

# JOB CORPS

## The Nightmare Mr. Nixon Plans For Millions

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ ON August 7, 1969, exactly one year from the day the Republican Party nominated him as its candidate for President, Richard Milhous Nixon appeared on national television to spell out the plans he and his staff had laid to solve the domestic crisis created by thirty years of the Fast Deal and Great Shuffle. The core of the Nixon program was a security system for "Welfare" families with children — which would provide a guaranteed annual income, long the heart of Fabian Socialist doctrine. Of course, it was denied that the program really provides a guaranteed annual income because Mr. Nixon had repeatedly denounced that concept during his successful quest for the Presidency. Nonetheless, there it was in all its Fabian glitter.

The President's "Welfare" reforms met with mixed reaction from the electronic gurus, social savants, and syndicated pundits. "Liberals" tended to view it as a giant step on the road to the Welfare State, while Conservative opinion ran the gamut from mild and cautious approval

to agonized shock. *U.S. News & World Report* revealed that experts were predicting the cost of the Nixon plan would escalate to nearly \$40 billion per year, and others noted that under the Nixon scheme 30 million Americans might soon be living on "Welfare" checks provided by whichever Americans elect to continue working.

Both Conservatives and "Liberals" agreed, however, that Mr. Nixon's speech was a masterpiece of rhetoric. New York Timesman James Reston, himself a past-master of etymological chicanery, praised the President for the feat of managing to present in "conservative language" a program so far to the Left. The *Washington Post*, *Newsweek*, and the *New Republic* all echoed the hoorah!

The President began his speech with an articulate indictment of the failures of the present "Welfare" system, presented his program for a guaranteed minimum income, and then closed by stressing that what he was really proposing was not more "Welfare" but something new, to be called "workfare." To the millions of Americans who are weary of financing unending giveaways, the President's skillful emphasis on "getting people off the welfare rolls and onto payrolls" sounded like manna from Washington. Mr. Nixon had stressed that in order to receive the new guaranteed annual income one had to be willing to sign up for job training and/or be willing to take an "acceptable job." It was these two conditions which made the "reforms" palatable to Conservatives.

But, as the ether of the President's rhetoric began to wear off, Conservatives

were left to wonder whether President Nixon's training and/or work requirements were as redeeming as they were made to appear. The American Conservative Union's *Battle Line* observed:

*... few can forget the national uproar mounted by liberals a few years ago when the City of Newburgh, New York, tried to enforce such a job plan on its welfare recipients. By requiring recipients to accept only "suitable jobs," the Nixon Plan allows a major loophole for those who make welfare hand-outs a way of life.*

M. Stanton Evans, uncompromising editor of the *Indianapolis News*, was especially concerned because the program would be administered by bureaucrats with what he called a "welfare mentality." As Mr. Evans pointed out:

*This [work] provision conjures up a picture of a welfare official's consigning welfare recipients to their cruel fate if the provisions of the "requirement" are not fulfilled. It is hard to imagine this actually occurring in very many places, which means that the "work requirement" feature could in fact become a paper tiger.*

Like many other Conservatives, Dallas editor Dan Smoot was concerned with the President's use of the adjective "suitable" to modify the word "job." Mr. Smoot warned:

*... Nixon says jobs must be suitable and conveniently located. What is a suitable job? Nixon says he means not "just any job," but a "good job." Under Nixon's scheme, a reliever who prefers welfare to work need merely assert that no good, suitable, convenient job was offered him.*

Of course, the President went farther. He knew that, of all government "Welfare" programs, probably none carries the emotional appeal of *job training*. The very term conjures up a bright picture of indolent drones being transformed into taxpaying workers laboring happily in a land of industrial honey. But, as the Republican-oriented *Human Events* has gloomily noted:

*... while the President is placing much faith in this proposal, the truth is that previous government manpower training programs have been a dismal flop . . .*

*In this regard, conservatives were disappointed that the President made no mention [in his speech] of two themes that were prominent in his campaign rhetoric: voluntarism and tax credits for business. Rather than trusting to a rejuggled version of programs that have already failed, why, ask conservatives, didn't the President make more use of the most successful job training mechanism in history: American industry?*

Why, indeed? Why a bureaucratically run program? Why forced labor or government "education centers" when private industry could be induced to handle the problem with a minimum of cost to the American taxpayer?

The current government training scheme, which *Human Events* rightly calls a "dismal flop," is the notorious Job Corps. An integral part of L.B.J.'s misnamed War on Poverty, it was designed during 1964 by Kennedy in-law R. Sargent Shriver; Harvard economist Bill Capron; A.D.A. wheelhorse John Kenneth Galbraith; Walter Reuther's protégé Richard Boone; the Ford Foundation's Paul Ylvisaker; Paul Jacobs, a former member of the Young Communist League and current fellow at the radical Center for the Study of Democratic



Institutions; Adam Yarmolinsky,\* the leader of Harvard's Young Communist League who was made assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara; Michael Harrington, successor to Norman Thomas as head of the Socialist Party; and, the man who is now Presidential Assistant to Richard Nixon, Daniel P. Moynihan.

Moynihan, a lifelong Democrat and

\*"Liberal" commentators made much of the fact that a coterie of Southern Congressmen refused to vote for the War on Poverty unless the Johnson Administration agreed to keep Yarmolinsky out of a working role once the War on Poverty became operative. Christopher Weeks, who was among the midwives at the birth of the War on Poverty, and later an assistant to John Lindsay, writes in his book, *Job Corps*:

"Yarmolinsky's demise remains one of the most deplorable sacrifices of a dedicated and hard-working public official to political expediency that has hit Washington in the last decade. He was a victim of suspicion, fear, and circumstances . . .

"First, he was of Russian extraction, and Jewish, and his parents had been connected with some organizations [like satellites of the Communist Party] which were known to be left wing and alleged to be subversive. Yarmolinsky, himself, however, had never been connected with any questionable organizations. [Former classmates at Harvard are prepared to testify that he headed the Young Communist League at Harvard and edited its publication, *The Yardling*. Yarmolinsky was so dedicated to Party discipline that he swallowed the Hitler-Stalin Pact and stood up in a Harvard meeting and declared that "our job is to stay out of the war." The current Communist slogan at the time was: "The Yanks Are Not Coming!" When Hitler betrayed his ally Stalin, the Party line did a 180-degree reversal and so did Yarmolinsky.] A graduate of Harvard, and Yale Law School, he had gone on to become law clerk to a Justice of the Supreme Court, then worked for the Fund for the Republic, and later became public affairs editor for Doubleday books — hardly a dossier which reveals any dangerous left-wing sympathies."

The Congressmen were late in locking the barn door. Although his work as McNamara's assistant — helping to sabotage America's arms systems — was doubtless of more importance, the imprint of Comrade Adam Yarmolinsky was already on the Office of Economic Opportunity.

former officer in the Fabian Socialists' Americans for Democratic Action, was ironically the key man in drawing up Mr. Nixon's "Welfare" program to solve the problems designed and created by Moynihan and his fellow Fabians. Mr. Moynihan even bragged about this little con game in the *Boston Herald Traveler* of November 23, 1969:

*You know, the libs will never forgive him. Richard Nixon has now done the final, unforgivable thing to the liberals. He's done what they wouldn't do. This was the first Presidential message on welfare in history. All previous Presidents were afraid of it and tucked the subject under Social Security. Liberal Democrats got themselves closed in on issues that they couldn't reopen. It's the mechanics of politics. This I know something about because it's my business. John Kennedy could sign a test-ban treaty that Adlai Stevenson would have been crucified for. It was O.K. for the anti-Communist Catholic to trust the Russians, but not Adlai. Lyndon Johnson could put through aid to parochial schools that John Kennedy could never get through. Now Richard Nixon has done this. The big liberals who didn't do it — who couldn't do it — are just shocked.*

All of this Brier Patch philosophy seems very peculiar, doesn't it? As if the whole thing were being manipulated by Leftist forces behind the scenes. Leftist forces well above mere "Liberalism." After all, one remembers that the War on Poverty in general, and the Job Corps in particular, were so mired in disorganization, corruption, radicalism, Black Nationalism, Communism, and criminality that Richard Nixon focused much of his campaign rhetoric against it. As Candidate Nixon declared:

*... a current poverty program that should be eliminated is the Job Corps. This is one program that has been a failure. It sounds good, but it costs \$10,000 a year to train a man for a job that may not even exist.*

Yet, soon after his inauguration, the Associated Press reported:

*President Nixon, backtracking on some election campaign views, told Congress yesterday he wants to keep the Job Corps alive... (and transfer it from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor).*

*While there had been speculation early in the administration that Mr. Nixon might even abolish the OEO, he said experience has proven "the value of having in the federal government an agency whose special concern is the poor." \**

On April 11, 1969, the Nixon Administration announced the closing of 59 of the 113 Job Corps Centers. The same day it announced the creation of twenty-seven new job-training facilities in large urban areas. Many considered the move out-and-out charlatantry — first promising to eliminate the program, then appeasing opponents with an ostensibly half-way measure that turns out to be an expansion of the program. Most of the camps closed were the small Conservation Centers located in places akin to Elephant Breath, Wyoming, or Burnt Mattress, Arkansas. Their replacements are large urban operations.

Besides shutting down small rural centers in favor of expanding urban Job

Corps facilities, the President promised a massive expansion of job-training facilities to complement his new guaranteed "Family Maintenance" program. And, soon after his nationally broadcast speech, Richard Nixon did indeed submit to Congress his proposals for a vast expansion of "Welfare"-oriented job training. As United Press reported on August 12, 1969:

*President Nixon today proposed giving states and cities much of the authority for running \$2.3 billion a year in federal programs to train more than 1 million Americans annually for jobs.*

In view of the Nixon proposal to put millions of men and women through his job-training program in the coming years, AMERICAN OPINION asked your reporter to visit one of the operating job centers for a talk with students, faculty, and members of the surrounding community. Our object was to attempt an accurate assessment of whether Mr. Nixon's programs are likely to create a major reduction in the number of those on the "Welfare" rolls.

The institution we visited was the Tongue Point Job Corps Center at Astoria, Oregon, approximately one hundred miles due west of Portland near the junction of the Columbia River and the Pacific Ocean. Astoria is now a fishing and lumbering center with excellent port facilities and a population of about ten thousand. It has a past rich in history and lore. Lewis and Clark terminated their journey westward here in 1805, and John Jacob Astor established Port Astoria in 1811 as the first permanent outpost west of the Mississippi.

Tongue Point has the unique distinction of having served both as a men's and (currently) women's Job Corps camp. It is located on a 747-acre former Navy Base which juts out into the Columbia River. Having been a military base for over

\*Indianapolis Star, February 20, 1969. On June 2, 1969, Mr. Nixon asked Congress to extend the anti-poverty program for two more years, declaring that the proposed two-year extension "represents a change from my earlier intention."



twenty years, there are millions of dollars of first-cabin facilities, including attractive off-base housing for the Center employees. In addition to dormitories (some of which were formerly quarters for officers) and spacious classroom and vocational facilities, there is a twenty-room dispensary, a theatre which features first-run movies nearly every night, a five-lane bowling alley, a roller-skating rink, color television sets, pool and tennis tables, and a spacious library.\*

The Tongue Point Center operates with a staff of 287 employees serving 730 girls. This ratio is a vast improvement over other Centers where the staff often outnumbers the students. The camp is run by the University of Oregon and Philco Ford, the former handling academics and the latter vocational education. Approximately fifty percent of the girls at Tongue Point are Negro, thirty-five percent Mexican-American, and the rest Caucasian with a smattering of Indian, Eskimo, and Hawaiian.

A "jobbie" receives room and board; medical and dental care; work clothes; a cash allowance in the form of a credit

card for the purchase of about seventy-five dollars worth of dress clothes; and, a monthly living allowance of thirty dollars, less deduction for Social Security and taxes. (Job Corpsmen are employees of the federal government.) In addition, each enrollee is given a "readjustment allowance" computed on the basis of months of Job Corps "service" and received on termination. If the Corpsman will allot up to twenty-five dollars per month of his "readjustment allowance" to his parents, the Job Corps will match that sum with an equal amount.

In other words, a "jobbie" can actually earn \$105 a month for attending a Job Corps camp. Sadly, this has induced a number of youngsters to drop out of high school to join the Job Corps. Critical Congressmen have pointed out that if a young man keeps his nose clean, and reasonably close to the grindstone, he will likely graduate from high school and be invited to join Uncle Sam's Army in Vietnam — while being paid \$94 a month. His illiterate friend who drops out of high school, has a scrape with the law and is sent to a Job Corps camp, can live in officers' quarters, see first-run movies, and be paid \$105 a month.

Any officially "deprived" soul between sixteen and twenty-one can join the Job Corps and stay for as long as two years. After one has been in the Corps six months, he receives a free round-trip plane ticket for a vacation at home.

The history of Tongue Point Job Corps Center as a camp for men was brief but colorful. Like so many of these camps it was replete with riots and brawls, drugs and liquor. During the time the boys were there, Astoria was plagued with a wave of shoplifting and a rash of radio and car thefts. One resident told this reporter, "It got so bad that I wouldn't let my wife go into town on weekends with or without me. On weekends they just took over the place, chasing every female in town between fifteen and fifty."

Inside the Center itself, a gang of

\*I was not able carefully to inspect the Tongue Point library. But, if it follows the procedure employed at the now defunct Camp Kilmer it would doubtless have proved fascinating. At Kilmer the government shelled out no less than \$10,000 in one month last fall to purchase sex novels for the Corpsmen. Among the interesting titles to whet the Job Corps appetite were: *The Nude Wore Black*, *Orgy At Madam Dracula's*, *Candy*, *Wife Swappers*, *Sex Turned On*, *All the Hungry Young Bodies*, *Call House Madam*, and *French Art Of Love*.

The above books turned up on a purchase order from the Federal Electric Corporation which operated this Job Corps show. According to D.L. "Jack" Weber, former deputy director of the Camp, "They were part of our program to get these fellows to read. Many of the youths we had had reading abilities on the second to fourth grade levels and we felt if we could get them even pocketbooks, their literary interest would improve . . . . Most . . . are 'soul material.'" Wags observed that while the literary interests of the boys might not have been stimulated, their interest in sex certainly was.



Corpsmen operated a lucrative protection racket. New enrollees were advised that a ten dollar fee would prevent them from falling victim to mysterious assaults. A longtime Camp employee told us: "The protection racket was an open secret, but the staff just looked the other way. Some of them were afraid too — and not without good reason. A lot of those guys were big. And pretty damn mean."

A retired serviceman who worked at Tongue Point for over three years maintains the waste was "enormous," and described how a team of carpenters was kept busy full-time to repair damage done by the boys. "When they got mad," he said, "they would just tear the doors right off the hinges." I asked him if Corpsmen were disciplined for such acts of vandalism. Laughing a bitter laugh, he shrugged and replied:

*Hardly ever. The fellow who was in charge wanted to baby them. The staff wanted to treat them like they were college kids, but you can't treat kids off the street like university students. The staff just would not lay the law down. They were afraid the boys would go home if there was strict discipline and they were having a hard enough time keeping them in camp anyway.*

In 1966, Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon began demanding that Job Corps camps also be established for young ladies. She introduced a bill which required that twenty-three percent of Job Corps enrollees be girls. The result was that Tongue Point became one of the first camps for women. According to the *Daily Astorian*, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had considered operating Tongue Point as a coeducational institution but feared it would be called a "den of vice."

The *Daily Astorian* of January 23, 1967, reported that the cost of converting the base from a men's to a

women's facility was in the neighborhood of \$100,000. The cost had been estimated at about \$10,000, but the night before the male Corpsmen evacuated the premises they smashed everything smashable. Although newspaper reports indicate that the number of enrollees had dropped from around five hundred to eighty-one, the 450 members of the staff then on the payroll were apparently doing something else that night. A former employee described the shambles he saw when he reported to work the next day:

*The destruction was incredible. Almost every door in every dormitory was broken. Ten new pianos were literally torn apart. It looked like somebody went at them with an axe. All the walls were marked and carved up. They took knives and slit all the leather couches and chairs and anything that was upholstered. Many TV sets were smashed. I'd say they broke about forty percent of all the windows on the base.*

The training of male Corpsmen at Tongue Point was fairly typical of the Job Corps as a whole. According to the *Daily Astorian* of February 3, 1967:

*All told, 2,370 youths were admitted to the Tongue Point Center since its inception in February 1965. Of those who stayed, only 793 completed their course of study . . . .*

In other words, two-thirds of the young gentlemen who enrolled in this federal program quit and received their free airplane ride home without finishing their training for a job. At the time, Tongue Point claimed to have its costs down to \$7,409 per man per year. This figures out to a cost to the taxpayers of \$22,200 for each graduate. However, there appears to have been some figure juggling.

The *Daily Astorian* of January 25, 1967, quotes Dr. Wendell Van Loan, a Tongue Point official, as revealing:

*Fixed costs of operating Tongue Point are such that it takes about 1,000 enrollees to keep the cost down around \$7,500 per student per year.*

The largest number ever enrolled was 867 during June 1966, and the number was down to 476 by January 1967. Congresswoman Edith Green claimed the real per capita cost at Tongue Point was \$13,000 (or \$39,000 per graduate), which seems a more realistic figure.\*

Like the rest of the Job Corps Centers, Tongue Point has had its full share of staff problems, having employed homosexuals, alcoholics, general misfits, and political radicals. Several current employees told us of their concern about the increasing number of Black Militants being hired to staff the Center. One highly agitated woman who was withdrawing her savings account and preparing to leave town confided that both she and her husband had worked at Tongue Point. She said he had been discriminated against in receiving promotions because he was Caucasian, and that life had been made intolerable for her in the dispensary because it was coming to be dominated by Lesbians. Practically in tears, she declared: "They are dismissing the decent ones and keeping the scum!"

Needless to say, the staff turnover at Tongue Point has been very high despite the fact that it is considered by O.E.O. to be a model institution. Staff salaries are high. A check showed most Job Corps officials were making considerably more than they had on their previous job.

Your reporter toured Tongue Point on a beautifully sunny Friday in November. My tour guide, Mr. Norman Myers, is a

Conservative do-gooder — a species more rare than an Arab at a Bar Mitzvah. Poor Mr. Myers complained that there were only two or three others on the staff of 287 who share his Conservative views. Nevertheless, he plods on like Don Quixote in the belief that he is "doing good." And, no doubt he does. Myers is extremely personable and highly dedicated, though some of his students — who like him immensely — told us that he is easy to con and considered naïve.

Mr. Myers explained that, in addition to the vocational training at Tongue Point, courses are offered in remedial education. The average Corpsman reads at the fifth-grade level. He said that even the one-third of his girls who have high school diplomas read very badly. This is so, Myers says, because "some states permit the giving of 'social promotions' and 'attendance' diplomas to illiterates." To try to deal with this problem, girls at Tongue Point are encouraged to work for a high school General Education Diploma (G.E.D.). In the nearly five years Tongue Point Job Corps Center has been in operation, only 336 of the thousands of youths who entered have qualified for this Diploma.

We visited some of the classrooms. Classes are small (about a dozen students) and use the most modern and expensive teaching machines, including closed-circuit television. Students who seek it are given individual attention which amounts to tutoring. Those few who wish to learn are helped; the rest sit and do nothing.

We entered one classroom where eight girls were sitting around a table smoking, eating, and talking about sex. A record player was blaring out "soul music." At the front of the room one lone girl was trying to study amidst the cacophony.

After we arrived the teacher responsible for the "class" was moved to ask the girls to shut off the record player. He was intermittently tied up with other teachers in his cubicle at the back of the room,

\*See Shirley Scheibla, *Poverty Is Where The Money Is*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, 1968.



but soon tried to enlist his "students" to watch a movie about Alaska. Meeting with no success, he retreated into his cubicle. Curious, I asked the girls why they weren't interested in seeing the "flick." One tough-looking creature (who looked like a member of the front four of the Los Angeles Rams) snarled: "Who gives a f\*\*\* about Alaska?"

I had to admit she had a point there. I didn't dare do otherwise.

When I asked why record players are allowed in the classroom, the teacher laughed: "Well, you know how teenagers are." He then explained that he was not trying to teach the girls anything that day since it was Friday and they had received their federal paychecks for job training. One would assume that students who are, on the average, seven years behind in the level at which they read would need to take advantage of every minute of schooling which can be made available.

We were told by Astorians who had visited these classes at other times that while the situation we saw was somewhat extreme, record playing in class is fairly typical and often the teacher is more of a babysitter than an instructor. Apparently the rule is to cater to the least common denominator, with the result that what few serious trainees remain are prevented from acquiring the training for which the Corps was ostensibly created.

Tongue Point offers vocational courses in Food Services, Institutional Household Arts, Electronics Assembly, Business-Clerical Techniques, and Drafting. On the average it takes nine months to slide through a course.

Among the departments we toured was that of Institutional Household Arts. That's federalese for learning to be a maid. We were welcomed by the head of the maid department, Mrs. Mary Poteet, a pert and highly enthusiastic blond in her early forties. The laboratory for this academic pursuit includes a room with a thick carpet which apparently Mrs. Poteet dirties every morning. There were a half-

dozen young women on their hands and knees cleaning. One particularly large girl, looking rather like a crippled buffalo as she brushed the rug on all fours, warned me away as I prepared to take a picture of the group.

Mrs. Poteet quickly directed us to her department's *pièce de résistance* — two elegantly decorated motel-type rooms complete with bath. To graduate, a girl must learn to scrub floors, make a bed, and clean the bath and toilet. I asked Mrs. Poteet how long it took her scholars to achieve their baccalaureate as motel maids. "About six months is average, but up to nine months if they are mentally slow or not motivated," she replied. I was forced to suppress a wince, thinking it took at least a morning to train each of the thousands of maids now actually working in hotels across America. You could teach a chimpanzee to be a maid in less time than it takes the Job Corps to train a single girl.

The Business and Clerical school is considered the most difficult at the Center. Here girls learn to be file clerks and clerk-typists. It usually takes a year to graduate from this department.

Mrs. Lynn Morey, the second of the base's three reputed Republicans, and head of the Business and Clerical school, showed me through several classrooms, some of them nearly empty. As is true throughout Job Corps, all of the equipment is the latest and finest.\* The charming and dedicated Mrs. Morey introduced me to several of her girls who were

\*While touring the Child Care department to which toddlers from Astoria are bused to give the girls experience with young children, I noticed a nearly-new Adler electric typewriter out on a short-legged table among the toys. Having just spent \$450 to buy an identical machine, I asked the young lady running the department why youngsters were allowed to bang on an electric typewriter. "Well," she replied, "it doesn't have a ribbon and some of the keys are stuck." Apparently those who have no responsibility for producing the money that government organizations spend have little care about how it is expended.



working diligently at a filing cabinet and asked them to describe to me what they were doing. They were unable to do so. Although most seemed busy as soon as we entered, there were horror comics, paperbacks, and astrology and movie magazines scattered about the room.

Mrs. Morey keeps a bulletin board with pictures of her graduates who are employed in offices, but one gets the impression that many of these girls are in over their heads, Job Corps standards having traditionally been below those required by private businesses.

Still, a few *do* try. They are the tiniest minority. At Tongue Point, as at other Job Corps Centers, two-thirds of the enrollees quit before graduating. One of the major reasons for the low percentage of completions is the inadequate screening done prior to admittance. About ten percent of the Job Corps candidates arriving at Tongue Point have to be sent home because they are alcoholics, drug addicts, habitual criminals, mentally retarded, or pregnant. Since the Job Corps policy is to send girls as far from home as possible (ostensibly to prevent a return home) many are flown three thousand miles only to be put back on an airplane. Tongue Point's Norm Myers told me:

*In one input we had fifteen pregnant out of about ninety. This meant spending about \$6,000 to bring them and then send them right back . . . . It would only be common sense to give them a physical at a local health center the day before they leave for Job Corps.*

Myers also thinks it is ridiculous to send girls from Florida to a camp in Oregon and *vice-versa*. He believes that at least the Mississippi should be used as a dividing point. The current policy is based on the premise of getting "jobbies" out of their environment. But it is hardly necessary to transport them to the opposite end of the country.

The justification given for bringing these girls so far from home is to provide a change in environment; but whether the environment is changed or just shifted from one locale to another is debatable. I was unable to learn why so many girls leave Job Corps to return to homes which we were told are so dreadful. True, some members of the staff work very hard at producing "attitude changes" among the Corpsmen, and with success in some cases. But, as Shirley Scheibla points out in her excellent book, *Poverty Is Where The Money Is*:

*. . . no one seemed sure that the life of relative ease at the center would make go-getters of school drop-outs. Were virtually unlimited free recreation and chauffeured transportation preparing the girls to be productive citizens? . . . Even giving the center the benefit of the doubt and assuming that the environment was beneficial, how much could this nine months' stay counteract poor home environments? Nearly everyone I interviewed planned to return home after graduation.*

Members of the staff told me that they object to the policy of judges who give youngsters a choice between reform school and the Job Corps. "We just aren't equipped to cope with criminals," says Myers. With such a wide span in ages and backgrounds, many of the younger girls from rural areas are learning criminal behavior from hard-core urban toughs who should be in reform schools.

Another problem caused by poor screening is that many of these youngsters are sent to a camp which does not offer the training he or she has been promised. Mr. Meyers told us:

*I've got one girl in my class right now who wants to leave. She came here to study cosmetology. She has*



*nine months' training and couldn't afford to finish up so she heard she could get it through Job Corps. She was sent here — but we don't offer a course in cosmetology.*

All of these Centers have been plagued with disciplinary problems. Most are run by persons with a social-worker mentality, correctly interpreted by the Corpsmen as a sign of weakness. Members of the staff who have tried to enforce discipline have found themselves undercut by their superiors. As one former employee complained, "Once the kids find out you can't punish them except in the most severe cases, it's Katy bar the door. Actually they aren't doing these kids any favors by not enforcing discipline. They have never had any discipline and need it desperately if they are to succeed in holding a job or in raising a decent family."

Another former Tongue Point worker told us: "I've actually had some youngsters tell me they were *disappointed* over the lack of enforced discipline. They should let ex-sergeants run these places instead of teachers and social workers. But everyone is afraid that the already high drop-out rates would go higher if there was strict discipline. Maybe so, but without it we are just wasting a lot of taxpayers' money." A Center maintenance man we asked about the situation commented: "The staff has got a bull by the tail. The kids are running *them*! These kids are street-smart and con artists while most of the staff is pretty naïve." Fights, often over boy friends, are common among the young ladies at Tongue Point.

The lax atmosphere at the camp is reflected in the girls' deportment when they leave the base to congregate in downtown Astoria. One enraged resident recently wrote to the local newspaper: "On Friday and Saturday nights Astoria is transported into an atmosphere of Sodom and Gomorrah." The exaggeration is only slight. Every weekend, soldiers

from Fort Lewis, men from Portland, and boys from other Job Corps Centers flood into Astoria and head for the Tongue Point recreation center, a converted store front. It operates like a commercial exchange for a New Orleans fancy house.

The girls are given a complete course in sex instruction at Tongue Point and are provided with birth-control pills. One Corps employee explained the attitude of the Center toward flagrant promiscuity this way: "Most of these girls had lousy morals before they got here and there is not much we can do about it." Twelve percent of the Corpsettas have had one or more children before entering the camp.

Each month, despite the near universal availability of the pill, several of the girls at Tongue Point find themselves pregnant. The camp's sex instructors claim they inject morality into their instruction, but that is pure balderdash. Tongue Point's Norm Myers told us: "I sat through one of those classes and was appalled with the teachings on abortion . . . You court disaster giving pills without moral instruction. We definitely *are* doing this."

By contrast, the attitude towards religion is quite different. For some time there has been no chapel on the base. The reason, we were told, is that "This is a government installation and those things are not allowed." The fact that every U.S. military base in the world has a corps of chaplains has not influenced the bigwigs at Tongue Point. Thanks to the perseverance of one Astoria minister, however, a late afternoon vespers service is being instituted in the dormitories on a revolving basis. It took the minister over a year to get permission to hold these services.

Negro girls who want to attend church are bused to Portland, a hundred miles away. One girl who had worked to get religious services instituted at the base told me: "They don't want anything of God in that place. Girls can get pills there, but religion is verboten. They supply the needs from the federal govern-



ment so that the girls will think the Government is the God from whom all blessings flow."

Some local hotels have even had to post signs reading "No Job Corps Allowed." Weekend visitors were sneaking the girls into their rooms. One hotel owner whose place of business is near the recreation center says the Job Corps is ruining his business. "They throw wine bottles and trash in my foyer and even urinate there. One day my wife was subjected to the sight of a couple having intercourse in a car right in front of the hotel."

The owner of a restaurant in nearby Seaside, a summer resort, told me that busloads of girls from Tongue Point, and busloads of boys from Tillamook Job Corps Camp (now closed), used to park in the parking lot across the street from his business while everyone went to the beach. Before the departure of the Corpsmen for their respective camps, the restaurant's customers, including many families, were subjected to an unwanted display of multiple sexual intercourse right in the parking lot. The owner reports his customers were not interested in watching a scene from "Hair" with their salads.

Some time ago a Tongue Point girl was found in the John Jacob Astor Hotel with \$100 she had made from customers that evening. I asked Robert Biddle, a reserve police Lieutenant until disabled by an accident, if prostitution was still going on in the area. "Undoubtedly yes," he said, "but amateur competition is so stiff that a professional has a hard time." Biddle told us that busloads of male Job Corpsmen are brought from as far away as nine hundred miles to be put up in local motels at government expense for weekend "dances" at the Tongue Point Center. Mr. Biddle said, "Camp security officers were told to keep hands off and to let the kids run free and do whatever they wanted to do. It was like a Roman orgy."

Girls at the camp told us that it is quite easy to get a weekend pass as long

as your request is in by Thursday. The procedure is to list a destination that sounds legitimate, then spend the weekend with a man in a local motel. Longshoremen report a problem with the Job Corps trainees boarding foreign ships at dockside and even swimming out to ships at anchor.

Located adjacent to the Job Corps Center on Tongue Point is a Coast Guard base. In fact, you must drive through the Job Corps camp to get to the Coast Guard base. A fence separates the two, but you can walk around it at either end. There is also a convenient nearby forest. Coast Guardsmen told us that men from their outfit have been caught in the Job Corps dorms and the girls in the barracks on the base. "One night while I had the duty," a Guardsman related with disgust, "I was making a bed check and found two naked jobbies in the racks with the Guardsmen. I called another guy and had him back a car up to the end of the barracks and we loaded the girls in the trunk and took them out past the gate and threw them out on the ground." The last Captain of the station became so upset with the number of cases of gonorrhea among his men that he threatened to courtmartial the next sailor to contract the disease.

In a classic of syntactical malapropety, the *Daily Astorian* reported on September 23, 1969:

*Dr. Veldon Boge, medical officer for the Job Corps at Tongue Point, said that there is a definite rise of gonorrhea among local teen-agers since his arrival here from Salem . . .*

It is little wonder that Astorians commonly refer to the Tongue Point Job Corps Center as a "federal brothel."

Girls we interviewed were quite candid about the availability of drugs on the base, though they said they are more available in the summer when the Seaside

resort is booming. The bulk of the drugs is brought down on weekends by soldiers from Fort Lewis, or by Portland residents, who either sell them to the girls or trade them for sexual favors. Glue sniffing is also a popular pastime at the camp. Four trainees at Tongue Point told me that a number of the caretakers are on drugs, and explained: "We don't tell on the caretakers and the caretakers don't tell on us." The girls brag that smuggling in drugs or liquor is relatively easy.

Not surprisingly, most Astorians deeply resent the Job Corps despite the public relations efforts attempted from Tongue Point. Nonetheless, the camp has its staunch defenders — including the editor of the local newspaper, who never runs a letter critical of the camp without a Job Corps rebuttal printed immediately below. If nothing else, the snow job over the Job Corps has taught local residents who know the truth to be highly suspicious of the Press. The Job Corps is also defended by a few local merchants on the basis of buying done by the camp and the spending by the girls of their subsidies for clothes and sundries.

But, of course, the "federal brothel" at Tongue Point is only one of the Centers which President Nixon would doubtless proliferate in his vast expansion of Job Training. While it is typical, a broader look at the Corps is nonetheless in order if we are to understand what Mr. Nixon's new "Welfare" scheme will mean.

The General Accounting Office has recently completed a fifteen-month survey ordered by Congress to determine the effectiveness of such anti-poverty programs. The \$1.1 million survey has attracted virtually no attention in the Press even though it presented the most detailed sort of evidence about the O.E.O. and especially government job training such as Job Corps.

The G.A.O. report established that in thirty-three percent of the cases in one study, and twenty-two percent in another, important eligibility criteria

were waived for Job Corpsmen. Many had a "history of serious criminal or anti-social behavior."

The G.A.O. report further confirmed that only thirty-five percent of the youths who left the Job Corps in fiscal 1968 were graduated, and that there weren't even specific criteria for graduation. Reasons listed for dropping out were, in order: (1) dissatisfaction with the Job Corps as a whole; (2) homesickness; (3) the inability to obtain desired vocational training; and, (4) fear of bodily harm.

Probably the only real criterion for judging the success or failure of any government job-training program is whether it breaks the "Welfare" chain and puts otherwise employable persons to work as Mr. Nixon says it does. A survey conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce discovered:

*Although a significant number of Job Corps graduates are initially employed, their employment, for the most part, is not a direct result of the vocational training received in the program. Seventy-two percent of those surveyed who were employed were not employed in the skill for which they were trained. It may be assumed that for the most part current economic conditions are more responsible for the graduates' employment than their Job Corps training.*

Another survey, this one conducted by pollster Lou Harris for the Job Corps (which buried its results), determined:

*Sixty percent of the Corpsmen found a job immediately after leaving the Job Corps. There is little difference in immediate post-Job Corps employment between the graduates and the dropouts . . . (Congressional Digest, January 1968.)*



Harris also discovered that six out of ten of the trainees were employed before entering the Job Corps, and that among those going back to work after Job Corps training, "...the median hourly rate showed an increase of \$.15 over the pre-Job Corps rate." The G.A.O. found the average increment of advancement to be only \$.07 an hour. For this the taxpayers spent thousands of dollars.

According to Harris, "...only one in ten of those working said they found their jobs with direct placement assistance from the Job Corps." When I quizzed Tongue Point public relations officer Jim Cameron about job placements, he became extremely vague and began to talk of how much "social enrichment" the girls received.\* I was beginning to perceive that I was talking to

\*Some of the girls we talked to did not seem at all "socially enriched" by their stay at Tongue Point. One group of four with whom we spoke were about to graduate as "nurses aides." Although they had been through the acculturation course, they used language that would make a Marine Corps Drill Instructor blanch. My advice is to stay out of hospitals.

Some of the girls seemed genuinely interested in self-improvement, but most seemed frivolous. Typical is this tape-recorded interview:

Q: What's your name?

A: Carolyn B. . . . They call me Baby Doll.

Q: Why do they call you Baby Doll?

A: Cause Ah'm a baby.

Q: How old are you?

A: Twenty-one.

A: Where do you come from?

A: Jacksonville, Florida.

Q: And what are you studying?

A: To be a nurses aide.

Q: Do you like it here?

A: Yeah, Ah love it!

Q: Why do you love it?

A: 'Cause there's lotsa fellas here, yuka, yuka, yuka!

Q: Weren't there any fellas in Jacksonville?

A: Ooooooh, gobbles and gobbles of fellas!

Q: What kind of courses are you taking?

A: Well, Ah'm taking G.E.D. reading, and G.E.D. math, and art.

Q: What does art have to do with being a nurses aide?

A: Well, you know we have to have some kind of recreation.

the local Minister of Obfuscation and asked what kind of follow-up was done to see if girls stayed on their jobs. "Oh, that would be very expensive. We couldn't afford to do that," he answered. Later, reflecting on his reply, it took me fifteen seconds to reason that by merely paying each girl ten dollars for submitting a verified statement of employment every four months the problem could be solved with a minimum of outlay. It took me so long to come up with that one I began to suspect the Job Corps is not really very interested in how many of its trainees become permanently employed. According to the G.A.O., Job Corps even cheats on what employment statistics it has. As Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia told the Senate on May 13, 1969:

*The Job Corps centers also generally showed themselves incapable of placing very many of their graduates in jobs. The G.A.O. investigators report: "Although some confirmations of initial placements were made by all centers, we found that reports of placements were not fully accurate. One center reported placements solely on the basis of confirmations that interviews were scheduled between trainees and prospective employers."*

*"Follow-up procedures were found to be equally inadequate and misleading."*

A G.A.O. study of 211 enrollees who did get jobs revealed that seventy-five percent left in the first four months. Of the 211, fifty-nine were fired and another 59 quit for unknown reasons. The discharges were for absenteeism, dishonesty, failure to perform adequately, violation of rules and policies. The report of the General Accounting Office concluded:

*It appeared that Job Corps trainees had not done materially*

*better than the other eligible youths who had applied to enter the program and then chose not to participate. It is questionable whether Job Corps training has resulted in substantial economic benefit thus far for those youths who participated in the program.*

Not only is federal job training a disaster when it comes to putting people to work at better jobs, it is a vastly expensive disaster. The G.A.O. reported:

*Considering both direct and indirect costs for the centers in operation as of June 30, 1968, enrollee man-year costs for fiscal 1968 were \$8,300 [or about triple the cost of attending a prestigious private university]. In light of the costly training provided by the Job Corps program, we doubt that the resources [over \$1 billion since inception] now being applied to it can be fully justified.*

Since only one-third graduate, the cost per graduate is near \$25,000. At the average increase of \$.07 an hour over pre-Job Corps employment it will take over thirteen years of steady employment to recapture what it cost to the taxpayers for one year in the Job Corps.

If what is past is prologue, things do not auger well for Mr. Nixon's proposals to give a million persons a year federally financed job training. Already, juicy contracts are being let by the Administration for the establishment of training facilities. For example, Congressman Craig Hosmer of California has announced a \$295,272 grant made by H.E.W. and the Labor Department to train eighty men at Long Beach City College. This figures out to \$3,690 per man and does not include room and board as does the Job Corps. Yet, according to Hosmer, "The Long Beach program is one of 105 projects in 29 states being funded under the Man-

power Development and Training Act."

Thus, even though the government's own statistics prove federal job training to be a vastly expensive fraud, the Nixon Administration is going right ahead with more of the same. Why? The fact is that if Mr. Nixon really wants to improve the employment situation for the "poor," all he has to do is face the fact that the chief cause of what poverty there is in our country today is the government. First, because many are encouraged to choose not to work, but to draw on the taxpayers for unemployment insurance or "Welfare" payments. Second, because government minimum-wage and child-labor laws prevent many teenagers from acquiring jobs and job training in the open market. Also, government-protected unions limit the number of young men who may become apprentices, and often discriminate against Negroes. These are matters about which an Administration *really* interested in helping "the poor" could do something.

The point of all of this is that job training, which obviously cannot be handled by the federal government as Mr. Nixon proposes, *can* be handled in other ways if the boys in Washington will just back off of their Fabian escalator and stop compounding America's problems.

In a just society an individual could obtain food, clothing, and shelter only through useful productivity. A man lives either from the sweat of his own brow or the sweat of the brows of others. There is no other way. More and more over the past four decades, our politicians have been permitted to reject concepts of our Founding Fathers in favor of a society where nearly everyone tries to live by picking the pocket of everyone else, with the whole festival of thievery supervised by bureaucratic croupiers who take thirty percent of the ante as the cut of the house for running the game. Their commandment is: Thou shalt not steal — that's the licensed profession of a politician.

Most of the fifty-seven percent of



Americans who voted against Hubert Humphrey in 1968 thought they were voting to end the "Thieving Society." Republicans were thus given their second opportunity since the New Deal to restore the American system — a competitive-enterprise economy functioning within a democratic Republic. They had fumbled away the ball on the last series of downs when, ignoring the Party platform of 1952, Dwight Eisenhower had beefed up the Welfare State installed by Franklin Roosevelt. As James Reston put it:

*President Eisenhower acquiesced in all the New Deal reforms the Republicans opposed in the '30's and '40's, and Nixon was his deputy. [Nixon] came to office as a minority president, accused of being a warmonger who was indifferent to the internal social and economic problems of the cities and the races, but he is now arguing for peace, and social justice — talking like a conservative but acting like a progressive.*

*Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. makes the same point in his study of The Tides of National Politics. The chief liberal gains of the past, he says, "generally remain on the statute books when the Conservative [sic] recover power... liberal grows constantly more liberal, and by the same token, conservatism grows constantly less conservative...."*

*This may not be true of the conservatives like George Wallace who are out of power, but it seems to be true of Nixon. He is zig-zagging to the left.*

The meaning of all this was stressed by the *National Observer* of July 21, 1969, in a feature entitled "Two Positions: 'Liberal' and 'Less Liberal' — the Conservatives Find Themselves Boxed In." *Baron's*, sister publication to the *Wall Street Journal*, put it this way:

*Unlike earlier conflicts of ideology in Washington, there is now no fundamental dispute over commitments, only a narrow haggling over technique. There are artificial "liberal" positions and "less liberal" positions, with the pulling and hauling largely between Senate Democrats and the White House, but the conservatives have been foreclosed from debate. Because the liberals have been surprisingly efficient in organizing loyal opposition, congressional conservatives have no choice but to join in support of the some-what "less liberal" White House....*

*If Mr. Nixon lately has been seen in the company of conservatives it is only because they have moved on to liberal terrain in order to support him....*

*Conservatives who looked forward to abolishing the Office of Economic Opportunity have found themselves in the odd position of promoting renaissance of the agency along new lines, the liberals defending the status quo. Old Guard Republicans who last year thought razing was too good for the Job Corps camps this year passionately defend the Administration's decision to keep half the camps open.*

*Perhaps the liberals should be happier with this condition than they are.... As much ground as they cover in seeking an issue, Mr. Nixon follows, yanking the Old Guard with him.*

This is a far cry from the days of the "Old Nixon" — who may be the non-personification of Kipling's *The Man Who Never Was*. Still, the "Old Nixon" — then doing a Spiro Agnew as a smokescreen to cover Dwight Eisenhower's moves to the Left — told an audience in New York City on January 20, 1958:

*If we have nothing to offer other than a pale carbon copy of the New Deal, if our only purpose is to gain and retain power, the Republican Party no longer has any reason to exist, and it ought to go out of business.*

Maybe it *has* gone out of business; certainly it has been captured. The Fabian plans for a Welfare State which have caught President Nixon's imagination are based on the "New Economics" of the bolshevik British radical, John Maynard Keynes. (See Page 19.) That the President is a devotee of Keynes' "New Economics" is attested to by the *Wall Street Journal* in its issue of October 21, 1968:

*... the Nixon camp is stressing that it's no less committed to the basic principle of Government-guided economic growth than the Johnson-Kennedy Administrations have been. Mr. Nixon has labeled himself a "new economist," aides note, a tag customarily attached to such Democratic [and Keynesian] seers as Walter W. Heller, Gardner Ackley and Arthur Okun, the current chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers.*

Nobody expected miracles of Richard Nixon. They did expect him to follow the principles of traditional Republicanism — to stop government spending on such programs as Job Corps and put the blocks to mushrooming "big government," as he had implied he would do during the campaign. Instead, Mr. Nixon has proposed — with programs like running a million Americans a year through outfits like Tongue Point — to go farther than Hubert Humphrey would have dared. Even staunch and stolid Walter Trohan of the *Chicago Tribune* has been forced to lament:

*Under his program of new federalism, Mr. Nixon made it clear he believes that poverty is a federal problem, even though he called for state cooperation in dealing with it. Mr. Nixon had been denouncing the welfare state from the time he first ran for Congress in 1946, but now he has served notice he will not tolerate poverty even though the cost of the anti-poverty program runs to 5 billions a year.*

*Although he calls it workfare rather than welfare, the cost is not far behind the Great Society program of Lyndon B. Johnson and greater than that of the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Fair Deal of Harry Truman or the New Frontier of John F. Kennedy. \*\*\*\**

*Conservatives are going to have to recognize that the Nixon administration will embrace most of the socialism of the Democratic administrations, while professing to improve it . . . .*

America is not being conquered by Communists alone, you see. The Fabian Socialists are in on the assault up to the hilt. The Communists' "heat in the street" is being used in Congress by the Fabian wing of the Conspiracy to legislate us into the Marxist State one step at a time. The President's phony "job training" scheme is a part of that program.

Whatever he considers himself, Richard Nixon has become a proponent of the Welfare State, directing the pressure from above in complement to the Communist-created pressure from below. The result is that the American middle-class is being swallowed in a giant pincer movement.

It will take pressure from above as well as from below to turn America into a collectivist State. If either arm of the pincer can be broken, America will survive. If not. Well, if not . . . just ask any refugee from Communism what it will be like. ■ ■