(WMP): Maury, I've given you some questions there. Perhaps you will read the question and then state your answer.

(MBF): Your first question was who were the leading individuals who founded the Fellowship Commission in Philadelphia, when did it come into being, and how long has it been financed over the years -- how has it been financed over the years...

There were twelve of us who started the Fellowship Commission on Oct. 11, 1941. At that time we felt the need for some overall set-up in the city of Philadelphia that could bring the groups together without in any way diluting their respective purposes and at the same time provide help which none of us could obtain by ourselves. So we wrote to William Henry Welsch, then the Associate Superintendent of Schools, and asked if he would chair a group to be called the Fellowship Commission. We met down in the old Solemberg's (?) Department Store restaurant, twelve of us including people like Clarence Pickett and myself and others that will be named a little later, for you. We decided to form the Fellowship Commission. We brought four groups together -- at that time the Council of Churches, the Society of Friends, Fellowship House, and the Jewish Community Relations Council. What we decided to do was to ask each of the four groups whether they would select five persons from their respective boards who had what we then called guts and integrity who would stick with the work of the Fellowship Commission which was then an unpopular kind of a cause, suspected of being too radical, or whatever you will, and who would stick with it even though the going got rough.

Out of the twenty we got twelve who were willing to work with us on that basis and we started the Fellowship Commission. At first we were merely what you might call a coordinating body. But by 1945 we had grown from four constituent groups to eight constituent groups and we had learned various lessons. Incidentally, I was the first and the only director it has had from 1941 until now.

We first found that unless we made it a part of the bylaws the President and the executive of the constituent agencies be on the board, we tended to become too professional. We didn't have enough lay leadership.

(tape gap for a minute or so)
... rather than ethnic groups, and the Nationality Services Institute, actually it was called the (can't think of it), but it did represent the foreign born groups. Somewhat later the Fellowship Commission started the American Civil Liberties Union chapter in Philadelphia and it became one of the constituent agencies and finally, within the last four or five years, the Housing Association, which was about fifty-five years old at the time, became our tenth constituent agency. So now we have ten groups -- those groups now are the American Civil Liberties Union of Greater Philadelphia, the Congress for Equal Job Opportunity, Fellowship House, the Housing Association of Delaware Valley, the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, the Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Conference of Christians and Jews (Philadelphia area office), the Nationality Service Center, and the Religious Society of Friends Meeting for Social Concerns. Those ten have their top lay person and their top professional person serve on our board, which means 20 members of the Fellowship Commission Board. In addition, we have the exact number (20) of Commissioners At Large, as we call them, representing schools and labor and other groups that really can't technically join an organization of this sort.

In addition to the constituent organizations, we have about 600 dues-paying organizations. They include a dozen colleges and universities, like Penn and Temple, Drexel, and Villanova; they include over 100 unions; they include about 150 schools and PTA's; they include about 150 churches and synagogues, and so forth. So we have in addition to that, a little bit better than 6,000 individual members, including about 2200 businesses, about 800 lawyers, about 800 teachers, about 300 clergymen, some 300 engineers, and so forth. We pick what we call gate-keepers, people who are in a position to spread the message and set examples for the large community in which they move. So we decided in the very beginning (to answer your question of how it was financed over the years) that we would never accept or seek funds from government at any level, local, state, or federal, and we never have. In our 34 years we have not taken one cent from government at any level, we have not ever attempted to become a part of the United Fund, or receive funds from it, or the Catholic Charities, or the Federation of Jewish Agencies. This is in order to maintain what we call our organizational and our operational independence and our credibility. So we have raised and spent a little over 6 million dollars in those 34 years and all of it has come from individuals or organizations or businesses and in some cases from foundations and in five or six cases, bequests ranging from $2,000 to the last one, $56,000.
Our annual budget is about $225,000 at this time.

Your second question is were you the first Executive Director and when did you take office?

As I indicated, I'm the only Executive Director so far. From October 11, 1941 until today, and until I retire, which should be in about four years, I have been its only Executive Director, assuming I don't get fired in the next four years.

Your third question: what part did you play in the drafting and adoption of the Philadelphia City Charter of 1951?

There the Fellowship Commission played a very, very key role. In the first place, two members of the charter commission were Vice Presidents of the Fellowship Commission. They were Abraham L. Freedman, who subsequently became a Federal Court judge, and Taylor G. Dougherty, who was Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools, at that time, and one of the most prominent Black educators at the time. They were both part of the Charter Commission.

Abe Freedman and Taylor Dougherty both were important parts of drafting the charter proposal which went before the public and was successfully approved. Tanner and I collaborated in writing the preamble, which was adopted bodily. We were responsible in the Fellowship Commission for two important aspects of the charter itself. One was the first and only time that I know of that any charter, as such, has incorporated a Human Relations Commission. Generally, it's been by ordinance or by other legislation. The entire country so far as I know. And this is certainly the first by charter. We drafted, Murray Shusterman was our lawyer and did it for us, Sadie Alexander was Secretary of the Fellowship Commission. She presented to the charter commission our proposal for a Human Relations Commission, with the kind of powers and scope that we felt would make it very effective. That was adopted almost bodily. And we also wrote Civil Service Provisions, forbidding discrimination in the employment policies of the city, via the charter. And subsequently there was a provision in there that contracts of $2,000 or more would have a non-discriminatory clause as far as employment was concerned. At that time, very frankly, it hadn't occurred to us to include things like Housing or Finance. We hadn't yet reached the stage of our development in '51 -- the Fellowship Commission was only ten years old -- to have begun to tackle that. We were tackling first economic needs and employment and opportunities for earning a living for the most disadvantaged in society, and they were primarily minorities.
So that we played an important part, not only in the drafting of portions of the charter, but then we joined forces with the Greater Philadelphia Movement and the Citizen's Charter Committee. The Greater Philadelphia Movement and others provided most of the funds for promoting public understanding and support of it. We did a good deal to mobilize citizen support and understanding because we still have the broadest base of any citizen group that I know of in the City of Philadelphia or the Philadelphia area, because we serve more than the Philadelphia area. Now in terms of human rights and inter-group relations, which we stress in asking voters to approve the charter, and we didn't play too much role in the other things because they were beyond our competence and beyond our scope. We also campaigned hard to get the charter approved and we are delighted that it was. That's why in subsequent years, with the educational home rule supplement, and in the last four and five years with new charter changes that we've been working for, we have played the key role. Now others have worked with us, but the kind of money that was available for promotion — for circulars, for newspaper advertisements, for radio speeches, for radio and television presentations — that has been lacking in the last three or four years. Although again the Fellowship Commission organized a Citizen's Council for charter revision when Mayor Tate was Mayor and it has some 53 city-wide and neighborhood organizations in it and we staff it here from the Fellowship Commission, but the opportunities for charter changes, even though most of the testimony before Judge McDermitt was inspired or initiated by us, there has been no movement in that direction, which may or may not be too bad a thing at this point. Although, we felt that the consumer program and a good ombudsman program and some very much needed changes in the cabinet level appointments — that they ought to be approved by city council. That's one of the things we felt should be changed in our charter — but there's been no chance to do that so far. But City Council simply rejected the report and recommendations of our Charter Committee and the public. So our role has been continuous, even though intermittent, from 1951 to 1975.

WMP: Why was that charter effort aborted, would you say?

The most recent one? Well, I think the reasons are several. Number one, there was a good segment of the former workers on behalf of the city charter who felt that it was good and felt a little leary about placing new powers in the hands of the incumbent administrations in City Hall. And because they distrusted one another of the incumbents in City Hall, like Mayor Tate and Mayor Rizzo, they were unwilling to open up the possibility that a mayor could run for an
unlimited number of terms or that he would have the powers to merge and to create new departments, or that certain controls over the budget and the revenue from a variety of sources, federal and others, might be manipulated improperly. So that some of them were afraid that the current administration would deal with the charter on the level of what they would like to see done.

WMP: Who were the people that had the muscle to stop the effort to change the charter?

Well, within City Hall itself, and they couldn't change, I don't know who some of the individuals were, but we do know that some of the political forces influenced or controlled by City Hall, when they couldn't make it possible for employees to run for office without resigning, or for the mayor to serve a number of successive terms, at that time they lost interest and probably scuttled the charter revision movement. It's also true that I don't think we're able quite to get the public excitement or support that we got earlier in 1951 when it was a brand-new thing, when the leadership was politically the Clark and Dilworth kind of team, and there were more young turks, if you will, who were working for good reform government and we didn't have quite that sort of excitement in 1970 - 1975. But we felt that certain changes would make important improvements in the charter and that new sources of revenue -- the Federal revenue sharing -- which was being used really at the discretion of the city administration and wasn't going for some of the purposes that originally we had hoped for, things of that sort were not really covered adequately by the charter -- we were trying to change them.

But I think that the fault was (a) some of the people saw that the good they hoped to get out of it wasn't possible with the charter changes as they were working out and (b) those of us who were working for charter changes didn't have the muscle or the issues to win widespread public support as we did both with the educational home-rule supplement and with the original charter.

The next question I think I've answered: Was Abraham Freedman one of your directors and was he for a time chairman of the Fellowship Commission?

No, he was never the -- you say Chairman -- we have a President. Abe Freedman was at one time a Vice President of the Fellowship Commission and was for a time Chairman of the Executive Committee, but in the Fellowship Commission we've never permitted the Executive Board to dominate or take over too much of the functions of the Board itself. We felt that the Board would become a rubber stamp and that the interest would die. So the Executive Committee was really reserved for decisions that couldn't be waited for a regular board meeting or that covered new areas of concern that we hadn't yet brought...
within our scope. So Abe Freedman was one of the most effective, one of the most respected leaders within the Fellowship Commission and in the general community. He was a Vice President at the time of the Charter Commission appointment, but he was never President.

WMP: Was he instrumental in bringing the acceptance of the Charter Commission in creating the Human Relations Commission?

Unquestionably. Abe Freeman and Tanner Doughery from within the Charter Commission unquestionably were very effective spokesmen for and advocates of a Human Relations Commission and I think that they probably played decisive roles. I can’t really tell how the others reacted, but at the time we knew that their leadership was key to the success of the adoption of it and it was.

Now you say, were you consulted by Mayor Clark when he made the original appointments to the Commission?

That was when the original members were Bob Callahan, Louis Ray Croft (?), Tanner Doughery, and Frank Leisher was appointed the first Executive Director. Now I don’t think Frank Leisher was a member of the Charter Commission. He was the first Director of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which preceded the Human Relations Commission and then for a time was also the Director of the Human Relations Commission, but I don’t think he was part of the original drafting group. Now I won’t say that we were consulted by Mayor Clark, but I will say that he responded most favorably to several suggestions that were made to him at that time because he was keenly interested and a champion of human rights. He recognized what the divisions over race, religion, and so forth were doing to the City of Philadelphia, and he was receptive to the kind of suggestions that were made to him and Bob Callahan had been an effective force in the FEPC effort and Tanner Doughery was both an educator and one of our Vice Presidents and alike in this sense was Abe Freeman and I think was receptive to suggestions because Abe Freedman had worked with Joe Clark for quite a long time as City Solicitor.

How did the existence of the Human Relations Commission within the city government affect the work of your Fellowship Commission and did the Human Relations Commission come up to your expectations?

I’d say that in the first ten and possibly fifteen years of the Human Relations Commission work we were very, very close working partners. Deliberately, we decided that our membership should not be overlapping so that we could disagree with each other when we chose to, work together when we chose to, and feel no compunction about criticism or going off in our various directions. I think in those days especially under the very able directorship of
George Schermer, whom we suggested be brought up from Detroit for that purpose because we thought he was an extraordinarily able person -- and he was -- that relationship was strengthened because George Schermer had been the first President of the National Association of Inter-group Relations Officials when he was Director of the Detroit Human Relations Commission and I was the third President of that body and we had had close working relationships and they continued after he came here. I think that after the change in the chairmanships of the Human Relations Commission that there was a marked change in the attitude within City Hall, notably under Mayor Tate and earlier under Joseph Clark and Dick Dilworth, I think that the Commission on Human Relations was given a great deal of freedom and a great deal of independence and therefore, I believe, was somewhat better trusted by the community including the Fellowship Commission. Subsequently, it seemed to some of us that the Chairman and the Chairwoman subsequently, did not have quite the freedom to move, and the misconception developed in City Hall that part of the Commission on Human Relations job was to keep the minorities in line, not to bring them into full partnership in terms of equal rights and opportunities and treatment on appointments and so forth, and the failure to show that kind of role was the prime reason why George Schermer resigned and made a scathing attack upon the Mayor of City Hall for what he regarded as interference with the Commission on Human Relations.

I would say under Clarence Farmer that the relationship has been much more casual, much more intermittent than it had been before that -- not because of any difficulties between us, but simply because our ways began to part increasingly. The earlier Commission had worked on needs affecting race, religion, and national origin, and the later years of the Commission on Human Relations from roughly, the mid-60's to the present, the emphasis is somewhat different. The relationship between labor and City Hall is stronger, and therefore some of the abuses by various segments of labor were not attacked as forthrightly as some of us would have liked, and in more recent years, the Commission on Human Relations has gotten itself out of any complaints affecting the police department and to a much lesser extent, the Fire department, and therefore we could not look to the Commission on Human Relations as an independent, credible champion when police abuses or police brutality, so-called, was the issue.

Other than that, I would say that for a while the Commission on Human Relations enjoyed a very good reputation in the Black community and the needs of the religious and the needs of the so-called nationality communities, having been pretty surmounted, not entirely, so they are still not entirely surmounted. The Commission began to be increasingly regarded as something working on racial issues and not so much on religious or ethnic (today ethnic is misused -- it means race, religion, and national origin --
but people think it means so-called foreign language or national origin groups, or Eastern or European white ethnic groups, which is a misuse of the word ethnic.)

I think today the Commission on Human Relations plays a much more quiet role, generally, it has played a fairly effective part in grosser forms of tension, but not, in the judgment of some of us, when persons of different races or cultural backgrounds, like the Spanish speaking, move into various neighborhoods and were practically chased out with violence and threats and destruction of their homes, I do not believe that either the Commission on Human Relations or the police department was very effective and helpful — protecting life when it was actually threatened by the new move-ins, but not protecting the rights to move and broadening those rights as far as governmental action was concerned. It was mostly through the ingenuity and the courage and the patience of the individuals themselves rather than through any efforts to enforce the ordinances and the state laws on fair housing. 

So I think that by and large the role of the governmental bodies — both the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission and the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations and private groups such as ours are complementary but they are not nearly as mutually helpful as they were in the early days even though there was really no breakdown or breakup of our relationships.

Now the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, we believe, has been somewhat more resourceful. It has gone more at things at their sources not their causes, it has attempted to get things in larger numbers rather than overdoing one by one complaints — servicing of individual complaints. But I think you are dealing mostly with Philadelphia so I won't get into that part of it.

One of the additional questions is how has the growth of the Black community over the past few decades affected the work of the Fellowship Commission of the Human Relations Commission? Well, I think that several things are worthy of note there — number one, much of the Black community now has a feeling of psychic equality — they know they are not yet equal before the law — they know they are not equal in their treatment and they know that there is considerable discrimination and racism, but they feel much less dependent upon the use of public or private groups — they utilize their own constantly changing leadership and their own resources more often than using intermediaries as we used to be in the days when they couldn't get past the front door of many employers or unions or governmental bodies. They don't quite need that any longer. They are able to stand on their own two feet and join with us as partners rather than as clients, in a sense. That's one important difference.
I think another important difference is that there is much more political sophistication — there's not still the sophisticated use of their number or their money and their contributions, but there is a good deal more political sophistication and now they are less willing to have candidates selected blindly by others with no voice on their part or no protest on their part. They are beginning to get some able spokesmen in the city council and the legislature -- they haven't changed the congressional representative -- it is still Congressman Nix, Robert N. C. Nix, Sr. They have not been in the last five years as united as they were before that. In part, some of the leaders have been coopted, in part some of the leaders have gotten tired, in part some of the leaders have been sent to pasture, but no new ones have emerged. So that today, for example, the five chapters of the NAACP in Philadelphia vary in their numbers and strength and vary in the effectiveness of their leaders. One or two of the leaders, like Alphonso Deal and George Sellers, are effective. They had for a time there a very able but rambunctious and in some cases disliked leader in Cecil Moore. But Cecil Moore at least spoke the heat and the impatience and the disgust of the Black community even though many of us felt that he was not particularly effective in making any sizeable gains at any level — education, housing, political, financial, employment, etc., but he did have the whip-lash tongue that was able to command public notice at the drop of a hat. He could call more press conferences and get them attended than any person I knew of in the city. Eventually he was thrown out of the NAACP for using it to advance his own political ends. We had to remove the NAACP under his leadership from our building, although it has never been eliminated as one of our constituent agencies. But it was a difficult thing to do and it was done and since that day Cecil Moore has continued to function as an individual — he hasn't had the command of the media's attention nor the resources or the manpower and while he is running for City Council and is still one of the best known of Blacks in town there is a divided opinion as to whether he is really a leader of the Black community or just an exceptionally well-known Black individual.

I think today the Black community is less organized than it was and less effective than it was in the '50's and the early part of the '60's, largely because it lacks effective leadership and organization, despite the fact that in two or three legislators there are some real potentials for leadership. They have grown greatly in the number of Black judges and the offices held in public life — in education, in unions, not so terribly much in business, except for the token appointment here and there by banks and others to fill visible positions as Vice Presidents or other things — too often in charge of
public relations or community relations or employment and rarely in the real policy making and determining levels. Nevertheless I would say that there has been progress at that level, but gross retrogression on the housing level, gross retrogression on the quality and the achievement educationally, that is, the percentages that are completing high school and going on to college or even just completing high school, and the percentages that are equipped to do the reading, writing, and the skills that are necessary in work as distinguished from professions.

Crime and the involvement of the Black community -- crime has been one of the factors that has set back housing and is causing serious fights on desegregations proposals for the schools.

WMP: Doesn't the Black community, Maury, constitute a larger percentage of the population now than it did twenty or thirty years ago?

Oh sure. It's more than doubled. Today -- well, when we started in 1941 there were roughly 300, possibly 350,000 Blacks. There has never been a feeling that the Blacks were properly counted by the census bureaus at any time for a variety of reasons, probably because some Blacks didn't want to and also partly because the census bureau apparently didn't work as hard to get precise or reasonably precise figures there. That number has more than doubled. Today the best guess we have in '75 as distinguished from 1970 when the census figures came out is about 3/4 of a million Blacks.
I think I've answered which mayors have given the most importance to the Human Relations Commission -- both Joe Clark and Dick Dilworth -- as was their practice, I think in much of city government, gave a very free hand to people they thought were able and I think that both Clark and Dilworth gave the Human Relations Commission, under George Schermer, considerable leeway. I think that Mayor Tate became disillusioned with it because he had a misconception -- maybe not a misconception -- wanted to make a use of the Human Relations Commission, which was not acceptable at least to the Executive Director and I doubt whether it was acceptable to many of the members of the Human Relations Commission itself. But at least he allowed it to exist and he allowed it to function to an extent.

Under Mayor Rizzo it is difficult to say the degree to which he involves himself, although I know he has appointed somebody on the staff there. But to some extent, even perhaps not too crudely, the Human Relations Commission is utilized to protect or advance the mayor's political or other ambitions. All too often the Director, now the new Chairman they call it instead of the Executive Director, of the Human Relations Commission is one of two Black appointments to almost any body that the Mayor wants to set up and have some control or influence over, and we haven't seen any great differences that have developed there. It doesn't seem to be as though there is unanimity, which is obviously impossible to have in such large groups. So I would say that the outstanding contributions of the Human Relations Commission have been in the past. I would still without overdoing it still feel that the Human Relations Commission serves an important purpose -- it's the only group that can 'command' the attendance of certain persons in business and elsewhere in the community -- it's the only group which can issue subpoenas if it needs to. It has the authority of the courts behind it. The rest of us have to beg or expose. We can't do much beyond that. Whereas the Human Relations Commission has some solid powers which have never been changed by law or in the charter even though in fact the use of those powers has been circumscribed a great deal by whoever was the incumbent in the office at that time.

And I would suppose the courage which the Executive Director displayed and the degree to which the appointees of the Commission didn't back them or backed them down.

Now you ask what role did the Human Relations Commission play in racial conflict situations at the time of Mayor Tate's administration? Now Mayor Tate was mayor from 1962.
The classic — not classic, but the major racial conflict in Philadelphia took place in 1964, exactly 20 years after the 1944 race riot in Detroit. Mayor Tate was in office and the police commissioner was Howard Leary and it was notable that at that time even though the police department was severely criticized by people who felt that they permitted looting to take place in North Philadelphia without stopping it, it was notable that no one was injured directly or killed directly during that riot except one person who was killed on the way to a hospital when the ambulance, another car, or a police car collided, but not directly in the riot itself. So we were congratulating ourselves that while we had property taken and some people severely hurt in terms of their businesses, that life wasn't taken. The Fraternal Order of Police, John Harrington, and others were severely criticized. Police Commissioner Howard Leary felt that he hadn't shown guts and I think there were people in the police department — possibly later Police Commissioner Rizzo — who felt that this was a kind of a craven attitude. Nevertheless, as far as history goes, while property was stolen right in the front yards of the police, it is still true that life was spared and no one was seriously injured or killed at the time. So I think since you give this credit when a Mayor is in office, the Mayor may properly take credit here that during his administration at that time about the most severe of the conflicts that we've had in the city of Philadelphia — at least in my lifetime — was handled satisfactorily from that point of view, unsatisfactorily from the viewpoint of the business people who were adversely affected by it.

Other than that, I think that the conflicts over housing have not witnessed equally effective efforts by either the police department or the Human Relations Commission. To see that the person's rights to equal housing of his own choice wherever he or she decides to move was in fact made available as required by Philadelphia and State law and by the federal constitution but that's a different story. So on that one episode I would say that Mayor Tate and his police commissioner may properly take credit for effective handling during the riot itself and for the immediate period afterwards. Whether or not the storekeepers were adequately recompensed by insurance or by the city and the state is another matter.

The next question is: what has been the product of Henry Sawyer's litigation in federal and district court before Judge Polun in regard to the hiring of Negro policemen?
Henry Sawyer is -- if the word isn't overdone -- is kind of one of the heroic figures in the Human Rights field in Philadelphia in the last 20 or 25 years. Not only in the racial field but in the church-state question, he took on causes and clients that were extremely unpopular. The nature of his own clientele would have suggested he be a little discreet or stay out of it if he could, but he didn't hesitate. He was almost uniformly successful in breaking up things which would have, perhaps, created more difficulty later on between religious groups and government when one or another didn't get what it felt it was entitled to. So in that area he made some important and I believe lasting contributions.

With the question of employment of Black police officers I think again that even if he didn't substantially change the internal situation because of the tight-knit character of the police department and the solid support it has from the former police commissioner and now mayor -- Rizzo -- but there remains that the courts were used. The courts did force disclosure. The courts did establish the fact that there were some discriminatory practices -- overt and covert -- by the police department and that a remedy could be sought through the courts and that it wasn't impossible to get somebody who would effectively enter litigation involving the police. So many lawyers and even bar associations side-stepped it. The district attorney's office doesn't usually get into it and notably in this case, the Human Relations Commission wasn't the one who took the step, so that actually if we are looking to the Human Relations Commission to correct abuses and discrimination by city governmental agencies, it's pointless to look to it. It has to be generally the function of an outside individual like Henry Sawyer or an outside group like the Fellowship Commission, the American Civil Liberties Union or the NAACP. The watch-dog role cannot be left to city government. Now we are trying, by charter revision, if we can and by ordinance if we can to get an ombudsman who would be appointed by the City Council and would be a citizen's way of reaching and correcting and preventing abuses by the administrative or executive arm of government. That, presumably, would be independent enough -- the terms not coinciding with the mayoral terms or the City Council terms -- to give a measure of help, but it wouldn't be necessary if in fact the Human Relations Commission was able to call the shots on abuses by Licenses and Inspections or police or firemen or any arm of city government, except for elected officials. None of us would give an ombudsman power over elected officials -- we think that there we have the power -- remove him if we don't like him. But with appointed officials it is almost impossible to reach them without an ombudsman or the equivalent of an ombudsman, such as the public advocate in the state of New Jersey, who has done some remarkably excellent work -- a man named Mr. Van Ness.
The next question is: what areas of the city are most plagued by racial conflict and what progress has been made in overcoming such situations?

Well, if you don't use the word "plagued" I think that it is self-evident that the situation of the Black community and the Spanish-speaking community is most acute in the lowest income neighborhoods, for obvious reasons. Poverty itself -- the fact that there are 2, 3, or 4 times as overcrowded as other sections of the city -- you have say, 150 per acre in North Philadelphia and 28 or 30 per acre in Northeast Philadelphia. So that alone would make you have both. Racial conflict implies inter-racial conflict and there has not been in the last four or five years any major violence between Whites and Blacks except in the housing situation. The housing situation is notably the most important. There was a potential for it over desegregation, but that hasn't eventuated except that there has been some intimations that we might have it if the courts order desegregation here as they have elsewhere.

But intra-racial conflict in the form of gangs -- Black gangs killing Black kids -- the major victims of crimes by Blacks are the Blacks -- the driving out of small business people, either White or Black -- the problem of neighborhood stores because they couldn't stand the hold-ups or the losses or the fear and the terror and occasional loss of life over the past 20 years by small storekeepers who were Jewish or White Christian or Black -- and that has been a serious factor there. The housing has been miserable -- there has not been any major housing improvement of any consequence for let's say two-thirds of the Black community and two-thirds or three-fourths of the Puerto Rican community of 100 or 125,000 (there is some dispute as to the number).

So if you say racial conflict most of us think of conflict across racial lines. That has not been a problem of any real account except in housing over the past four or five years. Every once in a while the threat will erupt when a White is the victim of murder or rape, but actually didn't erupt. And significantly, the public has not gotten excited that almost 200 lives have been wiped out of Black kids in gang warfare, whereas if 10 or 20, instead of 200 had been White kids killed in gang warfare, there would have been hell to pay in Philadelphia. The White community gets excited about this -- partly because they are afraid that that crime will spill over to them and also they feel if it's Black killing Blacks or Blacks robbing and mugging other Blacks they weren't too much worried about it. But the rate for the mugging or the gang warfare spills over into Whites, whether deliberately or by accident, as it has been on a few occasions, then the White community gets exercise, otherwise it hasn't been. And the Blacks
The community feels that their protection, their safety, has not been the equal concern of the police department to that demonstrated towards Whites, and that is an historic definition of racism -- that the schools, the neighborhoods, and the safety become matters of top concern to governmental authorities when Whites are involved, and a much lower concern and priority and service when the poor and if they are both poor and a minority are involved. Now maybe the White poor in sections of Manyunk and Roxborough and Frankford don't get as much service and protection as the more affluent White neighborhoods, but nevertheless it is not nearly as bad as that in the Black areas.

Finally, your question: does your organization deal with the busing issue and if so what success has there been?

Yes. We would not call it a busing issue. As a matter of fact that's what the big problem is -- that the issue has been made busing -- it hasn't even been made desegregation or integration or quality education. We would like to raise the level of public debate so that the benefits to all of having desegregated and integrated quality education would be made clear by educators and by public leaders rather than by leaders, public and private. We, for example, hold that if the public could be asked any hundred people in the street for their definition of quality education, they wouldn't be able to tell you what it is. We take the position that quality education, whatever else it produces, must produce academic, vocational, and living together skills, in safe and wholesome environments. We're saying in effect that every human being born -- rich or poor, Black or White, Christian or Jew -- whatever their situation -- must develop three kinds of skills -- the ability to work with things, the ability to work with ideas, and the ability to work with people. Now the ability to work with people is subverted by segregated schools and neighborhoods. So we're saying that you won't earn as good a living and won't be able to live peacefully and effectively and creatively with differences, no matter what they may be -- wealth differences, educational differences, occupational differences, racial differences, what not -- if you haven't developed these skills from the earliest years on and had them supplemented and complimented by church, family, and so forth.

We have got, just today by coincidence, and I'll give them to you -- a set of guidelines for submission to the Human Relations Commission, to the court, to the Board of Education, and to the public. We've got some action proposals that we think will help -- we've been trying to get them adopted for a long, long time by the School Board and others -- unsuccessfully. The School Board, the city administration, and the state legislature all would like the courts to take over the...
whole hot potato and leave them off the hook. And that's been part of the problem -- to delay and to pass the buck. To say we have to do it because the court orders it rather than to say we do it because it is (a) good education and (b) because the welfare of the community would be advanced by it. If we don't then your grandchildren and mine will be having the same debate -- how to live with people of other races peacefully, how to handle riots, how to handle these problems. Somebody has to break that vicious circle and we are one among a number of groups trying to do that.

WMP: What should I have asked you that I haven't asked you?

Well, I would say, Walter, that any discussion from my comparatively narrow point of view -- namely, human rights and its group relations as distinguished from business or other developments in the community -- the work in housing laws. For example, Abe Freedman, at our request, wrote the provision of the Pennsylvania Redevelopment Law, which outlawed discrimination in redeveloped housing ten or fifteen years before it became a central problem in Philadelphia, so the law pertained on afterwards. There has been no mention here about the ordinances passed in the city -- the ordinance against anonymous hate propaganda; the first FEPC ordinance; the first public housing non-discrimination ordinance; the first private housing non-discrimination ordinance in the city; the setting up, at first under Joe Clark's blessing and then ultimately by Dick Dilworth's appointment of the Higher Education Commission, a group which helped bring about not only the Community College of Philadelphia but wrote the law which set up the Community Council of Pennsylvania, which is created community colleges all over the commonwealth, including each of our surrounding counties. Lou Stevens and I wrote the ordinance which set up the Commission on Higher Education in the City of Philadelphia which grew out of the Higher Educational Opportunities Committee. These are among the kinds of things. I passingly refer to the educational supplement to the city charter -- and that was adopted and was an important factor in our charter which was a part of the 1951.

WMP: What provisions were there in that education charter relating to human relations?

Well, it's not just human relations, Walter. Actually, we got home rule and therefore a higher measure of independence in educational affairs. We didn't have to go to Harrisburg for approval of the legislature for every change that was made. It did, unfortunately, involve City Hall to some extent -- helpfully, and at other times very harmfully -- and the appointment and then the clubbing of the school board -- and gross interference, not in the amount of money which was assigned, which is proper for City Council
and the Mayor's office, but in the operation of the school system. So there have been some benefits and some losses, as well as some benefits. But the educational home rule charter, which we worked on, a number of us -- the Fellowship Commission, John Patterson's old group, the Citizen's Committee for Public Education, League of Women Voters, and others, worked on it for 2 or 2 1/2 years, I guess it was. It was an important landmark in consolidating and strengthening some of the positions and gains of the school system and I think that's an important thing here in Philadelphia.

We talked very superficially I guess about crime -- I guess you'll be talking to others about crime -- but we in the Fellowship Commission helped write -- and then the City Council ultimately approved, the ordinance which set up the Youth Services Commission and try to get at violence. And most violent crime, as you know, 50-60% of it is by people under the age of 25, both in school and out of school, so there are some other things. It was created in '73, didn't get its staff until August of '74, it has now completed a kind of comprehensive plan -- it is beginning to bring together some of the groups that are working on gangs and some of the groups that work on some of the preventative aspects of delinquency and anti-social conduct. It's kind of a center group, I guess, to the Crisis Intervention Network, which is supposed to deal more directly with gangs. The Youth Services Commission wasn't intended to -- was supposed to do more of a preventative job with kids who are gross absentees or truants or were failure in school and didn't see any future for themselves, but at least it is a part of the long and good history of Philadelphia, Walter, in establishing the legal safe-guards and then trying to establish machinery to enforce those safeguards. Of course it always has to do with the variety of competing vested interests -- political and otherwise, economic -- it's also true that Philadelphia's needs can't be completely resolved by the city -- the state and the national resources are also central.

WMP: There's still a Crime Prevention Association?

Oh yes. Some of us assume that roles are being carried out by organizations which themselves never said they would be doing that. Now, the Crime Prevention Association has really done a superb job with boy's clubs and more recently with Youth Services Bureaus in North Philadelphia and South Philadelphia and it's almost being used as a prototype for similar efforts around the country. So it is concentrated mostly in that area, but since the early days when Norah Winnet headed it for some twenty years, it has not been really a crime prevention association as such. It hasn't attacked the social, economic and political issues. It hasn't even attacked the quality
of the criminal justice system or even the operations of the juvenile justice system. Neither it nor the Crime Commission in Philadelphia is a real watch-dog on the gamut of criminal justice, nor is the Fellowship Commission's Committee and Committee of Ten (? of 44 public and private agencies really an effective watchdog, so if we say watchdogging here and there some of us do it with education and here and there some of us do it in parts of the criminal justice operation. Almost nobody is really watchdogging the police department except if a serious abuse takes place or a couple of informal groups like the toll cop (?) and the lawyer's committee for civil rights under law, which is not a part of (?) and a group that set up called Copar to handle abuses by police, but none of these have been terribly effective. Our effort to try to get the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to come in and do something about it died -- the U.S. Civil Rights Commission wouldn't touch it. There are all these political factors, as it was with Mayor Daley -- HEW's cut off of funds for the school system in Chicago. These are facts of life that we know we have to deal with, but where we knew that if we had a problem or had an effective or what we hoped would be an effective approach to the problems, that City Hall was wide-open under Joe Clark and Dick Dilworth. Not closed, but not as receptive under Mayor Tate and for most of this in this field, almost closed as far as Mayor Rizzo was concerned.

(WMP: It is strange that the Police Commissioner Mayor is the least responsive on this subject.)

Well, he's least responsive to any. He regards -- I think he thinks that in a show-down our types of groups that had to give the benefit of a doubt would not give the benefit of the doubt to the police department. I think that's reasonably accurate. But on the other hand neither will we damn the police department without the evidence for it. We do respond to fact-finding. We're not out to cut people's throats. We are anxious to change the picture if we can and to expose it or eliminate it if we can't change it, but that kind of an open ear even if it is rejected by Clark and Dilworth, and even to an extent by Tate I could get to Tate. I didn't always convince him, but at least you could get to him. Here groups like ours can't get to Mayor Rizzo. The ACU (S) can't get to him. The NAACP can't get to him. And dissent is regarded sometimes as treason or as communist or radical or something that would be brushed aside. Now if you can't be useful and you are not needed City Hall doesn't have a hell of a lot of time for you.
Now there was a time when you could get to the police department even when you couldn't get to the Mayor's office. Then, you could do that under the police commissioners like Tom Gibbons and Howard Leary and Brown and the like and even to an extent with Rizzo before he became Mayor. You had a hard job convincing but you could at least get in and talk. Maybe that's when you are still on the way up and you are still ambitious deal more with people, but afterwards people who don't agree no matter how honestly and how decently, you are just 'run out of society' as far as City Hall is concerned.

Fortunately for us, because we don't look for a dollar -- from City Hall or the State Government or the Federal government, we have a position of independence which enables us to take a position -- it may be strongly disliked and attacked, but it doesn't affect us financially and it doesn't affect us operationally, and to an extent it helps us keep our credibility because they know we can't be

(WMP: How is the media treating you?)

I think by and large, Walter, I really believe that the newspapers, radio and television stations have been remarkably cooperative over the years. I don't think in some cases their employment policies have been too good as far as minority is concerned, but they have given time and given spots and given programs -- they turn to you and they are always an open door. Again, on this desegregation bit, we met with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission -- and the Philadelphia Commission (I) and the Fellowship Commission -- something we initiated. We met with each of the dailies and each of the major television stations and when they were quite open in receiving us, even though they didn't fully agree with us any more than the public does. The public doesn't too much go for desegregated, integrated, quality education and it's hard to convince them that their children will be handicapped for life if they don't develop these skills so that when their employers or employees or whatever it may be later on -- will be able to work more effectively with people that they don't necessarily agree with.

I guess what we didn't mention -- there's the absence of any growth of close relationships on the human level as distinguished from water and sewerage and what not between the city and suburbs and the remarkably new and strong rule of the white ethnic groups. They have nationally and in Philadelphia become much more involved in politics, they are much more outspoken, they feel -- even though in some cases it is not true and some cases it is true -- their needs are not being adequately recognized so that a formidable force -- perhaps better organized and better led than the Black community, is that of the Italian community or the foreign language speaking
community — notably the Italian and to a lesser extent, Polish. The Irish power in the political circles is obviously been cut down considerably and shared. Jewish involvement, I guess in politics is much less than it was before, and groups that didn't have that weren't moving in the various professions and various businesses and in political life have begun to move up in sizeable numbers, notably the Italian and Polish.

These are factors that are a part of the picture today.

(WMP: What about people moving to the suburbs? Is this creating a vacuum of leadership or diminishing the leadership for dealing with the kind of problems that you cope with?)

In some ways, yes, Walter. I'm glad you raised that because I had made a note here and I didn't even bother mentioning it. The smallest minority now in the city of Philadelphia is the White Protestant. I don't think you have one — certainly no more than one — white Protestant member of City Council. Many of your judgeships which used to be dominated by White Protestants have gone to Catholics of various ethnic backgrounds and to Jews and to women, some of whom may be Protestant, but nowhere near the numbers. I doubt whether there are more than, as a guess, 200,000 White Protestants in the City of Philadelphia. In the city. Not doing business or professionally involved. I don't think there are more than 200 or maybe 250,000 Jews in the city as distinguished from the suburbs and New Jersey right across the river. Even though their businesses and professions may in many instances be here. That's about 400,000. The White Catholic and the Black Christian, mostly Protestant, 90-95% protestant, are about even — 750,000 each. So it would take a million and a half Catholics, white Catholics and Black Christians, or it would take 225,000 to 250,000 Jews, 200,000 Protestants and include in your Catholic community your Puerto Rican, because they are Catholic mostly.
(WMP: What is the role today of the White Protestant business leader downtown office building occupant -- do they just come in and go out or do they take some responsibility for the community in which they are doing business?)

Frankly, Walter, I wouldn't be able to identify which of the business community is White Protestant or Catholic. I probably could identify some that are Jews and some that are Black, but for example, I don't know what Fred Heldring or John Bunting's religion -- but anyway the business community -- I would say in the early days, from 1940 on to roughly 1965, the business community ... (interruption)

(WMP: My question has to do with whether the traditional civic groups, starting at the top of the hierarchy, the Greater Philadelphia Movement and the Committee of Seventy, and the Economy League and any others -- are they able to cope with some of these problems or don't they attempt to?)

I would say that from maybe 1941 to about 1960 - 65 even the business community in some ways was more advanced than the human rights community in recognizing the mistakes and the costs and the benefits and the losses in resolving or failing to resolve some of these problems. I think they played a much bigger part then than now. I think in those days they played it mostly through intermediaries. They didn't want to deal directly. They were afraid of what might happen if they were dealing directly with some of the minorities and they the thing didn't work out the way the minorities wanted it, whether they would suffer the business repercussions whatever the business might happen to be. In the last ten years I think most of business's efforts have been directly with minorities rather than through intermediaries such as our own. They have been mostly in the financial arena. They have been helping Blacks with self-help projects and Puerto Ricans with self-help projects. They have given some employment opportunities and some training opportunities. They make studies about housing and studies about schools but didn't really try too hard to influence the quality and the financial availability and the placement of housing. They were content, I believe, Walter, to see concentrations in public housing projects rather than see some of the minorities at least in the poor lower income levels spread to other parts of the community, so that some of the segregation problems in schools and in transportation facilities and in hospitals and in various types of neighborhood institutions became all segregated as a result of the increasing concentration because of the population more than doubled and the available housing didn't more than double so they had been going into older neighborhoods where others were moving out, either because they wanted different kinds of housing or the children were grown up or what. So the Oak Lanes and the Wynnefields and the like
became Black, the schools became Black, the bus lines and subway trains became Black, the nature of the stores serving those areas began to take on Soul Foods or clothing that some different groups wanted, and therefore in failing to see that in concentrating these we were concentrating trouble as well people, that it was not as far-sighted as you would want. But by and large, I'd say, in the early days, like on charter revision, which I showed the Greater Philadelphia Movement role, and I think today the Philadelphia partnership and to some extent also GPM is still counted among the more accessible, more reliable, more effective of the allies that human rights groups can have, both in and out of public life. The Chamber has been a cooperative group but it has not really ever really gotten into collecting some of the major needs, whether health services or the quality of the educational program. Again, they've made some studies and they've provided some experimental academies and they've given some manpower help and they've worked at getting jobs through natural alliance of business people and the like, but this has not been a cause of -- see almost everybody, Walter, without exception, in the more affluent parts of the community willing to work on remedial measures. They don't frighten anybody. But preventive measures frighten them because preventive measures might mean substantial changes of taxes, substantial changes of housing, substantial changes in power relationships and politics and what not and that frightens them. So you see, exodus from a city -- not merely because schools are becoming Black -- you see it sometimes generally when the political power, the economic power is fearful that they won't be able to influence political power sufficiently or government sufficiently to protect their interests. Then you see a more sizeable exodus, so I'd say that just as labor has become more middle-class, the incomes are higher than the working class that we used to think of, and that business and to some extent the professions have become that, we can count on spot help from business associations like GPM and Chamber. We can count on spot help from individual business leaders of the John Bunting, Fred Heldring type, but you can't count on either leadership to the extent that you used to or their ability to command much larger resources when much larger resources were essential in making substantial progress. You make well, almost all of them are willing to help on a health facility. Almost all of them are willing to finance the United Fund type agencies, or the equivalent type agencies, but I don't see very many of them, if any of them, here and there a foundation does, really promoting that kind of research, promoting that kind of advocacy, calling for major political or economic changes that might benefit much larger numbers and by benefitting much larger numbers might reduce the crime threat, reduce the health threat, reduce the tax loss threat, reduce the exodus threat, and the like. They have felt not quite the broad community concern that they did I think a little earlier.
(WMP: They don't try to get to the basic causes --)

That's right.

(WMP: Is the city line changing in a way -- are Blacks living in the city and commuting out to jobs in the suburbs in those new industries you see in those industrial parks?)

Sure. They are now commuting where they have the skills that are needed in the suburbs. I'm told that some of the suburban employers find that they can't get the semi-skilled or unskilled workers they need out there because there is no housing nearby and by the time you take the time and the cost to go out if the salary isn't adequate than people can't afford to move out to them. So the job opportunities have decreased for the unskilled and the semi-skilled -- radically decreased for them in Philadelphia -- it's less than half of what it was in 1940 or 45 or 50. Big business -- just as red-lining of neighborhoods -- has caused more and more concentrations faster than they might have taken place by removing some of the employment opportunities, by refusing to finance mortgages in certain areas, by policies which may have been justified as far as the immediate problem is concerned but when supplemented by other correctives that would have stabilized the situation, I don't think business can claim that it has tried to improve or stabilize things here.

(WMP: I would assume that jobs in industry have become more technical and more mechanized and that therefore more skill is needed --)

No. Almost the opposite. More skill is obviously needed in making that equipment and that machinery and in repairing that equipment, but the operations can sometimes be as simple as pressing a button, so that sometimes you don't need the operation -- and I went down to see Abbotts when they opened up their new plant down at the Food Distribution Center. I saw one man sitting in a television console. He controlled the milk that came in from the farm, they weighed the truck when it came in, they attached the hose to it. It all went right through there, all the way through, and when they bottled it there were about four people working in the department where they were bottling it -- half a million bottles a day of milk. Four people. All they had to do is make sure that when the cartons came down one didn't get crooked so it wouldn't jam up the works. They pulled it out and straightened it. So that the kind of skills needed on the operational level may not be very great. The repair and the making and the improvement, that's a different story.
It's like -- to make mechanized telephones you had to have master technicians to operate the mechanized telephones. The mechanized telephone today doesn't require a great deal of skill. Or take in department stores. The dumbest kid in school now -- she puts down that your bills are $7.80 and you give her a $20 bill and it subtracts and you know she has to give you $12.20 change. She doesn't have to add or subtract anymore. Now they are doing that with lots of other things. So in some ways the jobs are more skilled and more professional but in other ways some of the jobs have been simplified. But the big thing now is access to them. To take a person from 12th and Dauphin and get him out to Bucks County someplace with the cost involved and the time loss involved. He can't get a house anywhere near there within his reach financially -- the mortgages are way over his head -- is the problem. Two-thirds of all new business has been put in the suburbs in the last decade.

Now what has big business said to itself? Has it said to itself Philadelphia go to hell? Investment here will go to hell? I'll have to move out too if I can move my stuff? What has it said to stabilize things in Philadelphia? Now it hasn't been the S.O.B. in the picture but it hasn't also been "the savior" in the picture either. And yet they've got the resources, the perspective, the time, the continuity, which private agencies and even government doesn't have.

(WMP: Well, we're really talking around the question of employment opportunities for the minority groups in the city...)

Minority group opportunities have tremendously increased in public governmental life. Even today -- even with Tate and Rizzo you still have large numbers -- not always at the policy making level, but large numbers. The job opportunities, except a handful of cases like sanitation, in the unskilled and low-skilled group has gone down from 42% of all the jobs of Philadelphia to less than 20 -- about 17%. The Chamber of Commerce figures its own figures. So that there is a vast number to which -- it's a pity to say it -- aren't even worth exploiting. It used to be that some employee could exploit this unskilled and semi-skilled labor. Now they're not even worth exploiting.

(WMP: You mean they are not capable of working at all...)

They're not capable of profiting from them, so they won't take them. Before that you -- instead of hiring you for $150 a week, you could hire me for $80. Or two of us for $80 and get more work than they could get out of one. Now they're not even worth doing it because they've mechanized so much of it and because the quality of that labor is just
not necessary for them.

(WMP: So there is a shortage of jobs for unskilled people...) Yes. The number of phones in the United States is 300% greater than it was. The number of employees is only a fraction as large because one man can handle dozens of them.

(WMP: What's the sociological import of what you are saying now — you have more and more people who are not able to perform a productive function in society...)

We're saying two or three things, Walter. Number one is that the public school systems of the big cities are still living in a dream world. They have not adjusted to the inadequate preparation that most low-income homes have been able to give to their kids for schooling. That's number one.

Number two is the kinds of industry and business and services which can utilize that type of employee have not been utilized.

Number three -- internal retraining hasn't been done on any vast scale, so that you could upgrade these people in these kinds of jobs.

Number four -- the kinds of public service jobs which could utilize such people are just not being funded. So you -- we have not (a) equipped the people or (b) brought in the kinds of work for them to do that they can do. I'm not talking about the upper level, I'm talking about the lower one. Those that are on the dung heap, so to speak.

(WMP: What's the unemployment rate in the city?)

Well, it's about 10%. It's for Blacks it is maybe 12 or 14% and for Whites, 5 or 6%. For Black kids in Center City -- not the Chestnut Hills now -- it is 50%. If you included under-employment, maybe a kid who works 3, 4, 5, or 6 months a year and not all year round, it is probably higher than that. It's higher now than it was during the Depression in the 1930's. I just read an article the other day which shows that the employment of women has gone up, but the employment of men -- single men and heads of households -- has gone down. Now you take in your skilled levels. There is no use for a navigator on airplanes, today. You don't use navigators. It's all done by radar and everything. Some of your skilled workers -- your person who used to be a punch operator for computers -- now they have computers doing that. The programmers are key persons but the other jobs are being mechanized. You can move whole traffic systems now with one person running the traffic for a big city like Chicago or Detroit. Again, a television thing.
(WMP: Is this being done already here?)

It's being done to some extent all over. When cheap labor was unavailable or too costly, things were mechanized. Everything was mechanized. In the mechanization you need some unskilled labor but you don't need it in the numbers you used before. One girl now can handle bookkeeping machines for what 20 girls used to do.

(WMP: The sociological import of this is that some people are not able to even get along with these simple new --)

Reading and computing are skills which are not being taught to vast numbers and while the present generation may have to be kept on relief or otherwise, the second succeeding generations will also be on relief if the school systems and industry and business and government doesn't do the training that used to be done when immigrants came here and they were trained right on the jobs.

(WMP: Is this a concern of your organization...)

Yes. It is a major concern. We're pushing now for guaranteed employment and guaranteed income for those who can't work or shouldn't work. We're pushing for lots of things -- for example, we're trying to introduce the first work-study program on a massive scale in the United States in Philadelphia. We've reduced the number of kids who are dumped on the market every June by either becoming 16 years old or quit school or graduating but who have no skills to sell. So we've gone to Washington just last Thursday to try to find a work-study program at the high school level exactly like that on the college level. Where kids can work all mornings or all afternoons or work one week and go to school one week. And be on the job, because what they are learning at school isn't a damn bit of use when they get into the jobs, Walter.

We'd like to see -- we don't have illusions of grandeur, Walter, we're not that powerful -- we'd like to see a person paid, say for 40 hours a week, but only work 35 hours and use the other 5 hours to be educated at the job on better ways of doing the job he is doing or being upgraded or improving his reading or writing or other skills. So the employer would be paying for that five hours without direct work but he would eventually have better satisfied and more productive employees.

(WMP: Who is working with the employers to enlighten them or do they pick this up themselves?)

Some of them pick it up themselves. Some of us are trying to work with them. For example, you ask -- this effort to get in school and work with in-school youth fifteen and older but still in school for at least a couple of years is sponsored by six of us. The Fellowship Commission originated it and five others are co-sponsors with us. The Philadelphia
school system, the Philadelphia Diocesan School System, the Greater Philadelphia Movement, the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, and the Philadelphia Association of School Administrators. So there is business in it to the extent that GPM reaches out to those people. And we've been trying — David Eastburn is Chairman of our membership — and he's President of the Federal Reserve Bank. He's a remarkable guy. We're trying to say that properly looked at this is the best kind of social insurance you could possibly take.

If we don't break that vicious circle of dumping 10,000 kids every summer into the work market who don't know the first thing about reading, writing, and arithmetic and who can't read the simplest kind of directions, they may be able to drive a truck but can't make up the bill properly or check the things properly that they want. Unless we break that circle by getting some kids who have some record of success — build some self-confidence — they find out what they can and can't do through these kinds of things and do it on a massive enough scale — 500 - 1,000 kids won't do it. There are 30,000 kids out of 280,000 kids who need this sort of thing in the public schools alone and our program, as I said, affects both school systems — public and diocesan now people like that can help spread it.

Whether it will take, whether the people say hell, I won't worry about that, I'll just worry about my own business, I don't know.

There are some — I think the Fred Heldrings and the David Eastburns and the John Buntings and some of the younger people in the Philadelphia partnership are moving in that direction and some still in GPM and the Chamber too, for that matter. I don't know enough to speak too freely on that.

(WMP: Being down on the Fellowship Commission really broadens your scope on ...)

Well it's for two reasons — first of all, when we started it was always discrimination of opportunities based on racial and national origin. Then we added income, because we knew we weren't meeting certain needs. Then we added sex, and most recently, we added age. So now we work without regard to race, religion, national origin, income, sex, and age. That was number one.

But number two, we also recognized, Walter, that before what we thought were answers were pretty superficial things. We're now beginning to see the causes more clearly. Beginning to get at the sources that can affect the causes. We can't but we get at them, and they do it. And our job is to affect priorities, policies, programs, services, and funding in this area. We don't care who does it. For example, as I said, we initiated this program for work-study. A million seven hundred thousand dollars for the first year — we went down last Thursday to meet with the Congressional delegation.
All of that is going to go to the public school system. We don't even get our train fare back. And that's what we're in business for. To get an idea of how you might do the job better and affect larger numbers, and then turn that over to somebody else and then go to the next problem. The problem then will be preventive health—not remedial health, but preventive health.

(WMP: What's happened to all the social agencies like the Council on Social Agencies -- the Crime Prevention Association, etc.)

The Citizen's Council on City Planning is of course out of business. The Health and Welfare Council is a degree of help -- they work with us on the Youth Services Commission thing and we've worked with them on various things. But there is no matter of fact I just wrote a letter last week to Ellie Newbold, saying to her that if we could get a consortium of colleges and research facilities, there are thousands upon thousands of pieces of demographic studies that are available. You can go to the hundreds of places that have them, but there is no central depository of information about trends affecting the Philadelphia area so that we can all repair to without having .... (unclear). We can't do a great deal with polls of opinion -- we have to guess what the hell they are or extrapolate them from the Gallup polls and assume they apply to Philadelphia. There's much that can be done -- with no illusion, Walter. It's going to take where it used to take a generation or two for most of the groups to adjust, it is now taking three or four generations.

(WMP: You're not part of the Health and Welfare Council? It seems you ought to be somehow...)

We work closely with them, Walter, but we treasure the independence. You remember a few years ago when Rizzo and Frank Harrington told city employees that we said that no city employee should contribute to the United Fund because the legal aid society and the Community Legal Services were suing police. I said the Fellowship Commission was one of them. Well, I was called by the newspaper and I said that Frank Harrington doesn't know his ass from a hole in the ground. He's been on our tensions committee. He knows we have never taken a dime, we have never defended a person in court involving the police department. So he said, "I know that's true, but the United Fund had to go out and practically beg everybody to believe them that (a) we weren't getting any money from them, (b) that the others were doing their jobs legitimately -- protecting clients that were too poor to get their own legal defenses, that this was a legitimate cause, they ought to soft-pedal it. Now this is what happens, and therefore we have decided that even the United Fund -- Nellie Bok
can tell you all the founders of it. Nellie Bok -- Mrs. Curtis Bok -- was one of the founders also of the Fellowship Commission. One of the twelve original founders. And she and Judge Flood and others were connected to the United Fund. We could have gotten in on the ground floor. We decided we shouldn't do it. Later I found out how important that was, Walter, and in the Girard College case lawyer after lawyer wanted to stop giving us money. That would have affected the United Fund. The Community College -- the real estate people thought there would be more taxes on real estate. Nobody ever said it would be but that's what they said it would be. Confession of judgment and consumers were being abused. Each of those things somebody has a strong vested interest and it is their proper right to protect their interest. We find by not taking any large amounts of money from any one source that if we have to -- we don't do it necessarily -- we have to say the hell with them, or go ahead and do what we think is right.

(WMP: Did you stop the business of judgment of judgment?)

Under $10,000. Yes. We worked with Community Legal Services on that. As a matter of fact we had to withdraw because of three judges in the case -- John Adam and Charlie Weiner and a third one -- were all former chairman of our lawyer's committee. John Adam called me and said, "Mr. You know where we stand, but if you get in this we'll have to withdraw because it would be an alleged conflict of interest." So I said, "We'll get the hell out of it because we don't want to hurt the case."

So these are things. The Girard College case -- I forget his name now -- he used to be the President of the Chamber of Commerce -- he used to give us a hundred bucks a year. A lot of other people would give us when he found we were in that. We lost money. When we got into the housing ordinance in the city of Philadelphia, Walter, we lost $9,000 that one year from real estate and builders.

(WMP: What is your budget?)

$225,000.

(WMP: You have quite an operation.)

end of interview