of local government, clergy, business, labor, private and public agencies, meet to seek needed answers to the paramount issue. With them are those who best know the problem: the victims of ghetto life.

The conferees will participate on respective panels which will explore six major subject areas affecting the ghetto citizen: education, housing, welfare, employment, police and community relations and politics (voter registration, voter education, etc.). Within the framework of the panel deliberations, five potent and all-encompassing themes will be focused upon: 1) the instrumentalities of protest available to aggrieved ghetto residents 2) a thorough discussion of relevant issues in local race relations 3) the recommendation of specific legislation at the federal, state and especially local levels to legalize some effective instrumentalities of protest 4) the establishment of permanent mechanisms of negotiation between city hall and the ghetto communities and 5) the opening of lines of communication and information between the ghetto and the larger society.

## Keynote Address

Bayard Rustin, Executive Director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, served as the conference keynote speaker at the opening session on Monday, November 20th. The noted civil rights leader, in his remarks, offered several searching proposals which were well received by the conferees. Following are excerpts from Mr. Rustin's expressions.

- The Negro and Puerto Rican Community are not receiving available anti-poverty monies which are already appropriated. This must be rectified immediately.
- Ghetto dwellers do not exercise genuine political power. Minority citizens must play a vital role in the on-going political structure.
- Local economic programs which dramatically aid the poor must be implemented on a broad scale.
- The government must take the responsibility to educate the ghetto community. While all segments of the private sector must assist in this task, they cannot supplant the role of government.
- The concept of the "G.I. Bill of Rights" must be extended to all deprived minorities. The "head" of the family should be the principal beneficiary of this concept in order to stabilize the family structure.
- The ghetto communities cannot go it alone. They have the prime responsibility for rebuilding, but there must be constructive alliances with the dominant forces of society.

## **Recommended Action: Education**

### **Panel Number One**

The panel was almost evenly divided between community organization representatives and Board of Education personnel. School representatives were teachers, administrators, UFT representatives, guidance counselors, and human relations personnel.

There was immediate agreement that a crisis in education in New York City does exist, that education is a necessity. "If you can't read, you're not educated; if you are not educated, you cannot get a job because there are not that many jobs left requiring only muscle power as it was in the days of the early immigrants coming to our shores." Also expressed was the feeling that the black child is being shortchanged in education whether he attends school in the ghetto or outside the ghetto, and that all children in NYC, black and white are not being educated. Less children in the ghetto are getting an education that will help them fit into the mainstream of life.

In grappling with the causative factors involved in this crisis, the first item thrown on the table was the attitudes the child brings to school and to learning, attitudes of the parents, and the attitudes of the teachers and administrators. Parent's feelings that their child will not "make out so good" in a particular school is later reinforced when the child does fail. The teaching of values irrelevant to the child's environment is also a mitigating factor. There was also some discussion of the gaps in learning that occur before the ghetto child enters school, and the possible solutions to this. One panelist felt the home is a destructive force, and that all children, black and white, should be removed from the home by age 2½. The general consensus of opinion however, was that the Headstart or pre-school programs might have the answer. There was also concern expressed over the follow-through or lack of follow-through into the next grades of the gains made in Headstart.

Complaints made by the parents to community organizations were also "laid on the table"—too few identifiable images for the black child in school (paucity of minority group teachers and administrators), the need for the educators to learn a new way of teaching, and the feeling that there were too many incompetents in the field. Much emphasis was put on the changing role of the teacher and the changing role of the parents as this role relates to the school. Heretofore, the parents in the ghetto were excluded. Now they want involvement, and their expectation of teachers is also different and higher.

The educators in the panel also took a serious look at the causative factors, at the structure within which they must function that mitigates against them, as well as taking a soul-searching look at their own profession

and its weaknesses.

Listed at the top was the need for better preparation of teachers-in-training at the university level. There was concern about inadequate materials, teaching tools, and inadequate curriculum. Problem areas are reading, writing and arithmetic—and not just with ghetto youth—75% of our children in the city are underachievers; their resources are not being developed. Gone from teaching is the attempt to instill the love of learning.

There was also the feeling that teachers and others in the school system are overwhelmed with too much to do—especially as it pertains to paperwork and other non-teaching duties. Teachers need time to be creative, and in some, creativity has to be developed. Teachers are concerned that they have no status, that they are as much the victims of the system as the children, and when some attempt to be innovative, they are met with the phrase, “Don’t make waves.”

Lack of involvement of school staff in new, innovative programs was also highlighted because it was felt that this lack caused teachers “to get their back up.” A solution offered was involving the teachers and making them a part of this new learning process, and if necessary, establishing in-service training courses to help the teachers work through their feelings. In this way, teachers would not feel that they are “thrown in and left to sink.”

One administrator felt that the teachers are at the breaking point, need the support of other teachers in close proximity (four teachers to the classroom), and that teachers themselves needed psychological services. Others felt that four teachers to the classroom was too expensive and not necessary, and that more involvement of the paraprofessionals would ease some of the clerical strain on the teachers. Clerical work should be done outside the classroom so as to not divert teachers attention. Career paraprofessionals could eventually help in easing teacher shortage.

There was a lively discussion all around of the attitudes that teachers and administrators bring to the teaching of the minority child and how these attitudes are related to the present crisis. It was generally felt that the principal sets the tone and attitudes in his school. If he has lowered expectations of the minority child, so will his teachers.

In a continuing discussion of the lowered expectations of some teachers and administrators, one educator expressed the feeling that many children from the ghetto are not as disadvantaged as has been perceived by the teaching profession. There are just as many parents in the ghetto who are interested in their children, who feel that education is important, and who *want* an education for their children. Teachers must accept the fact that many children in the ghetto *do* come to school ready to learn, but are held back by

the prolonged readiness program. "The child is in the fifth grade and we are still getting him ready to read."

There was a heated discussion of the difference between the ghetto school and the school in the middle-class area with the insistence by one panel member that the ghetto youth does speak a different language, that the principal therefore finds himself in an incomprehensible situation, and therefore begins to feel there is something wrong with the children and with the neighborhood.

This panel member, as did one other, questioned whether the answer might not be black teachers for black children in the black communities. The unanimous feeling of all other members of the panel was that a greater number of minority teachers was needed in the schools, but that the concept of black teachers only for black children (and thus white teachers only for white children) was not the answer. Also, that competency of teachers and administrators are what all communities are interested in and are demanding.

This led to a discussion of the difference in teacher attitudes that occurs when a teacher moves from the ghetto school to the school in the middle-class area, and one educator verbalized that the attitude improved because sociological factors were not used as a "cop-out" by the teacher. "In the middle-class area, the teacher does not teach less because the child's mother was out the night before. Teachers must stop basing their concepts on geographic locations." Another comment, "a competent teacher can teach in any area to any person. Teachers who succeed know they are there to teach—to elevate; that is what education is all about."

There was discussion too on courses that teachers take on understanding the Negro child. "You are overwhelmed with the amount of difficulties the Negro child has to compensate for and teachers' expectations are lowered. We begin to feel that if we save one, we've done a lot."

In grappling with finding solutions, the panel found there were no easy, one-step solutions. There is a definite need for structural changes, and a reconsideration of educational values. There must be the inclusion of Negro history (and other minority group history) where it belongs in the curriculum and not in a separate booklet. Learning (and textbooks and curriculum) must be made relevant to the child's life experiences. Relevancy is also important in the selection of staff and in setting up of schools. Teachers raising their expectations of the minority child, adopting the attitude "I'm going to teach him to read," and in-service training courses in group dynamics for teachers and administrators, as well as human relations courses for administrators would bring forth more positive results than we have yet seen.

There must be recognition of the fact that we are in the midst of a social revolution and that the whole role of the minority community is changing. Minority people want to communicate, and only communication can bridge the gap between the school and the parents.

The panel found itself constantly coming back to the need for communication and at one point, realized that the same words did not have the same meaning for all. It was therefore felt that when avenues of communication are set up between the school and the community, the educators must become aware that communication is a two-way street; it is a talking *with* parents rather than a talking *to* parents, and it involves very careful *listening* to the message that the community's words convey.

In a lively discussion of the Bundy Report, the Panel agreed that there is immediate need to move toward a change in the school system. The Panel saw the Bundy Report as a step in that direction. However, the Panel saw certain limitations in the plan and made the following recommendations:

I—There should be consideration of other plans or modifications of the Bundy plan to fit the special needs of various communities.

II—Although most felt that the board in the individual districts should be established through direct election by the inhabitants of the area, in further discussion it was recognized that this could work to the detriment of minority groups in predominantly white, hostile areas, and some other alternative would have to be worked out to protect the interests of the minority groups.

III—That all powers in the Bundy Report, not specifically delegated to the Central Committee, fall within or under the powers of the local boards.

## MINORITY REPORT

A minority report follows, not because of a difference of opinion, but because in error, two points of information discussed had not been included in the summation. The first point is that regarding the Bundy Report, all panel participants (with the exception of one) were speaking as individuals and not expressing the viewpoint of the groups they represented.

The second point was the panel's strong feeling of the need for furtherance of the paraprofessional program as a clerical aid for teachers as well as the paraprofessionals becoming a possible means of easing the teacher shortage within about five years. The panel felt this program deserves consideration and support.

## Panel Number Two

### **A. Decentralization of the New York City school system along the general lines of the Bundy Report**

1. That curriculum and personnel be determined by local community boards with the assistance of their staffs including local supervisors appointed by such boards, subject to minimum state standards reasonably supervised and enforced.

2. That such local boards be selected by a process consisting in part of election and in part of screening and appointment, so as to assure full representation of parents and others in the community and so as to guarantee a fair ethnic representation.

3. That district lines be drawn preferably by new transition agency in such a way as to maximize integration.

4. That the central board (similar to the present Board of Education) help enforce integration and retain special powers to encourage integration such as the creation of educational parks. Zoning within districts should be carried out by the local boards in such a way as to maximize integration.

5. That the local boards be empowered to provide for a meaningful recreational program including meaningful vacations for the students in the poverty areas. The work of the local boards shall be coordinated with that of other city agencies and private agencies in the community so as to help foster a total student environment conducive to sound education. Such coordination should cover areas of housing, employment, health and welfare and recreation.

6. That local boards undertake imaginative, experimental, educational programs to meet the special educational needs encountered in the local community.

7. That wherever greater economy and efficiency will result from such utilization, the local board may utilize the central educational agency as a service agency.

### **B. Funds for Education of Disadvantaged Children**

1. That vast additional funds be spent for education in the ghetto areas along lines recently suggested by the Board of Regents.

2. That additional federal funds be made available in poverty areas. Preferably all federal aid to education funds should be allocated directly to local school boards under a decentralization plan. The funds should be only to such local boards that have jurisdiction over a geographical poverty area. Such funds should only be used for programs in the public schools or other programs directly administered by the local school board.

### **C. Personnel Training**

The qualification and training of teachers should include special skills for dealing with the educational problems encountered in the community in which the teachers teach. To achieve such competence, the panel suggests the following:

1. Practical training in dealing with general problems in the community.

2. Practical teacher training in the schools of the local community.

3. Inservice training to continue Recommendation #1.

4. That special training programs be offered by colleges in New York City to train teachers to deal with the special educational problems of the local community in which they serve.

5. That in order to make the results of their teacher training program more effective, such colleges should also offer special courses to persons other than teachers including parents concerned with educational problems of the community.

## **Recommended Action: Housing Panel Number One**

### **A. Recommendations in Respect to Publicly Aided Housing**

The housing panel noted with urgent concern the existing and established practice of discrimination, both overt and covert in publicly aided housing programs and to the end of abolishing such discrimination recommends the following:

1. That New York City clearly and publicly state its housing policy including its racial and economic objectives in respect to all publicly aided housing, on an annual basis in order that all citizens and groups understand and can comment on the housing goals intended for housing created through governmental aid.

2. In order to effectively implement the goals of integration and equality in all publicly aided housing, all units in such housing should be made available to every citizen of this community on an equal basis through an independent housing tenancy agency.

3. That the city develop a policy for effectively ending economic segregation and discrimination in all publicly aided housing for families which require assistance in housing from every economic sector. Dwelling units in the housing produced through different projects should be made available to all citizens under a sliding scale of rents as opposed to the current segregation of groups through rent limitations.

4. That the Housing Tenancy Agency have as a review body, an independent group of citizens who shall review the program of the agency in light of its accomplishments and measure against the stated public housing goals of the city. In addition, that this review body of citizens shall have the power to change the policies of the Housing Tenancy Agency, where necessary.

### **B. Recommendations Concerned with Discrimination in Privately Owned Housing**

The housing panel noted the absence of any real and substantial progress in the elimination of discrimination in privately owned housing. A first cause is the racism and discrimination by both the private owners and operators of housing and the public officials who are responsible for the operation and use of such housing and the lack of effectiveness, absence of sufficient funds, staff

and powers of the City Commission on Human Rights to enforce the existing policy of non-discrimination in privately owned housing. The housing panel recommends a new and affirmative program to end discrimination in private housing as follows:

1. That there be conducted a systematic investigation of discrimination in all types of privately owned housing and that where such discrimination is found in such housing and substantiated that;

2. The housing involved shall be, for a specific period of time be rented out by a public agency whose task shall be, through its rental policy, to end discrimination in such buildings and that only when such discrimination has been ended should such housing be returned to the rental management by private ownership, and;

3. That furthermore, when discrimination has been proven, affirmative punitive action be taken, in the form of revocation of a license which would be required of all owners and managers and all of the persons engaged in the operation of private housing.

4. To implement the above, it is recommended that the City Commission on Human Rights shall be provided with an annual budget of no less than five million dollars in order that it may conduct investigations, conduct appropriate research, retain all its legal staff and undertake any other activity that may be necessary. Furthermore, that appropriate legislation be submitted by the city to make such recommendation effective.

5. That the fair housing law be amended to include an appropriate section prohibiting the discrimination in housing against welfare clients and that appropriate penalties be imposed for any violators of such a law.

6. That in order to effectively make available to the people of the city the existing programs and agencies to prevent discrimination in private housing, there be established local offices of the City Commission on Human Rights in the various neighborhoods, communities and boroughs of this city.

### **C. Increasing the Housing Supply**

That unless a production of housing for both low and moderate income families is increased, no effective policy for improving the existing housing conditions in our cities is possible. Therefore, it is recommended:

1. That an intensive effort be made to enlist the support of all elements

in all our communities of the city to obtain a massive federal program for the total rebuilding of our cities for the benefit of all the people.

2. That the aggrieved and discriminated communities establish effective relationships with those sectors of the American economy and industry which through technology and science have of making meaningful breakthroughs in the reduction of cost of housing for low and moderate income families.

3. That the existing bureaucratic restraint and impediments in the production and the processing of housing by the existing governmental agencies be eliminated and greater responsibility be given to the private sector in producing more housing.

4. That it is the primary responsibility of government to insure the availability of housing within an economic capacity of all its citizens.

#### **D. Community Action and Housing**

The panel recognizes that local community housing action programs and the local community housing workers are most important current channels of communication for the redress of grievances in the field of existing housing conditions. The redress of grievances and appropriate municipal action to eliminate the grievances is a vital component of community satisfaction until new housing and better environment can be constructed. Furthermore, the communication between the aggrieved community and the city is important in order to achieve the necessary programs and political action related to improvement in housing conditions. The following is recommended to increase the effectiveness of community action programs and the people who are responsible for their operation:

1. That there be a series of annual public hearings where the senior city officials elected and appointed who are responsible for housing programs and environmental services be made aware of the problems which exist within their areas of responsibility and which affect the operation of the community action programs.

2. That in those areas of community organization where existing community action programs have been restricted or inhibited by current federal limitation that there be established, solely through city funding, parallel programs which allow and provide for meaningful community organizations including political action. The panel recognized that where community action

programs and personnel which man those programs are prohibited from organizational activity which may be embarrassing to existing political institutions then these programs are seriously impaired in their ability to achieve effective redress of grievances.

#### **Panel Number Two**

It was generally agreed that here in New York City the supply of decent housing is insufficient to insure all citizens a decent place to live. It was further agreed that it is the responsibility of government to see to it that its citizens are adequately sheltered.

The panel, therefore, addressed itself to the problem of what can be done to meet the need.

The first attempt was to define the problem and to express it in meaningful terms. It was pointed out that, of New York City's inventory of almost 3 million dwelling units, more than 15%—approximately 400,000 dwelling units—are in substandard condition: i.e., either deteriorating or dilapidated.

The cost of bringing such substandard housing up to minimal standards for decent living—that is, rehabilitation of the deteriorating and replacement of the dilapidated—was estimated to be about \$7 billion.

Again, it must be emphasized that this cost estimate applies to New York City alone . . . and that the expenditure would not increase the amount of housing, but would merely insure that all available housing provided decent accommodations.

Evaluating these figures, the panel quickly concluded that New York City is helpless to meet so overwhelming a need . . . and that the dimensions of the deficiency, which are typical of the plight of most cities throughout the nation, dictate that the main fiscal thrust toward a solution must come from the federal government. There was discussion by the panel of existing federal programs in the field of housing and the conclusions were general that what is being done now is not nearly enough and that the effectiveness of the on-going programs was marred by serious flaws.

Among the flaws pointed out was that Section 221(d) 3 of the housing legislation now under consideration by Congress requires that housing sponsors—even if non-profit organizations—must provide a minimum of five per cent of the capital required to build a project. It was the consensus that such a requirement would effectively stifle any effort by local organizations in poverty areas to avail themselves of this legislation to remedy their shortages.

It was emphasized that Federal effort must be exerted in two directions: first, toward the construction of new housing to increase the existing supply to the point of adequacy; and second, toward the financing of the necessary rehabilitation of repairable units presently in a substandard condition. The panel felt that both these efforts must be expanded far beyond anything now contemplated if substantive progress is to be made.

Another point repeatedly stressed in the discussion was that any Federal effort must go beyond merely seeking to supply the number of housing units required for decent shelter. It was unanimously agreed that any housing programs, executed by government or the private sector of the economy, must also serve the further purpose of advancing the attainment of socially desirable goals:

1. The achievement of economic integration through the use of such devices as the sliding scale of rents;
2. The achievement of racial and ethnic integration.

There was some discussion of national priorities and of the question of whether the nation is indeed capable of meeting all of the War on Poverty requirements under the conditions which prevail today. It was the unanimous conclusion of the panel that the program to assure adequate housing for all the nation's citizens deserved a priority at least as high as any other now under consideration.

In discussing the need for Federal help, the panel also concluded that, even though the initial impetus and the major thrust must originate in Washington, the private sector of the economy must also play a key role in the total effort. The panel endorsed and called for the expansion of such private efforts as that of the insurance industry which has dedicated a fund of \$1 billion—one percent of the industry's total assets—to be invested in areas of deprivation for the construction of housing and other badly needed community facilities.

In evaluating the contributions of the private sector, much attention was centered on the undeniable fact that many—if not most—of the city's banks have been reluctant to make loans for the rehabilitation of housing in ghetto areas, even when such loans are guaranteed by Federal agencies. It was emphasized that to deny the deprived access to this vital source of mortgage moneys imposes a crippling handicap on all efforts to sustain a reasonably high level of maintenance and repair for ghetto housing.

The panel voted unanimously to ask the Commission on Human Rights to make a detailed study of this problem in order to determine whether the denial of such loans by banking institutions is indeed a violation of existing

antidiscrimination laws. If it is, then immediate steps should be instituted to compel compliance. If existing laws do not prohibit such practices, then new legislation should be enacted which would permit punitive action against such discrimination.

In this connection, it was also felt that there is a strong possibility that the lending criteria promulgated by the Federal Housing Administration—i.e., types of neighborhoods, types of houses, etc.—have the effect of limiting the possibility of making loans in what are now the less desirable neighborhoods. In short, such criteria establish, whether intentionally or no, a condition of *de facto* segregation which must be eliminated.

The panel was strongly of the opinion that the Federal government must be more venturesome in the risks it is willing to assume because it is precisely in the areas of high risk that the need is greatest.

Finally, the panel took special note of the fact that New York City's housing problem is complicated by the fact that it is, as American cities go, relatively old. Statistics were cited to show that 80% of New York City's dwellings were built before 1939. Such circumstances mean that the battle against housing violations must be fought more intensively since it is easy for housing of such age to slip into substandard status.

Accordingly, the panel recommends that the city government expand its inspection services substantially in order to make sure that needed repairs are effected promptly . . . and before the neglect of them causes borderline housing to slip into the category of deteriorating or dilapidated.

In discussing steps to be taken to assure the implementation of its recognition, the panel felt it to be most vital that residents of deprived areas be enlisted to fight for what they themselves need . . . fight, that is, in the sense that they use all existing means to acquaint policy-making officials with what the ghetto wants and needs.

In this connection, the panel adopted a recommendation that the Commission on Human Rights appoint a committee to call upon all legislators—Federal, State and City—to urge their support of these social priorities. This recommendation was subsequently amended to call for bringing the legislators into the areas of deprivation, there to meet with the victims of poverty and to let the poor plead their own case with their own unique eloquence.

## Recommended Action: Police-Community Relations

### A. Recommendations of ways in which the New York City Police Department can improve police-community relations and its image without undermining its ability to function

1. That all uniformed policemen be required to wear "name tags" for identification purposes.
2. That an expanded and continuous sensitivity training program be given policemen at all levels, thereby minimizing the possibility of police-created animosity.
3. That because of the language barrier, a special recruiting program be developed for the Spanish-speaking community to help bridge the gap thereby reducing conflicts.
4. That I.D. (identification) cards be issued to key responsible precinct council members who can assist a patrolman in time of need.
5. That the N.Y.C.P.D. explore the feasibility of making local precincts really Community Service Centers, providing community assistance with professional intake and referral officers as well as other professional services e.g. attorneys.
6. That the N.Y.C.P.D. explore the feasibility of using recognized ghetto spokesmen, together with trained teaching personnel at the academy for orientation purposes and at precinct training sessions.
7. That community groups and public agencies use patrolmen (when possible) in their respective programs in order to accurately disseminate information re: police programs and activities and exposing the policemen to community residents.
8. That the N.Y.C.P.D. study the advisability of the employment of patrolmen at local Community Progress Centers.
9. That adequate funds be allocated to the N.Y.C.P.D. for an intensive public relations program (preferably a public relations firm) designed to educate the public regarding programs within the department.

**Note:** Of the above recommendations, there was consensus except on #4. The members of the police department had reservations primarily in the area of abuses to which I.D. cards might be used. As a concept, there was little disagreement on its value.

The panel also wishes to state that the community has the responsibility of trying to understand the policeman, his function and the vital role he serves in our society. If society truly wants a good police force, commitment to this cause is a must.

## Recommended Action: Employment

1. That HUD, RHA and Industry develop a realistic approach through transportation subsidies to create employment in distant places such as Nassau County and others to ease the urban crisis of unemployment.
2. That whereas the components of the Scheuer Program have been accepted by the applicants of the ghetto seeking training as one of the desirable programs. That whereas 1,000 slots for the Metropolitan area will not fulfill the need; it is suggested that the state supplement the Federal Government to see that this program be enlarged to cover the large number of applicants applying instead of putting monies into unwanted training programs.
3. That *Job Titles* of training programs be standardized, realistic to today's job market and requirement of today's job market.
4. That interested organizations work with a corporation such as the Psyche Corp. to eliminate criteria such as culture bias built in many examinations used by both public and private industries.

It was suggested that job content be the prime factor in the field of testing. It was suggested that companies preparing tests should employ more minorities in formulating such tests.

5. That both New York and Federal Govt. raise the minimum wage to \$2 per hour and that the work week should be 35 hours so as to enable the worker to become fully and gainfully employed with additional training and education in their spare time in order to advance. That human rights and civil rights groups coordinate this movement.
6. That a program or series of programs be set up to increase voter-registration in the ghetto areas for bloc voting for the purpose of breaking the lily-white unions' political control thereby obtaining better education, jobs and housing.

The bloc voting should be publicized through news and television media for the express purpose of alerting all elected officials of the strength of these ballots.

7. That the Contract Compliance Program of the New York City Commission on Human Rights be augmented immediately with a staff large enough to implement a realistic assault on discrimination by city contractors, their labor sources or their trade unions.

8. That private builders applying for building permits from the City of New York be required by law or executive order to establish their compliance with the City's non-discrimination policy as a condition to obtaining a permit.

9. That all city agencies as well as semi-independent authorities using city finances be required to report the ethnic composition of their work forces to either the City Commission on Human Rights or the Mayor so that appropriate efforts can be made to realize equal representation of Negroes and Puerto Ricans at all pay levels in city employment.

10. That institutionalized coordination be established between such agencies as the Human Resources Administration, the Department of Labor and the City Commission on Human Rights primarily for the purpose of creating and supervising an open hiring hall system for building trades employment. Standards and guidelines to be established for non-discriminatory testing practices and apprenticeship programs.

11. That the Commission on Human Rights should provide a Central Registry for Negro and Puerto Rican contractors and sub-contractors for the work to be done under the Model Cities and other programs. Other information should be disseminated in the ghetto areas by the Commission on Human Rights.

## Recommended Action: Politics

### A. Traditional Tools for Obtaining Political Power—Ineffective

1. Register
2. Vote
  - a. Primary
  - b. Election
3. Join—political parties and clubs

### B. Innovative Tools than can be used

1. Community Corporations
2. Clergy
3. Neighborhood Boards
4. Community Groups of all kinds
  - a. Established—Civic Associations
  - b. Emergent, UCHO, UBA, etc.
5. Private Agencies, YMCA, etc.
6. Unions not too helpful in past

### C. Education through these Tools

1. Meaningful participation
2. Training workshops
3. Citizen education classes
4. Ethnic news media and total news media radio
5. Schools—if community oriented

### D. Substance of Education

1. Gerrymandering of districts
2. Proportioned representation
3. Financial support of candidates (for accountability)
4. Study of Capital Budget
5. Study of Expense Budget
6. Analysis of functions and accountability of elected officials year round
7. Effective community pressure
  - c. Protests of all kinds  
etc., etc.
  - a. Lobbying
  - b. Boycotts

**E. None effective if community is fragmented ethnically, economically, ideologically. Must act together to achieve political power. No more Negro vs Puerto Rican battles for power, poverty funds and jobs, etc.**

## **Recommended Action: Welfare**

### **A. Minimum Standards**

1. Commissioner of Social Services should notify each client in writing of his rights to minimum standards of welfare. Each client to receive this information enclosed with his check by January 1, 1968. Each client who applies for assistance to receive this information in writing when his case is accepted.

2. Minimum standards should be posted in a conspicuous place in each welfare center.

3. Client advisory committees to publish the minimum standards in their newsletters.

### **B. Welfare Handbook**

1. A handbook of welfare benefits, policies, procedures and laws should be published in simple, concise language and made available to each applicant and each client. This handbook should also spell out the appeal procedure. The handbook should be completed and distributed by January 15, 1968. After that date, it should be distributed to each new applicant at the time of application.

### **C. The Affidavit System**

1. That it be expanded to all welfare centers.

### **D. Human Relations**

1. Training courses should be provided as part of an ongoing in-service training course for every member of the Department of Social Services, including the administrative and clerical staff. A minimum of 12 weekly sessions of 1 hour each is recommended. City Commission on Human Rights to be asked to recommend staff for this training course.

### **E. Local Clients**

1. Advisory boards to be set up in each welfare district similar to those proposed by the Board of Education. The board should include welfare clients, community people, and representatives from the Department of Social Services. This group should periodically evaluate the work of caseworkers.

2. Additional satellite centers should be set up in areas small enough so that the caseworker can become familiar with the area and the other service agencies in that community. These should be multifunction service

centers. These centers should service other community needs such as health, education, housing, etc.

3. The local welfare administrator in cooperation with the client advisory board should prepare a booklet giving specific information about the services and opportunities available in the local community. A copy should be forwarded to the Commissioner of Social Services.

### **F. Schools**

1. Inasmuch as the child on welfare experiences discriminatory treatment in many of the public schools because he is a welfare recipient, it is proposed that Commissioner of Social Services meet with Supt. Donovan to discuss this and that Supt. Donovan then make a public statement stating that discrimination against welfare children will stop immediately.

### **G. Housing**

1. Fair Housing Law should be revised to include source of income.

2. The same skills and attitudes used to place white welfare recipients in all-white neighborhoods should be used to place minority group families in housing outside the ghetto.

3. When the Department of Social Services relocates a family, they should notify the Commission on Human Rights of the families' old and new addresses. No referrals of families on welfare to substandard housing accommodations.

4. The Department of Social Services shall not enter into rental contracts with any owner or management who practices discrimination. The Commission on Human Rights to certify that the owner or management does not discriminate.

5. The Department of Social Services, in conjunction with client advisory boards and the City-Wide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups should determine the cost for families to live in decent hotels in New York City on a temporary basis. Once a scale of rates is agreed upon, clients should be given checks in accordance with these rates and allowed to find their own accommodations.

### **H. New York City Housing Authority**

1. Must include some 4 and 5 bedroom apartments in all new construction.

2. All Housing Authority regulations governing eligibility of tenants to be abolished.

3. That all housing managers' competence be reviewed as to his ability to manage a housing project without the utilization of fear and threat of eviction.

4. All Housing Authority properties be rewired to accomodate heavy electrical appliances.

#### **I. General**

1. That Negroes and Puerto Ricans be appointed to top policy positions in the HDA.

2. That Negroes and Puerto Ricans be appointed to the City Planning Commission.

## **CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS**

Dan Acosta <i>United Federation of Teachers</i>	Herman Ebling <i>National Conference of Christians and Jews</i>
Bill Allen <i>Lower West Side Community Corporation</i>	Dr. Modi Essoka <i>Harlem Commonwealth Council, Inc.</i>
A. Franklin Anderson <i>City Commission on Human Rights</i>	Thomas Fama <i>New York City Housing Authority</i>
Michael Arrieta <i>Ft. Greene Community Progress Center</i>	Susan Foster <i>Student—Columbia University</i>
Ira Asherman <i>City Commission on Human Rights</i>	Mary Fowler <i>Ft. Greene Community Progress Center</i>
Howard Bennet <i>A. Philip Randolph Institute</i>	Fannie Gaines <i>New York City Health Department</i>
Robert Blum <i>Assistant to the Mayor</i>	Alice T. Garner <i>HAND, Harlem Alcoholic Neighborhood Development</i>
Margaret M. Breen <i>Community-Wide Panel for a Better City</i>	John Gaynus <i>Operation Open City</i>
Janet Bryant <i>City Commission on Human Rights</i>	Sheron Gilmore <i>United Youth Action</i>
Lois Buell <i>United Neighborhood Houses</i>	Richard A. Givens <i>Community-Wide Panel for a Better City</i>
Eugene R. Calderon <i>Assistant to Bronx Borough President</i>	Gladys Gongorra <i>Lower West Side Community Corporation</i>
Blanca Cedenio <i>New York City Housing Authority</i>	Barbara M. Green <i>Assistant Principal, JHS 72, Queens</i>
Rosamund H. Clark <i>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</i>	M. Michael Grupp <i>New York Ethical Culture Society</i>
Wilberforce Clark <i>New York City Catholic Interracial Council for Business Opportunity</i>	Michael Halpern <i>Teacher, JHS 166K</i>
Ramon Cruz <i>Lower West Side Community Corporation</i>	Richard Harris <i>Lower West Side Community Corporation</i>
Edward Davis <i>Haryou-Act, Board 4</i>	Thomas Hayes <i>Lower West Side Community Corporation</i>
Robert B. Davis, Jr. <i>Protestant Council of the City of New York</i>	Alice M. Hecht <i>State Commission for Human Rights</i>
Pat Dougal <i>Ft. Greene Community Progress Center</i>	John F. Hickman <i>Ft. Greene Community Progress Center</i>
Edwina Dyer <i>Operation Open City</i>	Betty Hoeber <i>Operation Open City</i>

David Holland  
*New York City Housing Authority*

Warren Howard  
*Department of Social Services*

Doris Innis  
*Harlem CORE*

Hulbert James  
*City-Wide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups*

Herbie Johnston  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

Herbert Kahn  
*Queens Council for Better Housing and Community Development*

Mrs. Theodore Kheel  
*New York Urban League*

Harold Klapper  
*Vera Institute of Justice*

Wanda Klein  
*New York Parks Department*

Michael R. Kleinerman  
*Community-Wide Panel for a Better City*

Fredericka Kramer  
*National Committee against Discrimination in Housing*

Sylvia Kusiel  
*State Commission for Human Rights*

Beatrice Kuzmack  
*New York City Housing Authority*

Dr. Charles Lawrence  
*Brooklyn College*

Tilden LeMelle  
*Fordham University*

Edward Linkh  
*Catholic Charities, Family Division*

Lt. Harold Litsky  
*New York City Police Department*

Sol I. Littman  
*Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith*

David Lopez  
*City-Wide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups*

Connie McDougald  
*City Commission on Human Rights*

Msgr. A. McLees  
*Catholic Interracial Council*

Joseph Maniscalco  
*Human Resources Administration*

Theresa Melchionne  
*Deputy Commissioner, New York City Police Department*

Arnold Mendales  
*State Commission for Human Rights*

Edward Mercado  
*State Commission for Human Rights*

Edward D. Moldover  
*American Jewish Committee*

Robert Moore  
*Operation Open City*

James Murphy  
*City Commission on Human Rights*

Ray Negron  
*Operation Open City*

Stel B. Neuman  
*Board of Education*

Frederick Norton  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

Aida Casanas O'Connor  
*State Division of Housing and Community Renewal*

Nick Ortiz  
*New York Borinquen Alliance Club*

Joseph Pacheco  
*United Federation of Teachers*

Robert Palmer  
*Henry Schindall Associates, Inc.*

Robert C. Penn  
*Assistant to Manhattan Borough President*

Sherry Perlstein  
*New York Parks Department*

Mark Pessin  
*New York Parks Department*

J. J. Pettaway  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

Jacquelyn Pitts  
*City-Wide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups*

Viola Plummer  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

John Pollard  
*New York City Police Department*

Robert I. Postel  
*Community-Wide Panel for a Better City*

Trinidad Quinones  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

Emilio Ramos  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

Barbara Reach  
*Community Service Society*

Marie Richardson  
*Operation Open City*

Pauline Robba  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

Eleanor Robbins  
*National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*

James Robinson  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

Hilda Rodriguez  
*Hunts Point Community Progress Center*

Meriemil Rodriguez  
*Puerto Rican Community Development Project*

Victor Rodriguez  
*New York Borinquen Lions Club*

William Rodriguez  
*National Association for Puerto Rican Civil Rights*

Marie Rogers  
*New York City Housing Authority*

Robert D. Sackett  
*Department of Relocation*

Blanche Sanchez  
*Hunts Point Community Progress Center*

Beulah Sanders  
*City-Wide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups*

Morris Sass  
*Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith*

Luther W. Seabrook  
*African-American Teachers Association*

Joseph Sepulveda  
*South Bronx Community Progress Center*

Elaine Steele  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

Maggie Stein  
*American Jewish Committee*

Elaine Stroud  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

Wilbert A. Tatum  
*New York City Buildings Department*

Martie Thompson  
*Ft. Greene Community Progress Center*

Peter Trebotica  
*Lower West Side Community Corporation*

William R. Valentine  
*Housing Redevelopment Board*

Michael Vallon  
*City Commission on Human Rights*

Harriet Van Sickle  
*Manhattan Community College*

Leonard Vaughn  
*City Commission on Human Rights*

Priscilla Wallaston  
*National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*

Don Watkins  
*Brooklyn College*

Levan Watson  
*New York Urban League*

Alfred Waxman  
*New York City Housing Authority*

Cornelius White  
*Youth Board—Coney Island Center*

Lucille Whitley  
*United Youth Action*  
Enoch Williams  
*Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth in Action*  
Herbert L. Williams  
*National Association for the  
Advancement of Colored People*  
Edna L. Williamson  
*National Association for the  
Advancement of Colored People*

Jacob Wittner  
*City Commission on Human Rights*  
Marjorie Wittner  
*New York Ethical Culture Society*  
Wanetta D. Young  
*Parents Association, JHS 204*  
Mildred Zander  
*City Commission on Human Rights*

## NOTES