#3

Southern Economics Association
November, 1968

The Influence of Manpower Training Program on the South

by Vernon M. Briggs, Jr. *

Introduction

For decades, the South[1] has been the breeding grounds for many of today's most pressing domestic challenges. Only too vividly, other regions of our Nation have come to realize that their social problems are often those of the South one generation removed. Moreover, as the South stands today poised on the threshold of an unprecedented economic boom, the chief obstacle to attainment is the past legacy of neglect for its human resources. But, to paraphrase one of President Eisenhower's famous tautologies, "our past lies behind us." It is to the present and the future that the "manpower revolution" of the sixties has relevance. The potential ramifications of the new training efforts in the South transcend geographic boundaries. They are national in scope. The purpose of this paper will be to survey the status of these undertakings in the Southern states.

General Considerations

Necessarily, the manpower programs have been affected by the economic environment within which they operate. In the past, a major barrier to regional development has been the South's industry-mix. Excessive concentration of employment in agriculture, personal services, textile manufacturing, and wood industries has served as a negative influence on the expansion of employment opportunities in the region. As a result, between 1940 and 1960 only three Southern states (Florida, Texas, and Virginia) increased their shares of national employment.[2] Declining

employment opportunities in agriculture have continued in the sixties to be a prime cause for the exodus of rural migrants to the urban areas of the South and the rest of the Nation. Yet as massive as the flight has been, the South remains overly specialized in agriculture.[3]

A large rural population combined with agricultural and non-farm rural employment are vitual synonyms for underemployment and low per-capita income. So it is that in 1966, the per capita income of every state in the region was far below the non-South average of $3,201 (the average for the South was $2,345.)[4] It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the recent report of the President's Committee on Rural Poverty concluded that "Most of the rural South is one vast poverty area."[5] Many of the Nation's most acute poverty pockets are to be found in the region---much of Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, the Ozark Plateau, the South Texas border area, the Black Belt of the Old South, and Atlantic Coastal Plains area. Hence, there exists a plentiful clientele for the potential training opportunities afforded by an active manpower policy.

The shortcomings of education in the South are legendary.[6] Much has been done to improve the quality and the retension powers of Southern schools; but, relative to the rest of the nation, much remains to be done. High drop out rates; low attainment performance on competitive national examinations; and high mental rejectee rates on military entrance requirements, all mirror the obvious. Without drastic changes in funding levels, curriculum offerings, teacher training, student-faculty ratios, and integration policies, there can be little prospect for meaningful results from any system of training programs. In the absence of a strong

educational foundation, training can be only for the most menial and low-paying occupations. Such positions are already redundant in the South. In 1968, for example, Mayor Ivan Allen estimated that there were 25,000 jobs in Atlanta that were vacant because the available work force lacked the education and skills to fill the openings.[7]

Another facet of the South is its relatively low wage structure. Recent estimates place the general gross wage differential between the South and the non-South in non-agricultural employment to be about 20 percent.[8] A low capital-labor ratio, the absence of state minimum wage laws, a lack of union organization, a slow-growth industry-mix, and the dominance of agriculture are some of the explanative factors. The issue is of vital significance to a discussion of the federally-supported training programs. These undertakings require the uniform payment of wages equal to the federal minimum wage or a nationally determined trainee-allowance schedule. As a result, equity frictions have arisen in some communities that have hampered the introduction of these programs. There have even been instances in which training allowances have exceeded the wages that graduates can earn.[9] The issue is especially acute where the Southern wage differential is the greatest: at the entry level jobs where the emphasis of the manpower programs is currently placed.

Finally, of course, there is the heritage of denial of equal opportunity. The race issue is paramount to a discussion of any topic of importance. It is tied closely to the unique feature of the manpower programs of the sixties: their extensive reliance upon local institutions. The state employment service is the "central manpower agency" in the local community. It has the responsibility for recruitment, counseling, guidance, and placement of trainees. Usually it determines the occupations for

which training will be conducted. The local school system usually provides the instructors, facilities, and curriculums. But most important of all, the ultimate goal of training is job placement. Job availability relies almost exclusively upon local employers. Thus, the degree of local enthusiam for the training ventures spells the difference between success and failure in every locality. Too often the combination of federally conceived programs--with their operational guidelines--and their implied goal to help Negroes have coalesced local opposition to the programs. The inseparable relationship between manpower and equal employment opportunity programs has yet to be fully appreciated in the South.

Nonetheless, the South has partaken of the available program offerings. The significant consideration is the degree of participation.

Specific Programs

MDTA. In terms of annual Federal appropriation, the institutional (i.e., classroom) and on-the-job (OJT) training provided under the auspices of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) constitute the major flank of the new manpower training assault. The twelve Southern states have accounted for the following proportions of the nationwide enrollment in these programs:

	Institutional		OJT	
Year	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
1963	19	10,300	--	--
1964	29	31,000	--	--
1965	20	28,100	30	9,800
1966	24	38,500	28	19,000
1967	25	44,300	27	29,500

These figures, of course, overstate the acutal number of trainees. In some instances, program enrollments overlap years and the figures do not allow for dropouts.

Table I indicates the degree of individual state participation in institutional programs and the trends in characteristics of enrollees. Table II provides similar information for OJT.

It is apparent from Tables I and II that there is considerable variation among the states. It is only in terms of the number of enrollees that a useful generalization can be made: the effort to date has been grossly inadequate relative to the needs of the region. Only a fraction of those who could benefit are being reached.

Neighborhood Youth Corps. Following initial hesitancy, the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) has experienced growing acceptance in the South. Table III (column 1) indicates the number of enrollees from each state. Of the total program, the South has accounted for 23 percent of the enrollees in 1965; 32 percent in 1966; and 30 percent in the special summer programs of 1966. Unfortunately, detailed data on enrollee characteristics by State are unavailable.

During the early history of the program, the requirement that NYC trainees receive the Federal minimum wage ($1.25 at the time) was a major obstacle to its introduction in some of the communities. Now that the figure is $1.60 an hour, it remains a roadblock in certain rural areas. Yet the clamor of disapproval manifested by many Southern mayors when the program was cutback in the Summer of 1968 would indicate that the program has won acceptance in at least the urban areas of the South. Moreover, the growth in the number of NYC enrollees since the inception of the program confirms the impression that many of the original hurdles

have been overcome. Table III, however, indicates that there has been variation among the states.

Job Corps. In most Southern states, the Job Corps program has been viewed with much skepticism. That is to say, very few Job Corps Centers are to be found in the twelve state region. Part of the explanation rests with the fact that the establishment of such centers can be vetoed by a Governor. The sparcity of centers does not mean that Southern youth have been denied access to the program. Rather, it indicates that the participants typically must travel far from their home state. The burden is placed upon other regions to accommodate Southern youth, and these youths often must make more difficult living adjustment than other corpsmen. Current Job Corps regulations stipulate that participants be placed in the center nearest their homes. For most Southern youth, this still means a distant placement.

Of the six men's urban training programs operating in 1968, two are on the borders of the South (one in Texas and one in Kentucky). Of the sixteen women's urban training centers, only one is in the South (in Texas). The remaining Job Corps Conservation Centers (which are required to account for 40 percent of all trainees) number 84; of this total, thirteen are in the South (two in Arkansas, four in Kentucky, three in North Carolina, two in Tennessee, one in Texas, and one in Virginia). Thus, there are no centers of any description in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, or South Carolina.

Despite the distance barrier, Southern youth are more than proportionately represented in the Job Corps. The number of enrollees in the program from each Southern state are presented in Table III (column 2). As a

percentage of the total number of Corpsmen, the number of Southern youth, is phenomenally high, accounting for 43 percent of the total through June 1966.

Work Experience and Training. In 1962, the Social Security Act was amended to include a program known as Community Work and Training (CWT). It was designed to provide employment opportunities for unemployed parents receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC-UP). Participation by each state was optional. The only Southern state to enter the program was Kentucky which did so briefly in 1964. In late 1964, a program similar in format but more liberal in federal financing was enacted under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA). It was known as the Work Experience and Training Program (WET). With the exception of Alabama, every other state in the union participated to varying degrees. Kentucky, for example, has led the nation in Title V trainees.[10] Table III indicates the cumulative enrollment in each Southern state. The South has accounted for approximately 20 percent of the nationwide total.

In 1967, the Social Security Act was again amended to create a new program--the Work Incentive Program (WIN). It too seeks to provide work experience and training for welfare recipients. The CWT and WET programs are to be phased out of existence by July, 1969. As of July 1, 1968, the only Southern state to participate in WIN is Tennessee. Three other states (Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia) are expected to join during the present fiscal year. The remaining eight Southern States still have legal barriers in the form of State statutes that must be amended before they are eligible for inclusion.

Special Programs. In addition to the more familiar programs, there are several special undertakings for disadvantaged groups. Specially, they are known as Special Impact (or Kennedy-Javits), New Careers (or Scheuer), and Operation Mainstream (or Nelson) programs[11] and stem from 1965 and 1966 amendments to the EOA. All three programs are limited in scope and in funds. To date, the effect of these programs for the South has rested primarily in the fact that they are partially involved in the Department of Labor's Concentrated Employment Program (CEP).

CEP is an arrangement by which six manpower training programs[12] are lumped together and offered to a local community as a single package. As of mid-1968, twenty cities and two rural areas have been designated for CEP. Five of the cities are in the South (Atlanta, Birmingham, Houston, New Orleans, and San Antonio) together with one rural area, the Mississippi Delta. It is anticipated that the CEP undertaking--which is not a training program but rather than an administrative project---will be expanded in the near future. Many of the seventy-five Model Cities announced by mid-1968 are expected to receive a CEP contract. If so, as many as nineteen Southern cities could be recipients.[13]

The JOBS Program. The Job Opportunities in Business Sector (JOBS) program was launched in early 1968. It represents a continuing and expanding effort to incorporate private industry into the training and placement of the hard-core unemployed. Based upon the on-the-job training principle, the JOBS program provides more liberal Federal reimbursement to employers for training costs than other similar ventures. It is understood that the trainees will be "less qualified" than their normal job applicants. The unique feature of JOBS, however, is that it places the responsibility for the development of the

job opportunities in the local community with committees of private businessmen. Under the auspices of the National Alliance of Businessmen, business executives in fifty cities have established such groups for this exclusive purpose. Thirteen Southern cities are among these. Table IV indicates the progress (as of July 30, 1968) in each of the cities toward the attainment of their 1968 goals. Here too, the experience has varied. Tampa, Atlanta, New Orleans, and El Paso are in danger of failing to meet their assigned figures. Louisville and Dallas, on the other hand, had by that early date already exceeded their set goals.

Assessment

The myth of the "Solid South" has been exposed long ago as fantasy. Diversity is the rule and the South's experience with the manpower programs is no exception. In some instances the South has been in the vanguard---as with the Title V program in Kentucky and Job Corps enrollment in Texas; in other cases it has contained the laggards--as with Alabama being the only state that did not participate in the Title V program and the total absence of any Job Corps Centers in the Southeastern crescent of states from Louisiana to South Carolina. Between the extremes---and depending which program you examine---the South sweeps the spectrum.

Despite occasional verbal assaults by erstwhile politicians, the South has been willing to share in the available program offerings. The cynic might conclude that the participation proves that prejudice and distrust can be mollified by the presence of dollars. The optimist might say that the action is indicative of a new day of public concern for the betterment of the regional population. But, more likely, the explanation lies in

terms of enlightened self-interest. The region is sustaining unprecedented growth in its urban communities as well as a major change in its occupational structure due to industrial diversification. For the first time in its history, the South needs educated and skilled workers to meet the demands (present and anticipated) of its expanding private businesses and burgeoning defense and space industries. Its historic asset---cheap and unskilled labor--has become an albatross.

To meet its needs, the alternatives are twofold: upgrade its own workforce or encourage (by inaction or by program limitations) an exodus of its unskilled work force and an influx of talent from the rest of the Nation. Indications are that both courses are being pursued. Federally assissted manpower programs have helped the South to improve the employability of some of its citizens. Yet, relative to the need, the effect has been minimal. In terms of the proportion of its population who are Negroes; who live in poverty (both black and white); who have little formal education; who are employed in rural jobs; who are underemployed; the South has no peer.

To be meaningful, these undertakings must be substantially enlarged. With a disproportional share of the problems, the South needs more than proportional remedial attention. The South needs a larger slice of a bigger national pie.

Several general observations seem apropos. First, close examination should be given to those Experimental and Demonstration projects currently underway in the South that are attempting to prepare rural workers for urban employment. If they prove feasible, immediate priority should be given to the implementation of similar projects throughout the region. The inhumane

migration of individuals who are totally unprepared educationally, vocationally, or psychologically to move from the separated rural environment to the confinement of city slums must stop.

Secondly, to slow the outward migration of people and to improve the infra-structure of its industrially undesirable areas, consideration should be given to testing the "government as an employer of last resort" concept in the rural South.

Thirdly, the federal government should use its contract leverage in the South to enlarge markedly employment opportunities for locally disadvantaged individuals. "Affirmative action" remains more of a slogan than an accomplished reality. The national highway program, the Atomic Energy Commission projects, the space program, and the military installations of the region could do far more than they do provide socially useful jobs.

Fourth, the present power of the employment service in the administration of manpower programs should be diluted. It is impossible to find a public agency that has a more deservingly bad reputation among minority groups in the South. Despite efforts to alter its image, little of substance has been accomplished. At the expense of some duplication, the limited efforts of community action programs to perform parallel outreach recruitment, counseling, job development, and placement functions should be enthusiastically encouraged.

And fifth, it would be wise to allow some regional flexibility in the training allowances and in the wage payment requirements. Training programs themselves should not singularly undertake the Herculean assault on the South's low wage structure. Likewise, they should not attempt to become a substitute for the creation of an adequate income maintenance system for the Nation. The training goal should be to prepare citizens to qualify

for jobs that provide income above poverty levels. Training is not the answer to all of the social ills of society. It is, nonetheless, an important ingredient in the quest toward equal economic opportunity for all people.

So it is that a recent quotation by one of the South's finest citizens---Ralph McGill---aptly describes the present juncture:

> The pace of regional advance depends on how readily and with what acceleration the South brings quality education and skills to her people and abandons the discriminatory practices of the past. The future of the South, then, is bright if the Southern people will have it so.[14]

TABLE I Characteristics of MDTA--Institutional Trainees in Southern States, 1963-67

State and year		Number of Trainees	Characteristics (in percent)									
			Sex		Color		Age			Education (in years)		
			Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 22	22 to 44	Over 44	8 or less	9 to 11	12 or more
Alabama:	1963.....	800	35.2	64.8	83.0	17.0	41.3	51.2	7.5	13.4	27.2	59.3
	1964.....	3,100	48.8	51.2	69.5	30.5	32.0	58.9	9.1	11.8	26.9	61.3
	1965.....	2,500	48.3	51.7	71.8	28.2	36.1	57.9	6.0	10.7	32.8	56.4
	1966.....	2,400	56.5	43.5	40.6	59.4	40.7	51.5	7.8	18.4	35.9	45.7
	1967.....	2,800	53.6	46.4	40.5	59.5	37.3	52.2	10.5	18.3	36.0	45.7
Arkansas:	1963.....	700	66.2	33.8	78.8	21.2	37.9	53.2	8.9	21.4	21.5	57.1
	1964.....	500	54.0	46.0	88.5	11.5	45.5	47.5	7.0	8.3	23.4	68.3
	1965.....	1,000	42.0	58.0	62.8	37.2	57.4	37.6	5.0	13.7	32.4	53.9
	1966.....	1,200	50.3	49.7	71.2	28.8	43.2	45.7	11.1	15.1	27.8	57.1
	1967.....	1,900	50.6	49.4	72.5	27.5	34.1	50.0	15.9	19.7	23.6	56.7
Florida:	1963.....	900	41.7	58.3	81.9	18.1	21.8	59.2	19.0	7.3	29.3	63.4
	1964.....	3,000	62.2	37.8	71.9	38.1	55.8	33.4	10.8	17.0	39.1	43.9
	1965.....	3,800	49.9	50.1	60.3	39.7	38.8	49.4	11.8	14.0	37.4	48.6
	1966.....	3,500	49.6	50.4	38.9	51.1	37.6	51.2	11.2	16.5	36.3	47.2
	1967.....	3,500	40.5	59.5	44.3	55.7	43.6	47.0	9.4	15.0	38.8	46.2
Georgia:	1963.....	400	80.8	19.2	79.6	20.4	34.6	61.2	4.2	11.1	31.6	57.2
	1964.....	1,400	59.1	40.9	58.5	41.5	42.9	50.2	6.9	13.1	34.8	52.1
	1965.....	2,500	39.7	60.3	45.7	54.3	38.3	53.0	8.7	17.7	34.8	47.5
	1966.....	2,000	48.3	51.7	44.6	55.4	30.8	60.6	8.6	13.6	37.8	48.7
	1967.....	1,600	46.2	53.8	48.4	51.6	35.8	53.9	10.3	14.8	36.6	48.6
Kentucky:	1963.....	1,600	55.9	44.1	88.0	12.0	39.1	55.5	5.4	18.1	24.8	57.1
	1964.....	5,500	64.5	35.5	91.5	8.5	38.2	52.8	9.0	26.3	24.0	49.7
	1965.....	3,100	48.7	51.3	76.6	23.4	62.7	32.6	4.7	20.3	34.8	44.9
	1966.....	3,500	63.8	36.2	92.2	7.8	60.4	33.6	6.0	27.3	22.6	50.0
	1967.....	4,600	73.3	26.7	92.8	7.2	33.9	50.3	15.8	47.1	21.9	31.0

TABLE I (Continued)

State and year		Number of Trainees	Characteristics (in percent)									
			Sex		Color		Age			Education (in years)		
			Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 22	22 to 44	Over 44	8 or less	9 to 11	12 or more
Louisiana:	1963.....											
	1964.....											
	1965.....	1,700	63.1	36.9	59.6	40.4	43.4	53.5	3.1	13.7	28.6	57.7
	1966.....	2,400	47.1	52.9	50.6	49.4	59.3	25.7	15.0	14.1	28.7	57.2
	1967.....	2,400	60.7	39.3	49.0	51.0	53.9	38.7	7.4	16.0	33.9	50.1
Mississippi:	1963.....											
	1964.....	500	89.1	10.9	59.8	40.2	35.9	58.7	5.4	18.0	34.4	47.6
	1965.....	1,100	92.9	7.1	67.9	32.1	28.6	57.7	13.7	33.3	32.1	24.7
	1966.....	4,100	74.3	25.7	49.7	50.3	29.7	59.4	10.9	23.8	37.8	38.4
	1967.....	6,000	70.8	29.2	35.0	65.0	25.2	58.3	16.5	45.4	28.8	25.8
North Carolina:	1963.....	1,000	63.9	36.1	84.9	15.1	34.6	60.4	5.0	16.2	30.4	53.4
	1964.....	800	64.0	36.0	76.7	23.3	42.0	50.5	7.5	15.1	26.0	58.9
	1965.....	1,500	77.5	22.5	49.0	51.0	38.2	52.4	9.4	29.1	26.2	44.7
	1966.....	1,900	69.8	30.2	50.4	49.6	37.0	54.8	8.2	22.0	35.8	42.2
	1967.....	2,100	62.8	37.2	45.8	54.2	44.0	43.6	12.4	23.6	32.0	44.4
South Carolina:	1963.....	300	71.2	28.8	62.9	37.1	29.1	64.6	6.3	19.9	34.3	45.8
	1964.....	3,700	54.9	45.1	42.9	57.1	19.8	59.2	21.0	55.4	26.8	17.9
	1965.....	2,500	56.4	43.6	40.7	59.3	35.3	49.0	15.7	41.4	30.0	28.6
	1966.....	2,400	42.8	57.2	38.9	61.1	28.8	56.6	14.6	38.0	32.1	29.9
	1967.....	2,700	48.4	51.6	44.2	55.8	39.1	47.9	13.0	29.8	33.5	36.7
Tennessee:	1963.....	1,200	89.0	11.0	91.6	8.4	29.7	59.6	10.7	22.2	28.3	59.5
	1964.....	2,600	72.2	27.8	69.9	30.1	54.0	39.4	6.6	23.5	31.2	45.4
	1965.....	3,000	66.6	33.4	52.1	47.9	50.4	40.2	9.4	30.0	34.5	35.5
	1966.....	5,300	67.6	32.4	58.7	41.3	36.1	52.7	11.2	27.3	31.0	41.7
	1967.....	6,800	65.9	34.1	63.2	36.8	42.4	47.5	10.1	28.9	32.5	38.6

TABLE I (Continued)

State and year		Number of Trainees	Characteristics (in percent)									
			Sex		Color		Age			Education (in years)		
			Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 22	22 to 44	Over 44	8 or less	9 to 11	12 or more
Texas:	1963.....	2,500	72.5	27.5	83.0	17.0	42.6	53.1	4.3	6.1	19.6	74.3
	1964.....	3,100	66.3	33.7	76.8	23.2	44.6	50.3	5.1	17.1	27.1	55.8
	1965.....	3,400	60.0	40.0	67.3	32.7	58.5	38.8	2.7	17.5	30.3	52.2
	1966.....	8,100	61.9	38.1	67.1	32.9	50.7	45.5	3.8	15.7	34.4	49.9
	1967.....	8,100	61.5	38.5	63.4	36.6	32.7	56.7	10.6	21.1	41.8	37.1
Virginia:	1963.....	900	48.3	51.7	67.4	12.6	23.5	63.9	12.6	16.4	28.2	55.5
	1964.....	2,000	67.0	33.0	63.4	36.6	63.3	32.1	4.6	36.4	26.0	37.7
	1965.....	2,000	60.9	39.1	70.2	29.8	35.3	54.4	10.3	32.3	30.5	37.2
	1966.....	1,700	51.9	48.1	76.9	23.1	31.2	55.7	13.1	33.9	27.7	38.4
	1967.....	1,800	50.8	49.2	73.8	26.2	37.8	50.5	11.7	25.2	29.7	45.1

Source: U.S. Department of Labor

TABLE II Characteristics of MDTA-OJT Trainees in Southern States, 1964-67

State and year		Number of Trainees	Characteristics (in percent)									
			Sex		Color		Age			Education (in years)		
			Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 22	22 to 44	Over 44	8 or less	9 to 11	12 or more
Alabama:	1966.....	1,100	80.0	20.0	85.3	14.7	29.5	60.1	10.4	9.6	24.6	65.8
	1967.....	1,500	72.4	27.6	81.7	18.3	31.3	61.0	7.7	15.4	30.7	53.9
Arkansas:	1965.....	700	74.8	25.2	79.7	20.3	20.0	73.3	6.7	17.1	23.7	59.2
	1966.....	1,300	36.4	63.6	90.2	9.8	30.4	60.5	9.1	24.7	39.5	35.8
	1967.....	2,100	52.5	47.5	86.9	13.1	26.7	65.2	8.1	17.4	35.0	47.6
Florida:	1965.....	400	57.0	43.0	68.0	32.0	39.2	46.8	14.0	23.0	44.3	32.7
	1966.....	2,800	59.5	40.5	78.8	21.2	29.9	57.7	12.4	16.7	31.1	49.3
	1967.....	3,000	61.0	39.0	70.3	29.7	25.7	60.3	14.0	17.2	32.7	50.1
Georgia:	1964.....	500	74.0	26.0	43.8	56.2	38.6	53.8	7.6	33.7	36.3	30.0
	1965.....	1,000	85.7	14.3	63.1	36.9	38.8	53.4	7.8	20.5	32.9	46.6
	1966.....	1,600	66.7	33.3	75.5	24.5	30.6	64.9	4.5	11.6	27.7	60.7
	1967.....	3,600	53.4	46.6	85.1	14.9	30.1	65.7	4.2	12.5	31.1	56.4
Kentucky:	1964.....	300	66.2	33.8	97.9	2.1	35.1	55.9	9.0	34.3	35.3	30.4
	1965.....	300	22.9	77.1	99.3	.7	11.2	78.6	10.2	48.2	26.6	25.1
	1966.....	1,400	67.2	32.8	92.4	7.6	34.8	59.2	6.0	19.8	21.4	58.8
	1967.....	2,200	80.7	19.3	88.1	11.9	40.9	50.8	8.3	23.7	27.3	49.0
Louisiana:	1965.....	1,500	65.3	34.7	64.0	36.0	29.1	59.1	11.8	17.3	25.3	47.4
	1966.....	1,700	85.6	14.4	68.0	32.0	30.8	61.9	7.3	18.4	29.8	51.8
	1967.....	1,900	86.7	13.3	62.3	37.7	34.6	57.9	7.5	17.6	31.2	51.2
Mississippi:	1964.....	500	98.7	1.3	82.8	17.2	37.3	61.8	.9	8.6	11.3	80.0
	1965.....	1,400	76.7	23.3	85.9	14.1	52.2	46.1	1.7	4.0	22.1	73.9
	1966.....	800	99.1	.9	79.0	21.0	50.8	46.4	2.8	10.3	27.0	62.7
	1967.....	1,200	86.0	14.0	74.8	25.2	37.7	53.9	8.4	15.7	28.0	56.3

TABLE II Continued

State and year		Number of Trainees	Characteristics (in percent)									
			Sex		Color		Age			Education (in years)		
			Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 22	22 to 44	Over 44	8 or less	9 to 11	12 or more
North Carolina:	1964.....	400	41.5	58.5	49.4	50.6	16.7	57.2	26.1	24.2	30.6	45.2
	1965.....	1,300	45.4	54.6	74.3	25.7	24.8	58.1	17.1	19.3	31.4	49.3
	1966.....	1,900	50.2	49.8	78.6	21.4	37.8	52.4	9.8	19.2	34.0	46.8
	1967.....	2,600	49.6	50.4	77.6	22.4	37.7	55.8	6.5	18.9	36.7	44.4
South Carolina:	1967.....	2,800	47.3	52.7	72.0	28.0	31.3	58.9	9.8	33.5	38.4	28.1
Tennessee:	1964.....	400	68.5	31.5	81.1	18.9	17.2	60.1	22.7	21.5	34.4	44.0
	1965.....	1,900	84.3	15.7	96.3	3.7	30.0	58.6	11.4	30.0	22.4	47.6
	1966.....	3,700	89.2	10.8	78.8	21.2	22.3	65.1	12.6	24.7	24.1	51.2
	1967.....	4,100	79.7	20.3	83.8	16.2	24.2	64.6	11.2	21.6	28.1	50.3
Texas:	1964.....	500	88.3	11.7	85.1	14.9	35.0	61.7	3.3	12.4	26.9	60.8
	1965.....	1,000	66.8	33.3	87.9	12.1	35.9	58.2	5.9	7.4	29.1	63.5
	1966.....	2,300	78.7	21.2	77.4	22.6	28.6	65.1	6.3	7.2	18.9	73.9
	1967.....	3,500	81.1	18.9	76.4	23.6	33.0	61.4	5.6	7.6	22.2	70.2
Virginia:	1965.....	300	64.5	35.5	58.5	41.5	28.0	61.3	10.7	31.7	31.7	35.6
	1966.....	500	60.0	40.0	76.3	23.7	29.0	61.8	9.2	28.6	33.5	37.9
	1967.....	1,000	64.3	35.7	60.7	39.3	35.8	58.5	5.7	18.6	38.7	42.7

Source: U. S. Department of Labor

TABLE III

Participation By Southern States in

Selected Manpower Training Programs

State	Neighborhood Youth Corps Cumulative Enrollees from State Through June 30, 1966 (Column 1)	Job Corps Cumulative Enrollees from State through June 30, 1966 (Column 2)	Title V. Cumulative Enrollees through May, 1968 (Column 3)
Alabama	16,895	1,003	0
Arkansas	30,962	666	7,242
Florida	25,075	1,101	3,001
Georgia	25,944	1,174	3,527
Kentucky	25,553	733	11,409
Louisiana	16,717	1,056	4,029
Mississippi	20,120	805	7,340
North Carolina	28,656	426	989
South Carolina	8,492	943	847
Tennessee	17,496	666	3,937
Texas	32,525	2,508	2,868
Virginia	7,408	1,065	623

Sources: Column (1) Office of Economic Opportunity
Column (2) Office of Economic Opportunity
Column (3) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Table IV

Southern Participation in the JOBS Program

City	Jobs Under Contract as of July 30, 1968	Assigned Goal of Jobs Needed by December 31, 1968
Birmingham, Ala.	500	668
Miami, Fla.	560	775
Tampa, Fla.	40	649
Atlanta, Ga.	266	887
Louisville, Ky.	720	587
New Orleans, La.	233	1,235
Dallas, Tex.	1,386	935
El Paso, Tex.	10	554
Fort Worth, Tex.	194	474
Houston, Tex.	473	1,367
San Antonio, Tex.	652	1,216
Memphis, Tenn.	(no contracts approved for fiscal year 1968)	
Norfolk, Va.	271	585
Total	5,305	9,932

Source: U.S. Department of Labor

NOTES

* The author is Associate Professor of Economics at the University of of Texas at Austin.

1. For the purposes of this paper, the South is defined as indlucing the eleven states of the Confederacy plus Kentucky.

2. James Maddox, et. al., The Advancing South: Manpower Prospects and Problems (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1967), Chapter 4.

3. William J. Stober, "Employment and Economic growth: Southeast" Monthly Labor Review [Special Issue on "Labor in the South"] (March, 1968), pp. 16-23; also see Robert E. Smith "Employment and Economic Growth: Southwest," ibid., pp. 24-29.

4. Helen H. Lamale and Thomas Lanahan, "Income and Levels of Living," ibid., p. 90.

5. The People Left Behind (Washington: President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, 1967), p. X.

6. See Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966); Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Resources for Southern Manpower Development, Report to the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor (1965), Chapter II; James W. Whitlock, "Changing Elementary and Secondary Education," Monthly Labor Review, op. cit., pp. 39-43.

7. Report of the National Commission on Civil Disorders, New York: Bantam Books, 1968) p. 53.

8. H. M. Douty, "Wage Differentials: Forces and Counterforces," Monthly Labor Review, op. cit., p. 74.

9. E.g., see "Job Training in El Paso Succumbs to Federal Wage Law," Wall Street Journal, April 5, 1967, p. 5.

10. As a result of Kentucky's early dominance of the program, the EOA was amended in 1966 to restrict the amount of Title V programs appropriated under the title to any one State to 12.5 percent of the available funds. Kentucky has enrolled the maximum allowable since then.

11. Respectively, these programs are designed to provide (1) work experience and training for indigenous adults and youths in selected neighborhoods plagued by high unemployment rates; (2) employment opportunities for long-term unemployed adults in sub-professional, urban community improvement projects; and (3) employment opportunities for unemployed adults in conservation and beautification projects in small towns and rural areas.

12. They are MDTA-institutional, MDTA-OJT, Neighborhood Youth Corps, New Careers, Special Impact, and Operation Mainstream.

13. The nineteen Model Cities in the South are: Huntsville (Ala.); Texarkana (Ark.); Miami and Tampa (Fla.); Athens, Atlanta, and Gainesville (Ga.); Bowling Green, New Bedford, and Pikesville (Ky.); Charlotte and Winston-Salem (N.C.)1 Nashville and Smithville (Tenn.); Eagle Pass, a San Antonio, Texarkana, and Waco (Tex.); and Norfolk (Va.).

14. Ralph McGill, "The South's Glowing Horizon," Saturday Review (March 9, 1968) p. 115.