

URBAN STUDIES CENTER
Rutgers.- The State University.
New Brunswick, N. J. = January 1964 =

... NOTES ON "THE POVERTY PROBLEM" = by =

Harry C. Bredemeier //

The "poverty problem" is the phenomenon of some peoples' not having as much money as, by some standard, they "ought to have." To the degree that money is allocated on the basis of the value attached by consumers to services rendered, it is the phenomenon of some peoples' not having services to render that other people value enough to pay much for.* Either the skills they have are in such great supply that consumers of them need pay very little for them; or, though possibly scarce, they are not in great enough demand -- or, of course, both.

There are really only a very limited number of solutions to such a problem.

Insofar as the problem is one of oversupply, one solution is to reduce the supply. This can be done in the following ways:

- a. Some persons can be removed from the labor force, through such devices as earlier retirement, shorter work weeks, longer vacations, extension of the compulsory schooling period, or just plain "welfare" payments. All such devices, obviously, can contribute to a reduction of poverty in general only if those who are removed from the market are the recipients of high enough "transfer payments" to support them at a level above poverty.

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY

JUL 31 1964

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

* There are, of course, other bases on which money can be allocated, and I shall consider them below.

This means a substitution of what, for lack of a better term, might be called "legal" bases of allocating money for "marketing" or "bargaining" bases. It means, very simply, application of the payment principle by which farmers are rewarded for removing land from the market to the case of workers, who would be rewarded for removing labor from the market.

- b. Over-supply could, alternatively, be reduced by giving some of the persons with over-abundant skills, new and scarcer skills. This is the "re-training" formula of the Manpower Development Training Act, and as such I shall return to it below. Here it is important to note two implications of this solution. One is that, like the first solution (payments for not working), it requires sizeable transfer payments while the re-training is going on. The second is that it contributes to the reduction of poverty through decreasing the bargaining power of those persons already in possession of the scarce skills (by increasing their supply). It is, in other words, a way of reducing some peoples' poverty by reducing other peoples' affluence; and the people whose affluence is being reduced can be counted on to resist it. They will resist it the more, the less affluent they really are; and since most of the re-training programs aim at increasing the supply of those skills that hardly bring munificence to their present possessors (painters, butchers, carpenters, printers,

etc.), resentment and resistance can be counted on to be great.

As an apparent alternative to those two ways of combatting poverty (both of which are unquestionably effective, and both of which I shall return to below), it is sometimes proposed that poverty be attacked by raising minimum wages. This is in fact not a true alternative -- which is by no means to say that it isn't meritorious for other reasons. It is not, however, an alternative solution to the poverty problem.

To see this clearly, it is necessary to distinguish between two kinds of services that people might now be purchasing at "too low" wages. On the one hand are those services (rendered, for example, by hospital orderlies) that would have to be rendered, almost no matter what the cost. Raising the minimum wages of such persons would not decrease the number of them employed, and would, therefore, help to solve their poverty problem. However, the necessity of paying them more (which necessity could also be produced by reducing their supply) would mean that consumers of their services would have less to spend on other services, which would decrease the demand for those other services. This also amounts, then, to an attack on some peoples' poverty by reducing the "affluence" of other people.

(To repeat: This is by no means an argument for not doing it; there is much to be said -- and I am willing to say it all -- for such redistribution of income. There is everything, however, to be said for recognizing clearly the consequences of one kind of attack on poverty as compared to another kind; and that is

what this paper is all about.)

A second kind of services that are now being rendered at "too low" a wage are services that many people would not continue to consume if they cost more. Perhaps domestic service is a reasonable example. In this case, raising minimum wages would simply mean that a few people would get "decent" wages and others, who previously had been getting something would get nothing. Their poverty problem would be exacerbated, and would have to be met by re-training or by breaking down the aforementioned distinction between farmers and workers.

Again, this is not to say that higher minimum wages are not a very desirable approach. It could easily be justified, I would argue, by the proposition that if people don't want a service badly enough to pay a decent wage for it, they should do without it. It is only to say that this is not, fundamentally, a different approach.

There is, however, an approach that is different. We have so far been discussing only the attack on poverty that consists of reducing the supply of skills that can command only poverty incomes, or no incomes. There is also the demand side.

Insofar as the problem is one of insufficient demand, the solution is to increase the demand.

In fact, of course, the "poverty problem" is both. Not only are many, perhaps most, poverty-stricken persons not now competitive in the labor market; they are not now eligible for positions where demand does exceed the supply; and they could not qualify for jobs even if demand were to increase generally. Although it is true, in

other words, that improving the marketable skills of people will not by itself solve the poverty problem, it is also true that the poverty problem will not be solved (or will be solved only in a way that is needlessly -- and maybe prohibitively -- expensive) if their skills are not improved.

Three things, in short, are necessary: Increasing the demand for productive skills; increasing the ability of people to acquire those skills; and recognizing that, insofar as those two steps cannot be taken, the urban owners of potential productivity are at least as worthy of support as the rural owners of potential wheat acreage.

Increasing Demand

If demand is to be increased, people or agencies not now consuming services must be motivated to do so -- which, as any advertiser knows, means persuading them that the costs of their not consuming more are greater than the costs of their consuming more.

In war-time it becomes obvious that the costs of not consuming labor in the production and manning of bombers is greater than the costs of doing so; and we unhesitatingly accept the corollary that the cost of training riveters and pilots is worth the investment. Ways are found of turning people wholly ignorant of radar into radar operators; and it occurs to no one to think that if they haven't learned radar in their "regular schooling," that's too bad for them. What automatically occurs to everyone, rather, is that if people haven't learned radar in their regular schooling, whatever irregular schooling will work is exactly what should be provided.

The point of this obvious contrast is this: Defining the problem as "the poverty problem" rather than a "radar" or "bomber" or any "un-net need" problem tends to shift attention away from solving it by increasing demand and to focus attention on solving it by the "supply-reducing" tactics discussed above.

Public Needs That Could Be Turned Into Demands

Now, the fact is that what there is really a super-abundance of are public needs that could easily, profitably, and in an entirely "business-like" way be turned into effective demands. All that is necessary is to escape from the notion that shooting off gun-powder or sending every nth ton of steel into orbit is the only "productive" form of public expenditure.

One of the very valuable and urgently-needed functions that young and middle-aged poverty-stricken adults could be employed to perform is the parental function.

It would be naive and self-defeating to be shocked by a proposal to regard this function as something for which people should be paid. For the fact of the matter is that parents in the poverty class cannot now perform that function in a manner that will equip their children for productive roles in the urban-industrial system. They cannot because they lack the necessary commitment themselves to that system; they lack the know-how; and they lack the resources with which to give their children stakes in "respectability."

The further fact of the matter is that society does now

"employ" women to act as mothers, through the program of Aid to Dependent Children -- but in a self-defeating manner. The program is self-defeating in two obvious ways that have been noticed by many people: It encourages desertion by husbands and/or fathers in order for their children to receive welfare payments; and it penalizes initiative and enterprise of mothers and their teen-age children by reducing welfare payments in proportion to earnings.

It is also self-defeating in a more subtle but perhaps even more important way: By failing to define the payment straightforwardly as wages for the service to society of properly caring for and socializing children, society both loses the possibility of expecting and requiring adequate socialization, and reinforces the alienation of ADC mothers from the main stream of the urban-industrial world. It is no reply to this to argue that many women take care of their children out of "mother love;" for any women who do are supported by their husbands for doing so. It is only arbitrary accounting practices that prevents this from appearing in national income figures.

The fact is that parents in the poverty class are helping to raise the next generation. They are full partners in that enterprise, in the sense that they will participate in it. How they participate -- whether functionally or disfunctionally -- depends on the kind and amount of help, support, training, and acceptance of partnership they are given. Given handouts grudgingly and with obvious distaste, they will participate sullenly and with minimum effort. Given valued employment in a vital enterprise, subject to the

high standards that any important enterprise deserves, they are more than likely to respond with effort and commitment.

If, in short, poverty-stricken parents had the duty, in return for reasonable (not "minimum") wages, to learn and to practice, under supervision and in groups, child care and child training, they, their children, and society would be vastly better off. To repeat, it is merely fatuous to pose as an objection to this the fact that "most" parents care for and more-or-less adequately socialize their children without being paid for it. "Most" parents, in the first place, were themselves heavily subsidized when children so as to be able to do so; in the second place, they are in effect paid by husbands for doing so; and in the third place, the alternative is patently to perpetuate the poverty cycle.

In addition to this employment possibility, there are many others.

The educational, recreational, and cultural services and facilities for low income families in central cities are disgracefully inadequate; home-making services for uneducated mothers are greatly needed; there should be nursery schools for all children over three; families and children in trouble need help in dealing with the complex bureaucracy of social service agencies; teachers need assistants; camp sites need to be established and maintained in State and national forests and parks; houses need rehabilitation; public housing projects cry out for civilized amenities; teen-age coffee houses and canteens would fill a conspicuous void; local music, dramatic, and arts groups should be organized; research needs to be done that could employ indigenous "participant observers;"

and so on and on.

The possibilities for profitable investment in human lives are limited only by the fertility of the imagination.

And there, of course, lies a rub.

A New Jersey State legislator said not long ago that he favored amending the State Constitution so as to permit the revenues from any broad-based tax to be specifically earmarked for purposes announced in advance. The explicit objective of this was to prevent any do-gooders from using their imaginations to dream up any "uplift schemes."

Now, this particular legislator is, as a matter of fact, a sensitive and intelligent man. What he was expressing is the widespread belief system according to which, as John Kenneth Galbraith has put it, "Alcohol, comic books, and mouth wash all bask under the superior reputation of the market. Schools, judges, and municipal swimming pools lie under the evil reputation of bad kings."

It is this belief system that has stood in the way of the conversion of public needs into the kind of economic demand that could solve the poverty problem. The debate between "liberals" and "conservatives" has in large part consisted of assertions and counter-assertions of the order of "Public housing is a good thing;" "No, it isn't;" "Yes, it is;" "No, it isn't;" etc., etc. The result is an impasse, during which the public needs remain unmet, even though nearly everyone agrees they exist.

There is, however, a way out of the impasse. It is pointed to by the fact that, although "Schools, judges, and municipal

swimming pools lie under the evil reputation of bad kings," the manufacture of transistors for space capsules does not. Nor does the provision of food and gasoline on State-supported parkways, or the operation of ski concessions in State parks.

The implication is plain: Let us both stimulate and strengthen private enterprise, and meet urgent public needs in exactly the way we do in the case of defense needs.

Since housing, recreation, slum clearance, etc. are public needs, the public should pay for them; but since they are services that private enterprise can provide, let private enterprise do it in the same way it meets military needs under contract to the Defense Department.

To some "liberals" this is a red flag suggestion, since they would prefer slums to having them cleared through what they would call "subsidies to private enterprise." Equally, to some "conservatives," it is a Red flag, since they would prefer a stagnation of private enterprise to having it stimulated through what they would call "welfare statism."

Is it unreasonable to hope that they are a minority, and that, at least, most "liberals" would be happy to see slums cleared "even though" private enterprise flourished, while most "conservatives" would be happy to see private enterprise flourish "even though" a few swimming pools got built in the process?

Is it unreasonable to suppose that private initiative could develop effective ways of organizing camp-site crews, or nursery schools, or housing projects if entrepreneurs were sub-

sidized? Is it impossible to find ways of letting government contracts for such enterprises that would minimize graft or shoddy performance? Is it not possible to arrange things so that entrepreneurs would be in competition with one another to produce recreation centers that would appeal to a city's youth?

I suggest that with not very much imagination a way can be found to make the efficient meeting of many public needs a profitable venture for the American business community. To find those ways is to accomplish three objectives at once: To stimulate the private economy; to move effectively toward the elimination of poverty; and to enlist the support, rather than the opposition, of American business in the war on poverty.

To focus attention on such ways of increasing the demand for the (trained) services of the poverty-stricken is also to engage in the very business-like process of finding ways of "getting something" for our expenditures. What we do now in our current feeble and self-defeating gestures against poverty is to pour out billions of dollars in welfare payments, correctional institutions, reformatories, police raids, and so on; and get nothing. If we think in terms of meeting public needs, on the other hand, we will not only get a lot further in our war on poverty; we will also have, at the end, schools, judges, swimming pools, camp sites, recreation centers, nursery schools, and drama groups that (a) we can be proud of, and (for whom it may concern -- b) we can count in the Gross National Product.

The Need for Training

As was noted earlier, increasing general demand in such ways as those just discussed must be accompanied by efforts to improve the marketable skills of the poverty-stricken. Herbert Gans, in a report prepared as an Urban Fellow at the Rutgers Urban Studies Center has suggested a classification of the lacks, or deficits, characteristic of the hard-core jobless.

1. Lack of--
 - a. Intellectual and moral skills.
 - b. Social skills (dress, punctuality, manners).
 - c. Emotional "skills" (postponing gratification, tolerance for frustration, ability to take orders and criticism).
2. Ignorance of job finding tactics. (Use of advertisement, employment agencies, call-back routine.)
3. Ignorance of kinds of employment careers possible, and of available training facilities for them.
4. Lack of incentive to work:
 - a. Fear of sacrifice of--
 - (1) Leisure (the "lower class loafing syndrome -- a kind of pre-industrial preference for idleness).
 - (2) Self-respect, through acceptance of "demanding" or "emasculating" jobs; through the taking of orders; or through the fear of failure.
 - b. Absence of commitment to or belief in typical

rewards for work--

- (1) Self-respect, according to the principle that
"a man is supposed to have a job."
- (2) Sense of confidence from doing something well.
- (3) Money.

These deficits, of course, are generationally self-perpetuating and reinforcing. Children of parents who have them ordinarily learn them and teach them to their own children (although, as many middle class parents know, it is entirely possible for children to learn nearly all of them on their own!). If the deficits themselves, as well as their generational perpetuation, are to be corrected, then, different strategies of intervention are required simultaneously at each point in the age cycle, since an intervention at an early age could be vitiated by the pressures from older people; and intervention at later ages has the inertia of earlier experiences to overcome.

Let us distinguish among (a) the necessity for carefully structuring the entry channels through which children can be successfully guided into productive orientations and abilities; (b) the necessity for devising corrective channels for adolescent and young adults whose entry channels were pathogenic; and (c) the necessity for creating re-entry channels for older adults whose experiences have left them isolated from the main stream of urban-industrial life.

Re-entry channels

Young and middle-aged adults among the poverty stricken are

important foci of concern for several reasons. In the first place, they beget, socialize, and control children, whose life chances are thereby drastically reduced. In the second place, they may represent to children vivid images of the futility of ambition or of effort along the lines advocated by middle class school teachers. In the third place, they are poor.

At the same time that they are important, they present perhaps the most formidable difficulties for rehabilitation. Their very existence is evidence of the failure, in their cases, of the conventional channels -- the family, the schools, and the whole network of social service agencies. To think of their returning to them is, then, idle. Moreover, these people have acquired certain investments, stakes, defenses, identifications, mistrusts, and suspicions that make most of the existing re-entry channels ("correspondence school courses," night classes) impractical and far, far too socially and psychically costly to them.

New kinds of channels are called for, that will recognize and adjust to the realities of such adults' lives. Perhaps the chief of those realities is the fact that they are adults. As adults, they have given certain hostages to fortune that represent the equivalent of the economists' "fixed costs," which must be reckoned into the cost of their re-entering the urban-industrial occupational world. On the simplest level, they may have wives and children who must be provided for, and they themselves require food, clothing, and shelter. Any training program, then, must provide an income sufficient to meet those commitments, at least equivalent to the level

at which they can be met through welfare payments, or any available "shady" occupations.

On a slightly more subtle but nonetheless real level, there are matters of pride and self-respect that must be taken into account. Re-entry channels that emphasize the dependence of the poverty-stricken and the need to "rescue" them from their "miserable state" add a cost to their acceptance that may be prohibitive. Nor should it be thought that their dependence on "welfare" is equally costly in the same sense. Welfare can be accepted with a cynical "If-they-won't-make-room-for-me-let-'em-support-me" attitude; and self-respect can be maintained via hostility, more-or-less verbal insolence to show that one is not really accepting one's subordinate position, in-group derogation of the system, real and fancied devices for cheating it, and so on.* Such defenses against the loss of self-respect in training programs, however, would defeat the purpose of the training: While it is possible to sneer at the welfare system and still profit from it, it is not possible to sneer at training programs and still profit. Alienation from parents doesn't prevent living off them, but alienation from school prevents learning from it.

Effective re-entry channels, rather, must be defined as existing because the services and potentialities of the jobless are needed. The fact is that "Uncle Sam" must "need you" if you are to invest yourself in his activities. If he merely, and grudgingly, offers you a chance to prove that you have been a failure, you can,

* For an analysis of these human devices, see Erving Goffman, Encounters (N.Y.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961).

with any intelligence and self-respect at all, find a dozen ways to remain in poverty -- but with your self inviolate. This, then, is still another reason for approaching "the poverty problem" through an emphasis on un-met needs: Even the skill-upgrading programs are thereby improved.

Obviously, we are not speaking here of the poverty-stricken who have already staked their self-images on "independent" productive work, and for whom, therefore, unemployment and "welfare" are unbearable costs. They are not the problem, because it is not they who stay away in droves from the conventional training programs of MDTA. We are speaking, rather, of the poverty-stricken for whom poverty is, if not a cultural way of life, at least a familiar way of life, and whose experiences with the conventional entry and re-entry channels have embittered and defeated them. For such people, to respond with anything but suspicion, scepticism, and apathy to the invitation to "return to school" would be close to impossible. We are speaking of people who are comparable to the women who before World War II could not "afford" to be riveters, but who, when their latent interest could be legitimated by the "need" for them, could enthusiastically do so.

To enter into re-entry channels must be made "the thing to do;" and it must be made as easy as possible. Where to go and what to do when they get there must be made vividly clear. Upon arrival, moreover, the attitude on the part of the official doing the "registering" and "guiding" must not be one of impersonal "screening," but one of welcome and of congratulation for volunteering

Training officials must themselves be trained to define potential trainees as valuable resources, whose interests, capacities, and potentials are worthy of basic respect.

The training program itself -- its routines, methods, locations, rhythms, and social atmosphere -- must be tailored to the needs and expectations of adults, not simply consist of a mechanical application of public school procedures. Adults are not children; and to treat them as if they were is again to threaten their precarious self-respect.

Still further, in order to reverse a pattern of life that has, in fact, proved adaptive (although not positively adaptive to the occupational world) a great many supports and reinforcements must be provided. Here again, lessons from the army are instructive. In the first place, removal of trainees from their customary acquaintances and surroundings would be helpful, if possible without violating civil liberties.* In the second place, such changes in attitudes and orientations as are required to break through the poverty culture, would be facilitated if peer support could be harnessed in their favor. For this reason, the poverty-stricken should be encouraged and helped to enter and pass through re-entry channels as groups, which should be identified clearly and treated as units. Every effort should be made to build up the esprit and identification of the groups, which should be used vigorously for their group-therapy potentialities.**

* cf. Robert K. Merton on the "de-bottling" function of replacement depots, "Social Theory and Social Structure (N.Y.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), 272-275. cf also Sanford Dornbusch, "The Military Academy As An Assimilating Institution," Social Force, 33:316-321 (1955).

**cf. Lewin, Kurt, "Group Decision and Social Change" in Swanson, G.E., et al, Readings in Social Psychology, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: Holt & Co., 1952, pp. 459-473).

One of the difficulties of conventional training and re-training methods is that there is, in the eyes of trainees (at least) only a misty -- and perhaps chancy -- connection between the regimen of the training program and the "payoff" of the real world of jobs. This connection must be made much more immediate and clear. On-the-job training has a clear superiority in this respect to orthodox classroom training; and training in the social emotional skills required on the job, as well as in the technical skills, could contribute to a sense of reality rather than make-believe.

Above all, though, the need is for channels through which people can re-enter the world of preparation for work with a sense of being importantly needed and respected. This again underlines the importance of generating demand through some "moral equivalents of war."

Entry Channels and Corrective Channels

The children of the poor pose somewhat different problems. Depending on their ages, they are only beginning to learn the culture of poverty, and they are simultaneously exposed, at least manifestly, to the counter culture of middle class work orientation. More malleable, because less completely formed, they require reinforcement (and special tailoring) of the school's educational efforts; the extra-familial provision of the work-oriented models of identification that their parents cannot, by definition, provide; and assistance in breaking away from their parents' culture without, if possible, the often-prohibitive costs of feelings of guilt and disloyalty.

The considered recommendations of the Urban Studies Center for appropriate interventions in this area are contained in the design for a demonstration program in Newark, N.J., a copy of which is attached as Appendix A.

Beyond the Employment Principle

It happens that there are even more fundamental reasons than marketability for discovering how to break the circle of functionlessness -- poverty -- apathy. The most fundamental reason is the fact that we are on the verge of a totally new dispensation in the life of men. To appreciate this, it is necessary to consider the social structures that make up society from what may, at first, be a somewhat unfamiliar perspective.

On the one hand stands a structure of occupational and political roles that functions to adapt the society to its physical and social environments, and that serves the wants of members. On the other hand stand human individuals at varying stages of maturational development. Between them stand socialization and social control agencies, whose function it is to "relate" the other two structures to one another.

Now, there are two major possible meanings of "to relate" in this context. On the one hand, it can mean to socialize and control individuals in accordance with the needs of industry and the state; on the other, it can mean to utilize the resources of industry and the state to meet the maturational needs of individuals. Both processes, of course, must go on: There are instrumental needs of complex industrial, diplomatic, and military structures that

individuals must be trained and motivated to fill. And there are psycho-biological needs of individuals that must be met if they are to act at all.

Still, it is possible to emphasize one of the two functions over the other; and it makes a large difference which one is emphasized. At one extreme is a system in which the raison d'etre of individuals is conceived as feeding and fueling the industrial-state apparatus; at the other is a system in which the raison d'etre of industry and state is conceived as feeding and fueling the bio-psyches of individuals. It is worth repeating that if the industrial state is to serve as the instrument of human development, human development must include development of abilities and motives to meet the instrumental needs of the industrial state. But it is also worth repeating that socialization and social control structures operate in one way when their mission is to develop individuals into persons who can manipulate technologies for the sake of human development; and in quite a different way when their mission is to develop individuals into energy resources for the industrial state.

In large part, the relative emphasis on the two functions is determined by the pressures of adaptive exigencies. To the degree that the system's survival is threatened by hostile societies or by the recalcitrance of nature, to that degree individual members of the system must be seen as instrumental resources to be manipulated for the sake of the system's adaptive structures. To the degree that the system's adaptive technology is easily able to control the environment, to that degree, individual members can be seen as the ends for

the sake of whom the adaptive structure is itself manipulated.

The distinction between "must" and "can" is crucial. The greater the external threat to a system, the greater must be the regimentation and exploitation of members; the less the external threat, the greater can be the regard for members as ends in themselves.

For the most part in human history, the hostility and recalcitrance of the environment, in relation to the power of man's adaptive technology, has been such as to require the subordination of men to the needs of their societies. It was possible only to dream of a Garden of Eden in which the facts were fantasied to have been otherwise, and to dream of another world, after death, in which the facts would again be otherwise.

The reality men have known, however, has always been one in which it was necessary to train and motivate one another to serve the needs of their adaptive structures. And so successfully has that necessity been met that virtue itself has come to be defined in terms of the degree to which men can subordinate themselves to those adaptive instrumentalities. The fearless, self-sacrificing soldier and the worker who drives himself relentlessly are the models of manliness.* Paradoxically, then, reality has forced men and their social institutions into attitudes and arrangements that utterly disqualify them for existence in a Garden of Eden. If the dream of a Garden of Eden were to be realized, it would be a nightmare.

* The apparent reverse of this -- that the rate-buster, the brown-noser, and the glory-seeker are objects of scorn -- reflects men's bitter recognitions that the industrial-state apparatus has not been for them.

Indeed, it is a nightmare. Retirement with an adequate pension is not "arrival," it is a trauma; and a fully automated and cybernated society, which could be science's recreation of the Garden of Eden, is an unholy spectre. (I suspect that if the Garden of Eden story were being created today, it would take a very different form to express modern man's anxieties. Man might still, in the new version, be created by God; but Satan's temptation would be the offering of enough knowledge to enable men to create the cybernated Garden of Eden and imprison himself in it. Then Adam and Eve would gradually go nuts, seeking escape in alcohol, narcotics, and so on. Finally, out of pity, God would intervene by forcibly removing Adam and Eve from Paradise -- and giving them work to do.)

Not nearly enough attention has been paid to this paradox and to possible ways of resolving it.* Nor is it our central concern at the moment.

Our central concern here, rather, is to note that "the poverty problem" is only a pale microcosm of the problem of functionlessness. Apart from the sheer human tragedy of wasted lives in an affluent society (and apart from the bad public relations value in international affairs of over-size "pockets" of stubborn poverty), the significance of "the poverty problem" lies in what it foreshadows. And the significance of efforts to find meaningful roles for the poverty-stricken is that such efforts can be pilot projects for the larger effort that will have to be made on a national scale before long.

* A brilliant and much too unnoticed exception is Herbert Marcuse's Eros and Civilization (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).