

REORGANIZATION IN THE CASBAH \*

By Nicholas von Hoffman, Supervisor of the Woodlawn Project for the Industrial Areas Foundation, Chicago, Illinois

People's thoughts are captives of their vocabularies. When we use the expression "community organization" we are automatically accepting certain shaky assumptions. We are implying that there are communities which are not organized, that every community ought to be "organized," and that community organizing is a profession apart from others, like law or engineering. Personally I believe that all three propositions are either false or highly misleading.

So far as I know there are no disorganized communities. The two words cancel each other out. The word "community" sums up a host of organized relationships. I don't want to get involved in fine distinctions, or I will be like the sociologists who don't even agree on what a society is. When I talk about organized relationships I mean nothing fancier than relations between people that are recognized by all, that are frequent, and that anybody who knows the community can reasonably anticipate as he moves about from person to person. Wherever you have that, you have a community of some kind. And you have that wherever people are making their homes. It's the difference between a hotel and a boardinghouse. The one doesn't have a crisscross of common relationships and practices; the other does, and is a little community.

You may say that I am splitting hairs. You might concede that there may not be disorganized communities but there certainly are disorganized geographic districts, especially in big cities where a lot of people live without community--that is, without organization. On the surface the statement seems plausible, but a little reflection should make you doubt it. The instances on record of even a small number of people living closely together in a state of semi-anarchy are very rare. I don't know of one.

Skid Row, which is a place where people go because they want to escape social and legal control, turns out to be a kind of "anti-community." An "anticommunity" is a community founded on values and interests that are the reverse of the dominant world enclosing it. Even the Bohemian sections of big cities are not peopled by disorganized individuals. They have their own communities too.

According to the ancients the act of creation was bringing order out of chaos. It has been left to men to reorganize from time to time. Organizing of every sort is actually reorganizing. Let's not arrogate to ourselves, even in our thinking, powers and responsibilities that belong to the gods. In saying that organizing is in reality reorganizing, I am not trifling with a petty distinction. Many people who talk about community organization define it as organizing a "disorganized" mass of people who seem to be detached islets in the moving river of society.

Such thinking quickly jumps to the assertion that "such and such a place cannot be organized because the people are too disorganized." We have allheard the remark, and we have seen sensible people nod their heads in agreement. The speaker could be right, but there are no such places, and we are not called to organize anyhow; our work is reorganization.

After having invented the impossible fiction of a "disorganized community" some sociologists have set out to prove it empirically. Of course they were successful, and the myth of the disorganized lower-class Negro, Puerto Rican, or Southern white community became an established fact. The repercussions of having demonstrated the validity of a false proposition have been enormous. Government policies in education, welfare, housing, and law enforcement have been based on it. Since it is a fundamental tenet that disorganized communities cannot be organized, tiny committees of professionals with time to meet for lunch were judged the optimum organizational activity possible. Many men who might have accomplished real good did not try, since it had been demonstrated that results were all but impossible.

#### LOWER-CLASS NEGRO COMMUNITY

I want to stick with the lower-class Negro community because the future of its people will largely shape the future of our cities themselves. Also, by looking into these districts we can find out a lot about the organization and reorganization of people in general. For the same difficulties arise in many white areas, but since their problems are less intense the underlying similarities are less in evidence.

Lower-class Negro sections have their share of natural community. Political groups flourish in them. Churches that have not had their incentive sapped by debilitating denominational subsidies develop organization and substance. Throughout, a web of gambling organizations provides a fine communications network. There are such trade associations as the organization of beauticians, barbers, and saloon

keepers. Sometimes the organizations are formal and elaborate; sometimes they are informal and simple. There are the clubs, lodges, fraternities, and sororities. Blocks and buildings have their small groups that usually revolve around some outstanding local figure who may be simply a resident but is also frequently a flat janitor, a barber, or a building manager. Among these and more groupings are types of organization that the outside world recognizes. I speak of churches in the major denominations, PTA's, social agencies, and such miscellaneous associations as the League of Women Voters. They are in the community but aloof from it. Their contacts are unbelievably sparse and their penetration is almost nil. The isolation of the "respectable" organizations confirms the disorganized-community hypothesis in the minds of their staff people. From their vantage point, the neighborhood does indeed look like demoralized anarchy.

Usually the groups that suffer from being cut off are what I like to think of as "branch office" organizations. The local PTA or major-denomination church or social agency is a replica of a form and program devised elsewhere under other circumstances. You might call it a standard brand pushed into a specialized market that has no call for what is being offered. But the branch office has no power to change the "line." It must sell what the central warehouse sends it. I have watched this happen even when the people in the branch office knew better. The subordinates in many local social agencies will laugh behind their bosses' backs. The underlings are usually less well paid, less part of and less interested in the downtown world, where programs and policies are conceived. Being closer to the community they are less prone to let theory wipe out fact.

There are purely political reasons why, for example, a local YMCA in a lower-class Negro neighborhood will carry out a perfectly pointless program year after year. The people who own the Y's don't want any trouble. But I have also seen churches and social agencies fail to exploit rich opportunities out of dogmatic stubbornness. Mediocre, doctrinaire professionalism has littered the poor sections of our cities with immobile, unadaptable, institutional dinosaurs. These beasts can neither feed themselves nor support their own weight. They violate the law of the survival of the fittest, thanks to a large vested interest in failure. The failure to attract support from the beneficiaries or to get results can't possibly be disguised. Failure is used to demonstrate how bad things are and how badly the services are needed. Thus, repeated failures supervised by qualified professionals assure the annual subsidy.

An enormous amount of rationalizing is needed to keep such a system going. The mess in the community surrounding the branch offices is too awful to be covered up. So the justification is that,

inadequate as they are, the branch office staff are the only hope. For evidence the branch office managers hold up the people's nonexistent "disorganization" again. Those who are told about it must believe what they hear. They couldn't know better. Their ignorance has made them terrified of the lower-class Negro community. With heads stuffed full of lurid tales of rape and narcotics, they are gullible setups for swallowing any wild story. The phantasmagorias that are soberly passed on to philanthropic administrators and benefactors as research are the more credible because their tellers are convinced that they are true.

### A PERSON WITH A FOLLOWING

The interval between the crazy notion of a disorganized community and a leaderless one is short. No comment about lower-class Negro communities finds more utterance than the bromide about lack of leadership.

No people has ever been without leaders. They may not have been smart or good at bringing home the bacon to their followers, but leaders there always are aplenty. Well, what is a leader? This definition may be simple-minded--namely, that a leader is a person with a following--but it is useful for understanding. If you will go along with the definition, then you will see that a lower-class Negro area is swarming with leaders.

The leaders are not well-educated white collar types. Some leaders are on ADC, but the going theory is that a woman on ADC ~~must~~ be a slob. That word is never spoken. Adjustment, dependency, aspirational level are the words used, but they mean slob. All kinds of irrelevant reasons are used to knock people off the leadership lists. None of them have anything to do with whether or not Jones or Smith has a following. The practice of not recognizing popularly chosen leadership is as old as politics, but it can be a dangerous game. The Negro population affords a good example.

The white world has picked out the Negro leaders it cares to recognize. It complains that there are too few of them, not realizing that only a certain number of people will consent to be lackeys, or Uncle Toms and Aunt Tomasitas, as they are called by the millions of Negroes they do not lead. Being a puppet, even at good wages, is a hard job. Since the leaders the whites have chosen for the Negroes are either detested by their supposed followers or unknown to them, they are never able to get Negroes to obey orders. The whites are displeased by their quislings' inability to get Negroes, particularly lower-class ones, to behave. They complain that the Negro leadership is untrained. Massive adult education is prescribed, and the

Uncle Toms are marched off to school to learn leadership skills. After being put through the leadership-training spaghetti machine (the product is an extremely thin pasta with a hollow center) the leaders return, as ineffectual as ever.

"Community organization" now intrudes itself into our line of vision. The "community organizers" are also representatives of the repudiated name brands. They run smack into the same insolubilities. In short order the "community organization" develops into a professional luncheon circle. There is talk about indigenous leadership, adult education, urbanization, and acculturation. Recently some effort in the direction of housing has been included. The results are so scanty that a whole rationale has been developed to demonstrate that results aren't important. The thinking is that doing, not getting, counts. The atmosphere changes to the therapeutic climate of the outpatient clinic. Words like "process" and "experience" are loudly spoken.

The profit to the individual and the society, we are told, is invisible but even more worth-while than palpable accomplishment. Potential leaders are having experiences that will stand them and us in good stead at an unspecified future date. The naked emperor is walking the streets again while his ravished subjects praise his "experiential" robes. In the meantime truth grows uglier, and we begin to cast about for other ideas.

Let's go back to the lower-class Negro area for instructional material. I have already said that it, the prime example of a disorganized community, does not and cannot exist. I should now like to argue that its nonexistent leadership is actually alive and kicking. The leaders are the men and women running the organized groups that the experts have empirically demonstrated don't exist.

These undiscovered leaders are inconveniently realistic in their judgments. When you find them, which is very easy, they point to a system which they say is the cause of most of the community's and the people's woe. The system is summed up by words like "Jim Crow" and "discrimination." The true leadership is remorseless in crying that the great money and power interests maintain, and profit by, the system. The leadership persists in espousing causes and policies that will blow up storms of peppery controversy.

We have come to the heart of the matter. The leadership is calling into question the conduct and arrangement of society. The leaders are demanding great and deep changes.

## BUSINESS OF POLITICS

To me their demands place the whole discussion in the domain of politics. The arrangement of society and the conduct of the state are, more than anything else, the proper business of politics. Community and politics, as the words are usually used, are things apart--but are they?

"Every state is a community of some kind," says Aristotle, who adds that "he who by nature and not by mere human accident is without a state is either a bad man or above humanity." Obviously, that is a far cry from the narrow partisan cheering that we customarily call politics. Serious political thinkers, beginning with the Greeks, have passed over electioneering as a minor part of man's political activities. They begin their thinking about the family, property, education, and the other aspects of society that some of us pass over as "nonpolitical." The moderns, from Montesquieu through Marx and Ortega y Gasset, do the same.

In democratic societies, particularly, most politics is non-partisan. Official actions of party and government usually ratify decisions already arrived at in a variety of other ways. That is not a cynical allusion to the "back room boys" but a recognition that the form and substance of popular government is closely determined by the society that erects and maintains it.

The unrecognized leader in a lower-class Negro community is absolutely right when he insists on keeping political considerations paramount. He knows that programs to curtail high school "dropouts" are worthless when high school students are barred by discriminatory hiring practices from employment. He knows that conservation and rehabilitation programs cannot improve housing because the people do not have the income to afford the improvements. He knows PTA's are laughable objects because they are the creatures of school systems that deliberately fail to educate his children.

Because he knows these things he shrugs his shoulders at what the standard brands offer. The church with its ~~business-as-usual~~ routine offers him little--not even a sympathetic voice. The recreational social agency gives second-rate athletic and social distractions that are not appreciated when present nor missed when absent. The relief worker is an adjunct of an unfriendly government. To the unrecognized actual leaders, these services are barbiturates. They anesthetize against the pain inflicted by a system of society and government that leaders and followers loathe and execrate.

It may bother some people to learn that innocent health and education and general welfare programs are looked at this way. That is because they are not thinking politically. The unrecognized leadership is thinking politically. The political mind looks broadly, sees interlocking factors as they operate on the totality, and asks: Where

is all this going? Do we want to go there? Political understanding quickly arrives at some very uncomplimentary judgments about the standardized programs. To many unrecognized leaders the major objection is not to the programs' inadequacy but results from a belief that their purpose is to keep the leaders and their people in subjection.

Never is such a state of affairs more obvious than in lower-class Negro neighborhoods where the leadership is engaged in active resistance to the reigning policies. The refusal to co-operate, which outsiders term apathy, and the outright resistance, which is called unurbanized or antisocial behavior, are two of the weapons used in a struggle that local leadership views as political. The outside world prefers to talk as though the problem were medical. By that I mean that the lower-class Negro neighborhood is talked about the way doctors talk about pathology. The people are converted into patients who are to be passive while they are operated on and cured. When the "patients" fight back we misread their reactions and declare that their opposition is another symptom of what ails them. I am not exaggerating, as anyone who has heard the experts talk about "social engineering" and social planning" will verify.

#### THE RIPENING OF CASBAHS

The root of the difficulty is that the true leadership has never been able to force recognition from people outside the leadership's home base. The result is that in an odd way the leaders are winning the battle but not gaining the victory. What I have in mind when I say that is not very pleasant. I mean that in the big-city slum or near-slum districts the dominant society is being driven out. The ultimate was reached last summer when the New York police were assailed by pop bottles hurled from the roof tops by an unfriendly populace. In such sections, law and order, education, social work, the good and the bad manifestations of the ruling world, are in full retreat and are very close to being driven out entirely. Heretofore we have had national enclaves, voluntary and involuntary ghettos, in our big cities; now we are menaced by the ripening of casbahs where our writs do not run, where outsiders dare not go, and where a dangerously separate world is coming into existence.

It is in this sense that I mean that unrecognized leadership is winning the battle. The leaders are chasing the nonindigenous world out of the casbahs and assuming local control. I wish I could say this was a sturdy example of self-government, but it is not. Anyone familiar with certain sections of New York and Chicago will quickly agree. The power of the state has been successfully challenged, and what should be a source of support and strength for the state's democratic institutions is changing into the very reverse.

For the local leaders the victory is very unprofitable. They have chased their oppressors' chosen representatives perhaps, but they have not defeated oppression. They have broken up every attempt to impose policies and arrangements on them, but they have not been able to create and put in force their own.

Why not? I answer, because their leadership has not been recognized. And why hasn't it been? I don't think it is either fair or accurate to lay all the blame on the people whom we have picked as our go-betweens. It is true that social workers, city planners, clergymen, and other professionals whom we have made our delegates have been astoundingly dense and morbidly taken up with academic will-o'-the-wisps, but their inadequacies do not explain the present mess.

I repeat that all the blame cannot fairly be put on the outside professionals. Some know better and do what they do only because it is a condition of employment. Many of the rest do merit scorn. I have witnessed rice Christianity in our slums that would result in an American missionary abroad being expelled from the country. At a recent church-sponsored meeting I was astonished to hear a discussion of social services as a device for hooking new members. It is a cause of personal rejoicing to me that men here and the world over hurl such "assistance" back in the faces of the spiritual cannibals who offer food in exchange for souls. I say the same to those who use social services to inculcate so-called "middle-class" values in people denied middle-class opportunities and income. I cannot get over our practicing a colonialism on our own fellow citizens we dare not inflict on the Stone Age aborigines of the central Australian desert.

The casbah's leaders can only fight guerilla warfare. Their resistance has been very, in fact spectacularly, effective, but it has been resistance and resistance only. The nature and extent of their power and organization has precluded their forcing recognition and mounting an affirmative drive.

While there is almost a unanimity of opinion in the casbahs--I continue to use this example because it makes things dramatically clear--the forms of organization have been good for little more than resistance. The leaders of a thousand small groupings are not in touch with one another. No vehicle exists to mass power for activities beyond each small district. No single leader or grouping is by himself or itself strong enough to demand and get recognition.

I cannot imagine a worse situation. The outside forces have been defeated and driven out for all intents and purposes, but the

victorious leaders are not organized in a manner that permits them to follow up their essentially defensive or negative triumph with positive action. I wish I could say that we can take this state of affairs to mean that we have reached an impasse. Impasses are static, but humans aren't or at least they aren't for long. The communities we are speaking of continue their rebellious course, but after the big success of establishing the fact that they will either rule themselves or not be ruled at all, more guerilla warfare is needless. It is destructive and commits the people to a downward devolution to nowhere. It releases more and more personal desperation in destructive spasms that yield no good result. So it has always been in politics when the people who have the power can't or won't assume office. In the instance we are talking about, the leaders with the power can't assume office.

They can't, that is, unless there is a great reorganization. They must pool their power to form an instrument for taking charge in an affirmative sense. By coming together in larger and wider unity they can consecrate leaders of sufficient power and backing to force recognition. Moreover, a larger and wider union permits the leaders to conceive and promulgate specific concrete and affirmative programs.

#### UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

We are looking at an unfinished revolution. For practical purposes, the old regime's power has been broken. It sits outside the revolutionary district's borders with a titular control which it considers still in effect by sending occasional excursions into the casbah. Within, the revolutionaries, who have made almost a clean sweep, do not realize the extent of their accomplishments, nor do they have the faintest idea how to follow up what they have done.

I hope no one will make the mistake of thinking that what I have been describing is novel. It is a political dilemma that has recurred one way or another since history has been recorded. There have been times when the incipient revolutionaries have been stamped out, and the fundamentally unstable situation has been taken care of by drastic purge. Sometimes the outcome has been brighter. A new and legitimate power has been created by internal reorganization.

How has that come about? For instance why haven't the local, unrecognized leaders in the casbahs pushed on to the next step? For the most part they have never thought of it, they don't know how, and besides no single one of them has the resources to do what needs doing. Nor is their situation new to human experience. New forms and patterns of action have often come about only when an outside element has been added to the political chemistry. Many revolutions, be they violent or nonviolent, are traceable to outsiders.

Moses, whatever his blood pedigree, grew up an Egyptian. Lenin was a worker no more than Clement Atlee, and the Frenchmen who were the schoolmasters of the American Revolution were certainly not provincial colonists. The outsider is often the final and indispensable catalyst for change.

If we explore the many probable reasons for the outsider's playing this part in politics, we will have to roam too far afield. Suffice it to say that outsiders are customarily less likely to fail to see the forest for the trees. Their fresh viewpoint opens men's eyes to new formations, new tactics, to the road that goes toward the constitution of a new order.

The outsider is the reorganizer. Haven't we all sat at a chessboard looking pessimistically at our pieces when a friend has walked up, glanced at the chessmen, and made a simple move that seemed like revelation? Usually the move is obvious in retrospect. The friend has reorganized our thinking for us. He added nothing more than a new way of looking at old facts. Newton wasn't the only man in Europe who knew about Kepler's spherical orbits; but he was the only man to see a new way of thinking about them. Mao Tse-tung wasn't the only revolutionary in China, but he was the only revolutionary who could reorder the ways of looking at the facts of China to make a revolution. The same can be said of Ghandi.

Reorganizing of the sort I am speaking about can go and has gone under a variety of names, from Calvinism to community organization. The choice of names is pretty much dictated by the propaganda necessities of the moment. What remains constant is the purely political nature of the activity.

### POLITICS OF CHANGE

All politics is arduous and difficult, but the politics of change, which is really what we are talking about, is the most difficult of all. The material is the most volatile, the most uncertain, and the most likely to run off in ways the originators never dreamed could happen. Robespierre, officiating at what he knows are the asinities of the goddess of reason, is a warning against believing change is easily managed. The best change and the best revolution is orderly because order preserves the best of the old, to which it adds the best of the new. The best revolutions are orderly because there is less likelihood of provoking a counter-revolution. The New Deal set the seal on an orderly revolution and thereby tamed the counterrevolutionary furor to an irreducible minimum, to wit, Taft-Hartley.

But the politics of change, whether seen as orderly revolution or as armed upheaval, is not choosing abrupt change over a more desirable evolutionary change. The unwarranted introduction of the evolutionary idea into social and political thinking has been a deceiving curse. Societies do not evolve. They do not obey unconscious laws of their own nature. They are the deliberate creations of men. They change when men decide to change them. The changes are not always wise, or even understood by the changers, but what happens is the outcome of conscious, purposeful action. That the actors are sometimes wholly mistaken about the end product is no ground for modifying this statement.

Men often speak as though we had a choice between swift action and more gradual evolutionary change. The idea is invoked when debate over putative change gets too fierce. The case made in regard to the American Casbah is resisted with the argument that it is better to await the day of evolutionary ameliorations of the system. Such talk is nonsense.

People are always looking for the soft way out of making hard decisions. Eyewash about evolution and education is the language they hope will spare them conflict. I hope you will not entertain the false hope of expecting vital change to emerge without angry conflict. Let us look at two great orderly revolutions instituted by the English-speaking peoples. I refer to the great Reform Act of 1832 in England and the Supreme Court decision of 1954 in the United States. The one opened the door to modern representative government; the other permitted us to walk through it. In both cases the previous fifty years had been given over to arguments purporting to demonstrate that the change could come gradually through education and the mystery of unwilled metamorphosis. You may call it progress or evolution. In the end nothing of the sort happened. A decision had to be made, and in both instances it was bitterly resisted in some quarters.

Looking back after the deed is done, chroniclers have pronounced change gradual. They observe that people were not ready and that it took many years to educate and prepare them for the moment of change. In truth, the gap in time between an idea's being proposed and its being carried out is more plausibly explained as the time needed to gather the power to force the decision.

The evolutionary idea is a happy ex post facto rationalization. It allows people to say, "See, we were really going to do it all the time." Inasmuch as the losing side can use it to save face, it helps to heal wounds that are best speedily closed. But, regardless of how convenient the apology may be, we must not confuse it with the real ways change occurs.

## QUARTERLY REORGANIZATION

Now I think we can try out a definition for "community organization." For me, it is the age-old political activity of helping to reorganize a society so that it can change to meet the wishes of its people in a manner that is not without conflict but that is orderly. I stuck in the sloppy clause about conflict lest anyone harbor a vestige of hope that he can get off without it. Actually, the qualification is unnecessary, since conflict is the measure of change. Change cannot exist without conflict, and where conflict is disclaimed there has been no change. It must be so because no change can come about by which all profit as individuals. Change creates new winners and new losers in a society. The winners cheer and the losers groan, although all may benefit indirectly if the change is one that enriches the society.

Some people carry on as if to say that no community should be without its "community organization." If you are prone to concur with this analysis, you will agree that such organizational activity is scarcely wanted everywhere.

Our reorganization or orderly revolution is obviously to be saved for special cases. It should be reserved for communities and peoples who find the apparatus available to them inadequate. Such drastic measures, must have urgent cause. Every community has its problems. Some will never be solved, some cannot be in this generation, and some are of the minor sort that can be taken care of with the means at hand if the people affected so desire. In such communities the people are doing well enough taking care of themselves. Our interference would be officious. We would have nothing to offer, and the odds are that our contribution would be a net minus. Our object is to make democratic self-rule work, and where it is working we should leave it alone. Given half a chance, men run their own business best.

Our attention should fasten on the places where the democratic system has never been introduced or has broken down. It takes no research or scholarly beard-pulling to spot them. They are brutally and crudely evident. We belong there, working at the reorganization which men must manufacture to provide themselves with the tools essential to self-government.

## SHOULD THE PROFESSIONAL DO THE JOB?

Who should do the kinds of political activity we have been talking about? Is this work that ought to be restricted to the professionals? The Industrial Areas Foundation has sometimes been criticized for using nonprofessionals as staff members and censured for helping to build powerful organizations totally controlled by nonprofessionals.

Do such people have the knowledge and judgment commensurate with the power they exercise?

Democracy is a system of government that abolishes a professional ruling group. It transfers the responsibility for the state to every citizen individually. If for any reason too many citizens cannot or will not do their duty, the system must fall to pieces. Perhaps the least important duty a citizen has in a democracy is voting. The ballot box is the last resort of a citizenry that has not been looking after its affairs closely enough. Electing the good men or throwing out the rascals cannot take the place of a people's careful and thoughtful day-to-day management and supervision of the work of running a society and a state.

Some of our people cannot do their duty as citizens because they are deliberately stopped. Another portion of our people will not because their private lives have obliterated their public selves. Probably both groups deserve our attention, and it may be that by the time the last chapter of American history is completed we shall repent not applying ourselves to the second group. Justice conveys the greater claim to the first, who would enjoy their rights and do their duty if they were allowed. A profession that enjoys others' rights and does others' duties is not a profession in reality, but a paid ruling class. The reasons may seem good and sufficient, but every time we resort to professionals, we are usurping the citizens' indispensable place in a democracy. Democracy is a faith which holds that in the long run people have the judgment and wisdom to exercise power in their own name.

Does it make sense to speak of professionals? Exclude those who happen to be paid for their political work. They are professional as some golfers are pros and some amateurs. What I have in mind is the person who goes to school and graduates into a profession, laying claim to a scientific body of knowledge and a suitcase full of skills and techniques. No such political profession exists. None ever will.

A few courses in leadership training and popularized sociology equips one for nothing. Such credentials can't be taken seriously and are laughed at everywhere except in schools and other sheltered places where the young and tender collect. I won't expatiate on the proper training for politics. That subject is also one that has occupied the best minds, and having nothing worth-while to add, I limit myself to reminding you that the Greeks doubted that anybody but men of years and experience could understand it.

You do not have to be a Greek philosopher to see that academic qualifications won't get you into the ball park. The Industrial Areas Foundation, which operates on the assumptions stated in this paper, is asked by many people and many organizations to come and help. The requests are made because IAF has a reputation for performance. Of course we aren't always successful--nothing like it--but our efforts do bear fruit often. The price for remaining in the field of political or social action is relevance. Nothing succeeds like it and nothing substitutes for it.

You may take those observations as the amoral words of power politics. They are not so intended. Politics is a serious business of supreme importance. Listen to Aristotle: "If all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces the rest, aims at good in a higher degree than any other, and at the highest good." The highest good is not to be managed by failure; the highest good must be attended by success.

The aim of this neighborhood foundation project is to further, in a poverty area of Columbus, Ohio the social service life of the settlement in the direction of neighborhood decisions and total community service and general welfare. The settlement is governed by the incorporated neighborhood as its self-governing community service agency. With the transfer of the settlement agency to the people and neighborhood corporate character we are laying the foundations of a democratically governed community of service.

A demonstration grant is being sought from the Office of Economic Opportunity under Title II, Section 207, to fund the operation of the governing structure of the Neighborhood Foundation for a period of two years, within which time service program proposals will be developed by the people and submitted for funding to various sources, metropolitan and national.

Membership in the foundation rests on residence or regular employment in the bounded area of the expressway on the south and west Bryden to the north east to Ohio south to Main, then east to Wilbur and Wilbur on the east. The Neighborhood Center, which is the existing church settlement, agency being transferred to the East Central Citizens Organization, is centered in this bounded territory. For the past years, this area has been the circumference of Church activities, membership