

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Undergraduate Research Journal

Title

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5d3325kf>

Journal

UC Riverside Undergraduate Research Journal, 19(1)

Author

Torres, Steven

Publication Date

2025-08-11

DOI

10.5070/RJ5.47166

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

Steven Torres, Department of History
Jorge Leal, Ph.D., Department of History

ABSTRACT

The Model Cities Program (MCP) was launched in 1968 as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty. Its purpose was to provide increased financial resources and improve living conditions in urban communities. The MCP also intended to bring city officials and local communities together to discuss unresolved issues that had been affecting neighborhoods. Los Angeles (L.A.) became a participant of the program, particularly its eastern neighborhoods with a significant Latinx population. However, the efforts to improve East Los Angeles's Latinx neighborhoods failed due to poor organization and a lack of centralized leadership. Many public projects were not completed nor received the entirety of proposed funding grants. My research explores the progression of the MCP in East Los Angeles between the years of 1969 and 1973. This research analyzes the issues that were present in L.A.'s MCP and how local Latinx communities reconsidered their relationship with institutional organizations. I draw on media publications and city records from the period. These sources reveal how the program gradually shifted away from productive planning and became ineffective, prompting community criticism. Prior studies have discussed the poor organization of the MCP across the U.S., but questions remain of how the program functioned in Los Angeles and its impact on Latinx communities. I argue that the issues of Los Angeles's MCP encouraged local Latinx communities throughout L.A.'s eastern neighborhoods to reconsider their relationships with institutional organizations. These communities instead chose to focus their efforts on community-established services and projects.

KEYWORDS: Federal programs, East Los Angeles, activism, Latinx, Model Cities Program, Urban

FACULTY MENTOR - Dr. Jorge Leal, Department of History



Dr. Jorge Leal is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of California, Riverside. He is trained as a cultural and urban historian of Southern California, primarily researching youth and Latina/o/x communities' impact on the region during the 20th century. Dr. Leal is also the founder of The Rock Archivo LÁ, a public history repository collecting, examining, and sharing cultural ephemera from L.A.'s Latina/o/x youth communities.

Steven Torres

Steven Torres is a fourth year history major, concentrating in Latinx and urban histories during the 20th century in the United States. He conducts his research under the support of Dr. Jorge Leal and is a part of the TRIO McNair Scholars Program. He is the Vice-President of the History Enthusiast at UCR. Steven plans to pursue a Ph.D. in history and wants to enter academia at a research-based institution.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

INTRODUCTION

On February 23, 1973, a bold and flashy headline in the *Los Angeles Free Press* declared, "THE WAR ON THE POOR: Community participation in poverty programs under attack." The article was in reference to actions by former United States President, Richard Nixon, who planned to end several social assistance programs that were previously implemented by his predecessor, Lyndon B. Johnson.¹ In "A War within our own boundaries': Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and the Rise of the Carceral State," Elizabeth Hinton explains that Johnson's War on Poverty aimed to invest in and support urban regions across the United States.² After Nixon took office, he faced multiple challenges during the early 1970s including a struggling economy which impacted millions nationwide. Additionally, according to Bruce J. Schulman in *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics*, Nixon introduced liberal-leaning domestic programs like the Family Assistance Plan (FAP) to alleviate economic pressure, which struggled to pass through Congress, falling short in 1972.³

The Model Cities Program was launched in 1966 and ended in 1974. Susan Schindler contextualizes in "Model Cities at fifty: afterlives" that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), sought to reform urban communities and counteract the negative connotations of racial and socio-economic prejudices, which viewed cities as a landscape for poor and ethnic communities.⁴ Cities across the United States were given the opportunity to participate in the Model Cities Program in order to address urban neglect. Los Angeles was among them, with East Los Angeles

emerging as a key site. Cristina Rodriguez notes in *Walk the Barrio: The Streets of Twenty-First Century Transnational Latinx Literature*, East Los Angeles has held a historically active Latinx population throughout neighborhoods such as Boyle Heights.⁵

Although poor leadership and inadequate funding resulted in the failure of the program, the instillation of the Model Cities Program across East Los Angeles represented a historic effort by federal institutions to rebuild trust with ethnic and racial communities. Analyzing the program in the Los Angeles area during this period will improve chronological understanding of its operations between the late 60s and the mid 70s. Issues that impacted East Los Angeles Latinx communities and its neighborhoods were not fully resolved.⁶ In this essay, I will show how the MCP operated in East L.A., prompting response by local Latinx communities. In examining these community responses, I will also discuss how the community-based organizations achieved greater political visibility to address the issues of the MCP.

HISTORIOGRAPHY METHODOLOGY

Scholars have increasingly analyzed the social and cultural dynamics of urban spaces and Latinx communities during the mid to late 20th century. More specifically, this literature has recognized urban spaces as critical in shaping Latinx identity politics, empowerment, and unity. It also acknowledges Latinx communities' influence and impact on local urban economic development programs and the

- 1). Anna Sklar, et al., "Los Angeles Free Press," *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973, 1, JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.
- 2). Elizabeth Hinton, "A War within our own boundaries': Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and the Rise of the Carceral State," *The Journal of American History* 102, no. 1 (2015): 1-2, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44286139>.
- 3). Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2002), 32.
- 4). Susan Schindler, "Model Cities at fifty: afterlives," *Planning Perspectives* 39, no. 1 (2023): 1, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2023.2294745>.
- 5). Cristina Rodriguez, *Walk the Barrio: The Streets of Twenty-First Century Transnational Latinx Literature* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2022), 22-23.
- 6). This paper primarily utilizes the gender-neutral term: Latinx. This is in consideration of the historical Latinx community of Los Angeles that identifies itself in various way rooted in heritage and culture. Additionally, other terms including "Hispanic" and "Chicanx" (also a gender-neutral term), will used throughout the paper.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

establishment of cultural spheres. Scholarship on the Latinx community has merged analyses from different academic subfields such as Transnational, Cultural, and Immigration Histories. These approaches have highlighted how Latinx communities in urban settings played a foundational role in preserving and sharing knowledge with incoming migrants.

Urban historians A.K. Sandoval-Strausz and Johana Londoño have both examined the dynamics of urban landscapes and Latinx communities. In *Barrio America: How Latino Immigrants Saved the American City*, Sandoval-Strausz argues that Latinx immigrants played a crucial role in revitalizing city life in the United States during the late 20th century. Sandoval-Strausz uses quantitative data throughout *Barrio America*, to highlight the correlation between the historical waves of immigration from Latin-American countries during the late 20th century and the increase in municipal growth among the Latinx population during that period. Additionally, he uses oral histories to highlight the lived experiences of migrants from a variety of Latin American countries.⁷ Meanwhile, Johana Londoño in *Abstract Barrios: The Crises of Latinx Visibility in Cities* problematizes the “Latinization” of urban landscapes designed by white developers to attract tourists and residents, such as the Fiesta Marketplace in Santa Ana, which was modeled after Tijuana’s architecture.⁸

In contrast to Sandoval-Strausz’s analysis of municipal growth, Londoño argues that the increase in Latinx populations in urban centers was not a form of resistance by the Latinx communities. Instead, white developers purposely created controlled spaces such as shopping centers to prevent the expansion of self-created Latinx community spaces.⁹ Both analyses provide distinct explanations of the “white-flight” movement and its relation to increased Latinx communities in cities. Sandoval-Strausz suggests

white-flight was resolved by Latinx populations repopulating cities. Meanwhile, Londoño work analyzes city growth and its relationship to the Latinx experience across urban centers in the United States. Despite their differences in reasoning about municipal growth in the United States, their works shape the understanding of the intentions of federal programs such as the Model Cities Program to “revitalize” city life and persuade white-flight participants that urban centers were not spaces of “blight.”

Current scholarship on the Model Cities Program has analyzed the transition of the program from the management of Johnson Administration to the Nixon Administration. However, scholars have not analyzed the greater Los Angeles area, which has limited its historical understanding of and its documented impacts on local communities. Other cities, such as Seattle, have been written about by scholars. This includes Elizabeth Brown’s “Race, Urban Governance, and Crime Control: Creating Model Cities,” which analyzed Johnson’s Great Society Programs and the development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Brown also discusses the internal issues of Seattle’s Model City Program, such as conflict between local community members and the program’s leadership.¹⁰ Similarly, James A. Williams, “TO TRANSFORM THE INNER CITY: Tucson’s Model Cities Program, 1969-1975” discusses Tucson’s experience with inadequate budgets that could not properly support city projects.¹¹ Brown’s and Williams’s analyses emphasize that the inefficiencies of the Model Cities Program were not uncommon across the United States, and these issues frequently occurred through the program’s local leadership. This pattern also emerges in East Los Angeles, as community members were in conflict with the leadership of the Los Angeles Model Cities Program.

7). A.K Sandoval-Strausz. *Barrio America: How Latino Immigrants Saved the American City* (New York City: Basic Books, 2019).

8). Johana Londoño, *Abstract Barrios: The Crises of Latinx Visibility in Cities* (Durham: Duke University Press Books, 2020), 114-115.

9). Londoño, 115.

10). Elizabeth Brown, “Race, Urban Governance, and Crime Control: Creating Model Cities,” *Law & Society Review* 44, no. 3/4 (2010): 794, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40926317>.

11). James A. Williams, “TRANSFORM THE INNER CITY: Tucson’s Model Cities Program, 1969-1975,” *The Journal of Arizona History* 52, no. 2 (2011): 153, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41697354>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

More recently, Casey D. Nichol's work, "The Magna Carta to Liberate our Cities: African American, Mexican Americans, and the Model Cities Program in Los Angeles," argues that the program's structure amplified visibility of various Los Angeles communities as they had increased contact with city and program officials. Specifically, Black and Mexican American community members who had experienced the challenges of living in urban environments, including predatory policing and educational inequity, hoped the Model Cities Program would reform these specific issues along with their neighborhoods.¹² Nichol's work takes an alternative approach to previous scholars who have studied the program, primarily emphasizing community unification to increase understanding of historical relationships rooted in ethnic and racial struggles.

EAST LOS ANGELES AND THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

In 1968, the *La Raza* newspaper discussed the state of their community's infrastructure and neighborhoods with a section titled, "Mortar & Bricks... are not a home."¹³ This section outlined the need for improved living conditions for the Latinx community throughout Los Angeles neighborhoods, especially its eastern area. The editorial explained that in 1967, Mexican Americans from across California met to discuss housing needs for their local communities, forming the "Mexican-American Council for Better Housing." Their intention was to prioritize collaboration with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and address it in Washington, D.C.¹⁴ This meeting of Latinx community members from across the state to discuss the state of housing highlights the early steps community members took

to improve their living conditions through political action. The formation of the Mexican-American Council for Better Housing represented the necessity for an organization to represent the Latinx community. It also highlights how they began to use their economic leverage to improve the housing issues they faced. This section further detailed the issues that had occurred throughout East Los Angeles.

The Mexican-American Council for Better Housing addressed concerns regarding housing for the Latinx community in Washington, D.C. The answers they received left them with further confusion and demonstrated the challenges the Latinx community throughout East Los Angeles faced in regards to urban redevelopment. The Mexican-American Council for Better Housing discovered that an associated organization, the East Los Angeles Improvement Council had previously submitted a plan for adequate housing support. This was denied by the Department of Housing and Urban Development due to disagreements over the cost of financially supporting a housing project and concerns that it surpassed the square footage unit requirements.¹⁵ This collection of events between representatives of the Latinx community in East Los Angeles and federal officials represented early conflicting ideas, which further heightened during the Model Cities Program between 1970 and 1974. It also emphasized conditions of the barrios, which would begin to receive increased attention from governmental institutions. As Wendell E. Pritchett explains in "The 'Public Menace' of Blight: Urban Renewal and the Private Uses of Eminent Domain," terms such as "blight" were used to describe the deterioration of cities and incentivize renewal.¹⁶ With governing institutions now becoming increasingly aware of the issues across East Los Angeles neighborhoods, this

12). Casey D. Nichol, "The Magna Carta to Liberate our Cities: African Americans, Mexican Americans, and the Model Cities Program in Los Angeles," *Pacific Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2021): 9, <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2021.90.3.377>.

13). La Raza, "Mortar & Bricks... are not a home," *La Raza* (Los Angeles), February 10, 1968, 9, Online Archive of California, <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/rq8tzgrpujssod5k1l9anahlpou41>.

14). La Raza, 9.

15). Ibid.

16). Wendell E. Pritchett, "The 'Public Menace' of Blight: Urban Renewal and the Private Uses of Eminent Domain," *Yale Law & Policy Review* 21, no. 1 (2003): 3, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40232666>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

began to increase the conflict between federal officials and local community members about how to resolve these challenges.

As the Model Cities Program began to take shape in Los Angeles County, city officials discussed which specific areas would receive funding. In articles published in 1968 and 1969, contributors to the *Los Angeles Times* explained how the decisions were made to allocate funding from the Model Cities Program. Editorial member, Herbert Ray in 1968 discussed that the city had not originally considered various East Los Angeles neighborhoods including Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, and El Sereno.¹⁷ In a 1969 *Los Angeles Times* article, Don Snyder explained that El Sereno's concerning conditions were considered along with the other East Los Angeles neighborhoods. Originally, Watts had been considered a greater priority, but Los Angeles councilman Arthur Snyder helped include these neighborhoods during the program.¹⁸ The inclusion of these neighborhoods garnered attention toward the possibilities of improving the conditions of East Los Angeles. The large Latinx population throughout East Los Angeles, hoped that their historical presence would allow for direct oversight of the projects supported by the Model Cities Program. These anticipations, along with the frustrations over the management of the program, were discussed in *La Raza's* February 1970 publication.

In February 1970, *La Raza's* contributors dedicated a section addressing the Model Cities Program, deeming it a failure for Latinx people living in the East Los Angeles area. "whose Model Cities whose?" contained a description of the issues that had occurred between the program and the Latinx community. The contributor to the section of the

article noted that "Chicanos in the East/Northeast barrios were happily discussing what government money could do to create a new city.... Unfortunately, Chicanos now have misgivings... It is controlled by Mayor [Sam] Yorty."¹⁹ As the Model Cities Program emphasized a foundation for citizen participation by contributing to project proposals, opportunities arose for community members to apply their knowledge of the issues the city faced. Latinx members living in the East Los Angeles area were enthusiastic about holding a leading role to help transform the barrios and establish improved infrastructure and resources. These improvements included the implementation of educational programs, a recreational center, and regional and cultural center.²⁰ The mayor during this time, Sam Yorty, and Los Angeles County officials allegedly took full oversight of the Model Cities Program, overshadowing the opportunity for leading roles among the Latinx and Mexican American communities. With an affluent government official taking leadership of the project, Yorty's perspectives and visions of redeveloping the barrios throughout East Los Angeles was in conflict with those of the residents.

In a February 1970 article by *La Raza*, the contributors further detailed other Hispanic and Latinx community organizations' involvement, displaying the unified efforts that were taken to address contemporary issues. In *Abstract Barrios*, Londoño explains that throughout the 1970s, an amplified awareness across the United States raised concerns about the declining states of barrios.²¹ With the conditions of the barrios being noticed by federal and state institutions, residents hoped their challenges would finally be resolved. However, due to the poor organization of the Model Cities Program, many had critical views. *La Raza* reported that

17). Hebert Ray, "Councilmen Favor Model Cities Aid for Boyle Heights," *Los Angeles Times*, April 6, 1968, B1, ProQuest, <https://www.proquest.com/hnplatimes/historical-newspapers/councilmen-favor-model-cities-aid-boyle-heights/docview/155878727/sem-2?accountid=14521>.

18). Don Snyder, "Model Cities Funds Asked for El Sereno," *Los Angeles Times*, May 26 1969, SG1, ProQuest, <https://www.proquest.com/hnplatimes/historical-newspapers/model-cities-funds-asked-el-sereno/docview/156184093/sem-2?accountid=14521>.

19). *La Raza*, "whose Model Cities whose?" *La Raza* (Los Angeles), February 1970, 2, Online Archive of California, <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/iu3866ui3yhism4pzlgovv57dp3zhayw>.

20). Los Angeles Herald, "L.A. Schools Ask \$5 Million U.S. Aid," *Los Angeles Herald Examiner* August 28, 1970, 6, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers, <https://infoweb.newsbank.com/apps/readex/doc?p=EANX&docref=image/v2%3A1770633D3145AC61%40EANX-17E472A72DBE28CA%402440827-17E40925DE8824A3%405>.

21). Londoño, 124.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

“CSCLA, MECHA, MAPA 40th and the Congress of Mexican American unity have passed resolutions against Model Cities.”²² This highlights how Latinx East Los Angeles communities were hesitant to continue depending on the Model City Program and viewed community-based organizations as significantly more reliable. As explained in “Chicana/o Activism and Education: An Introduction to the Special Issue” by Luis Urrieta, Jr., El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano De Aztlán (MEChA) was formed to empower and support the Chicax community and recognize significant issues throughout their communities.²³ With a strong relationship to community-based organizations, members were able to better use their voices to address their concerns. Additionally, the involvement of these community organizations represented the collective interests that were in conflict with Yorty’s vision of the Model Cities Program. These community organizations did not believe Mayor Yorty was qualified to lead the Model Cities Program. This returns to the idea that the program should have been led by local community members, who also participated in these organizations to address contemporary issues.

As Nixon approached his final years of presidential term in 1973, the unstable economy led to decisions regarding continued support of social assistance programs, including the Model Cities Program. On February 23, 1973, the *Los Angeles Free Press* devoted a section to “36 Program participants speak,” which discussed a timeline of the Model Cities Program in East Los Angeles.²⁴ Editorial member Ron Ridenour explained that Los Angeles County had submitted a HUD planning grant in 1968. It was agreed upon by community members in May of 1970 after several conflicting interests were addressed. The county finally began developing plans and received funding in March of 1971. The East and Northeast areas were given the option to receive priority allocation of the grant for the

neighborhoods.²⁵ The information provided by the *Los Angeles Free Press* about the complications of approving projects for the Model Cities Program clarified and aligned with *La Raza’s* explanation of events from February 1970.

The February 1973 publication of the *Los Angeles Free Press* mentions that the final approval to receive the HUD grants to begin establishing the Model Cities Program projects took much longer than expected. After the grant proposal was submitted in 1968, it took two years to be approved, after local community members finally reached an agreement upon the plans in May 1970. In the February 1970 issue of *La Raza*, editorial members explained that the Latinx community in the East Los Angeles area discussed how the Model Cities Program could benefit them. Additionally, *La Raza’s* editorial contributors explained the community had experienced conflicts with Los Angeles Mayor, Sam Yorty. The significant time it took for members of the East Los Angeles community to come to an agreement was due to disagreements over leadership and potential project development ideas.

In the same February 1973 *Los Angeles Free Press* article, Ridenour further contextualized the state of the Model Cities Program in East Los Angeles. With previous challenges such as finalizing an agreement with community members and the leadership of the projects, other issues further delayed the project. Ridenour then explained the complicated state of the program after interviewing Arturo Bastidos, an official of the Model Cities Program, about the East Los Angeles redevelopment projects. Bastidos noted that the East Los Angeles area received only half of the project opportunities in comparison to Watts even though they had both been given the same budget. Additionally, the Watts area allegedly had greater organization and direction of projects. Bastidos believed that government officials purposely did this to create racial tensions between Black people and Latinx

22). *La Raza*, 2.

23). Luis Urrieta, Jr., “Chicana/o Activism and Education: An Introduction to the Special Issue,” *The High School Journal* 87, no. 4 (2004): 2-3, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364280>.

24). Anna Sklar, et al., 1.

25). *Ibid.* 4

26). Ron Ridenour, “Neighborhood workers speak out,” *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973, 5, JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

people.²⁶ In this section, Bastidos expressed his frustration about the direction and lack of support for the East Los Angeles redevelopment projects. While Bastidos provided no concrete evidence that government officials or senior-level figures of Model Cities purposely imbalanced support between Los Angeles neighborhoods, Bastidos's frustration does highlight the confusing state of the program. For the Latinx community throughout East Los Angeles, the ideas proposed would be hindered by the complications caused by the disorganized structure of the Model Cities Program. When the hopes of receiving support to create an improved infrastructure and environment as not fulfilled, it strained the relationship between local members and the program.

Shortly after the February 1973 publication by the *Los Angeles Free Press*, the leadership of the Model Cities Program was further clarified in a March 1973 publication. In previous years, Sam Yorty was increasingly discussed by community officials as a possible leader.²⁷ In the March 1973 publication, multiple figures and directors were interviewed in regards to the progress of the Model Cities Programs projects.²⁸ A telegram sent to Deputy Mayor Chairman, Joseph M. Quinn discussed that the Los Angeles community was dissatisfied with the replacement of Laurence C. Whitehead, the program administrator of Model Cities Program. Additionally, the HUD had stopped operations of the Model Cities Program in East Los Angeles for failing to meet regulations. This shifted the attention to Mayor Yorty, who claimed that the staff of the program demanded greater benefits, causing the abrupt stop. Due to this response, candidates for the mayor in Los Angeles did not believe Yorty's claims, which further exacerbated the complications of the Model Cities Program.²⁹ The increasing complications of leadership across the Los Angeles City Council board and the Model Cities Program negatively impacted local communities. The halted projects across the East Los Angeles community further delayed the possibility of their neighborhoods being improved under the city's

current conditions. The escalation of the leadership conflict over Model Cities began to shift the focus away from the development of the planned projects. Instead, the Model Cities Program became the center of a debate over who would lead its operations. Due to this ongoing conflict of leadership, the Latinx and Hispanic community members of East Los Angeles continued to face challenges receiving institutional support to improve their neighborhoods.

CONCLUSION

Johnson's launch of the War on Poverty in 1964 sought to alleviate and support the United States through various programs. Notably, the Model Cities Program attempted to "revitalize" cities across the country and help them to regain previous historical population numbers. After Nixon succeeded Johnson in 1969, he became responsible for continuing the Model Cities Program, along with managing a troubled economy throughout the 70s. The Model Cities Program captured the attention of many city officials including Los Angeles. More specifically, East Los Angeles became a primary location to implement the Model Cities Program to address historic challenges of poor financial and institutional support.

For the Latinx and Hispanic communities throughout East Los Angeles, the Model Cities Program offered an opportunity to alleviate the conditions of the area. This brought anticipation for adequate resources, financial support, and most importantly, community visibility to address the historic issues that had impacted them. These hopes deteriorated as conflicting interests between the community and leading figures of the program occurred, making it difficult for project to be approved. Additionally, conflict between Los Angeles city officials and Model Cities Program directors resulted in further delays of the completion of these projects. As the chaos from the

27). William H. Jones, "Letter," The G Street Collection: Papers of Arthur A. Fletcher, May 24, 1971, Washburn University Library, <https://wuir.washburn.edu/items/62e41924-47b2-411e-901a-b654b8bce943>.

28). The previous footnote references a letter typed by William H. Jones, a deputy administrator for the Model Cities Program. In addition to its contents, the letter contains several names of the figures mentioned throughout this paper, identifying their respective titles in relation to the Los Angeles City Council and the Model Cities Program.

29). Ron Ridenour, "Doris Fuller: 'It was designed to fail,'" *Los Angeles Free Press*, March 2, 1973, 7, JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040044>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

disorganized leadership of the Model Cities Program unfolded, it became clear that the program had difficulties in focusing on its main objective. As media publications began to emphasize the continuous conflict, the program shifted away from its goal of supporting Latinx and Hispanic communities. They failed to receive the fulfillment of the program's promises. Due to this, the East Los Angeles community would need to continue addressing the existing issues that made living in the barrios difficult.

Thirty-four years after the termination of the Model Cities Program, a member of Nixon's administration and the Model Cities Program, Christopher DeMuth, commented on the poor outcome of the program. He described the troubles he saw in the Model Cities Program, noting its poor organization and inability to support each participating city, leading to its failure.³⁰ DeMuth's comments highlighted the organizational issues of the Model Cities Program. The program failed to address the historical lack of support across cities, especially in spaces where ethnic and racial communities resided. For the Latinx community, the outcomes of the Model Cities Program were another failure by governing institutions that hindered their goals of achieving economic stability and political visibility. This article focused on the conflicts between the program administration and local Latinx/Hispanic communities. There remain opportunities to continue analyzing the program, especially by analyzing other forms of media including televised interviews or oral histories from Latinx community members, to further contextualize the understanding of the program in Los Angeles. This would support broader connections to the living experiences in cities for Latinx people in the United States.

accessibility through mentorship in higher education is truly admirable. I am eternally grateful to have the opportunity to have him as my serving faculty mentor and for always supporting my ideas. I also want to extend my gratitude to the UCR TRIO McNair Scholars Program team, more specifically, Koby Hansen. The UCR McNair Scholars Program team has provided me with rich resources and support to ensure I excel in my research abilities which I could have not imagined of achieving.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my greatest appreciation and gratitude to my faculty mentor, Dr. Jorge Leal. Dr. Leal has been an incredible mentor throughout my undergraduate career, helping me navigate academia within the field of history and in my preparation for graduate school. His devotion to

³⁰. Christopher DeMuth (Administration member), interviewed by Timothy Naftali, January 14, 2008, Richard Nixon Oral History Program, Richard Nixon Library and Museum, <https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/forresearchers/find/histories/demuth-2008-01-14.pdf>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

REFERENCES

- Anna Sklar, et al., "Los Angeles Free Press," *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.
- Brown, Elizabeth. "Race, Urban Governance, and Crime Control: Creating Model Cities." *Law & Society Review* 44, no. 3/4 (2010): 100-112. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40926317>.
- DeMuth, Christopher. *Richard Nixon Oral History Program*. By Timothy Naftali. Richard Nixon Library and Museum, January 14, 2008. <https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/forresearchers/find/histories/demuth-2008-01-14.pdf>
- Hinton, Elizabeth. "A War within our own boundaries': Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and the Rise of the Carceral State." *The Journal of American History* 102, no. 1 (2015): 100-112. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44286139>.
- La Raza. "Mortar & Bricks... are not a home." *La Raza* (Los Angeles), February 10, 1968. <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/rg8tzgrpuzjss0d5k119anahlpou41>.
- La Raza. "whose Model Cities whose?" *La Raza* (Los Angeles), February, 1970. <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/iu3866ui3yhism4pzlgovu57dp3zhayw>.
- Los Angeles Herald. "L.A. Schools Ask \$5 Million U.S. Aid." *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, August 28, 1970. <https://infoweb.newsbank.com/apps/readex/doc?p=EANX&docref=image/v2%3A1770633D3145AC61%40EANX-17E472A72DBE28CA%402440827-17E40925DE8824A3%405>.
- Londoño, Johana. *Abstract Barrios: The Crises of Latinx Visibility in Cities*. Durham: Duke University Press Books, 2020.
- Nichols, Casey D. "The Magna Carta to Liberate our Cities: African Americans, Mexican Americans, and the Model Cities Program in Los Angeles." *Pacific Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (2021): 377-398. <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2021.90.3.377>.
- Pritchett, Wendell E. "The 'Public Menace' of Blight: Urban Renewal and the Private Uses of Eminent Domain." *Yale Law & Policy Review* 21, no. 1 (2003): 1- 52. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40232666>
- Ridenour, Ron. "36 Program participants speak." *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973. <https://jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.
- Ridenour, Ron, "Neighborhood workers speak out." *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.
- Ridenour, Ron. "War against poverty turns into war against poor." *Los Angeles Free Press*, March 2, 1973. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040044>.
- Rodriguez, Cristina. *Walk the Barrio: The Streets of Twenty-First Century Transnational Latinx Literature*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2022.
- Sandoval-Strausz, A.K. *Barrio America: How Latino Immigrants Saved the American City*. New York City: Basic Books, 2019.
- Schindler, Susan. "Model Cities at fifty: afterlives." *Planning Perspectives* 39, no. 1 (2023): 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2023.2294745>.
- Schulman, Bruce J. *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2002.
- Sklar, Anna et al. "Los Angeles Free Press." *Los Angeles Free Press*, February 23, 1973. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.28040043>.

Trouble in East Los Angeles: Los Angeles' Model City Program, 1969-1973

REFERENCES CONT.)

Snyder, Don. "Model Cities Funds Asked for El Sereno." *Los Angeles Times*, May 26, 1969. <https://www.proquest.com/hnplatimes/historical-newspapers/model-cities-funds-asked-el-sereno/docview/156184093/sem-2?accountid=14521>.

Urrieta, Luis Jr. "Chicana/o Activism and Education: An Introduction to the Special Issue." *The High School Journal* 87, no. 4 (2004): 1-9. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364280>.

Williams, James A. "TRANSFORM THE INNER CITY: Tucson's Model Cities Program, 1969-1975." *The Journal of Arizona History* 52, no. 2 (2011): 143-168. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41697354>.

Jones, William H. "Letter," *The G Street Collection: Papers of Arthur A. Fletcher*, May 24, 1971. <https://wuir.washburn.edu/items/62e41924-47b2-411e-901a-b654b8bce943>.