

*File with Wake seminar material*

March 1, 1970

President Paul F. Romberg  
California State College, Bakersfield  
615 California Avenue  
Bakersfield, California 93304

Dear President Romberg:

We, the undersigned Bakersfield community members of the Title I, HEA Program, "A Planning Seminar to Change Non-Ghetto Community Leadership Attitudes Toward the Ghetto Communities" respectfully submit that we cannot in good conscience accept nor lend our support to the California State College, Bakersfield usurpation of our efforts and accomplishments that is represented by the 1970-71 proposal submitted by you to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. We have given five months of our time, freely and voluntarily, in developing means to influence key community leaders to take appropriate action to correct ghetto community problems in our area.

We object to submission of the CSCB proposal, "A Program to Increase External Awareness and Understanding of Ghetto/Barrio Conditions", without consulting community members. We further object to the following deletions and directions of the proposal:

1. The CSCB proposal reduces the local advisory committee to unimportance. The function of the local advisory committee to formulate plans for community action and participation toward rectification of our problems has been delegated to pure research. No provision remains for cooperative college-community action. There is no anticipation of community involvement, except on a very limited advisory level. Our problems need a broad based college-community effort through the existing communication planning and action-oriented task forces. These are composed of community interest group representatives and college faculty members and are responsive to the seminar as a whole. The CSCB proposal has them subordinated to the Executive Committee which also clouds the role of the seminar as a whole.
2. CSCB proposes needless repetition of already completed research on disadvantaged Black, Mexican-American, and White residents and the realities of life in the ghetto communities in which they live.
3. The evident purpose of the proposed program is to help the College make an "impact" on the community -- not to help improve the nature of life in the ghettos.
4. The CSCB proposal changes the emphasis ~~from~~ a college-community applied research, planning, and action project to a student-faculty-administrative academic exercise. We have spent five

months researching and pinpointing problems which demand cooperative college-community action and leadership and effective means of communication with the context community leadership. We have reached the point of beginning to apply our research in planning our programs of communication. Our plan has been to continue to gather factual data from existing research reports, our many years of experience in the field, and by conventional new research. The OSCB proposal denies the existence of the first, disregards the value of the second, and reduces the third to the level of undergraduate competence.

During the five months of the present seminar we have advanced in our thinking to the beginning of communication action a full three months before any of us expected to reach this point. We have adopted the goal of improvement of the total environment of the Bakersfield and Kern County communities which we hope will lead to improvement of life in the ghetto communities.

Our approach is to stimulate pride in the total community environment and desire to carry out improvements to make all parts of the community worthy of pride.

Our plan is to develop total community awareness through education as preparation for direct contact with ghetto context community leaders.

To this end we are developing a 30 minute documentary film on the Bakersfield environment under the leadership of our communication task force coordinator, program director at a local television station and other tv employees. The film will stress total environment from affluent to ghetto areas and is oriented toward community pride and involvement. It is to be shown to the seminar group to increase our knowledge of specific details and improve our perspective on the total problem. Then the film is to be aired locally and shown at service club and other functions. It will also be advertised and made available for purchase or rental by non-local television stations.

We are participating in California Conservation Week efforts, March 7-14, to educate the public regarding the total environment and the responsibility for every part of it that everyone has.

We will also participate in the National Environmental Teach-In, April 22, for the same purpose.

We are participating in community meetings such as the Bakersfield Council of Churches February 19 panel discussion of "Black-White" Tensions in Our Community". We have been invited to participate in a similar panel on Mexican-American - Anglo tensions, and other meetings concerning the ghetto and ghetto community-context community relations.

The 1969-70 Seminar and the Director's proposal for 1970-71 which we helped formulate (rejected by the CSCB Administration) offered hope and possibility of improving ghetto conditions. We see no hope nor possibility of improving ghetto conditions in the CSCB proposal.

We hope there will be an opportunity for revision of the CSCB proposal by negotiation with the CCHE, and that the College Administration will take advantage of that opportunity.

Respectfully submitted by the 1970-71 Proposal Task Force Members,

- 1 TED WARNER  
PRODUCTION DIRECTOR  
KNTV-17 BAKERSFIELD
- 2 John Ebert  
Business Representative  
Carpenters Local 743
- 3 Clyde Anthony Victor  
Secretary, Bakersfield College  
Bakersfield, California
- 4 Fleming Attha  
5273 Montecito Dr  
Bakersfield, California
- 5 Lewis E. Sigman  
Director, Kern County  
Self-Help Enterprises, Inc.
- 6 Aysel Rubin  
Retail Clerk Union
- 7 L. J. Williams  
2200 Central Ave  
Bakersfield, Calif.

cc: CCHE

Comments on letter to President Romberg concerning Title I proposal:

1. The statement that the program is not designed to help improve the nature of life in the ghettos rests on a gross misreading of the proposal.
2. The non-college members of the Seminar are involved in the total operation, not restricted to "a very limited advisory role" as alleged.
3. Any "research and pinpointing of problems" that went on during "the five months" was not reported at any Seminar meeting attended by a CSB representative.
4. No "existing research reports" have been presented for study.
5. It is unclear how any significant proportion of the input for the proposed film can be drawn from presentations made to date at the Seminar, except insofar as they have dealt with techniques of effective communication.
6. It is unclear how much each of the signers did to "help formulate" the original proposal.
7. If the signers of the letter have contributed their time "freely" then the \$50 payments to some Seminar members for attending meetings must have gone to other members of the Seminar, and it is surprising that the stipend recipients were not the persons who were turned to in preparation of next year's proposal.
8. It is unclear why the letter states that the Director's proposal was "rejected," when in fact it was adopted and amended in a fashion that the Director said was acceptable to him.

P. S. Wilder QSW

March 9, 1970