

DE FACTO SEGREGATION IN THE NORTHERN PUBLIC SCHOOLS; ITS ANATOMY AND TREATMENT *

by JOSEPH B. ROBISON

*Assistant Director, Commission on Law and Social Action,
American Jewish Congress, New York*

DE FACTO segregation, as that term will be used here, means segregation which exists in fact but which is not the direct result of either law (as in the South) or intentionally discriminatory action. A moment's consideration will show that this particular phenomenon creates its own distinctive problems.

Over the years, the civil rights forces have evolved a well-developed program to deal with both discrimination imposed by law or other governmental action and intentional discrimination by individuals. While we are still far from success, we at least know what we want of ourselves and what we demand of others.

We do not yet have this clarity about de facto segregation. Here we are not dealing with discriminators. We are dealing with a spillover from discrimination elsewhere. It should be obvious that this involves different principles and requires different methods. The persons we are trying to influence are not themselves discriminating. For the most part, they are public officials committed by law and in fact to the policy of equality. The problem is to work out with them just what their powers and responsibilities are when the divisive effects of discrimination invade their

operations. This paper deals with that problem as it affects public schools.

The most potent generator of de facto segregation is the ghetto pattern that distorts the nation's living quarters. The facts regarding that pattern are familiar enough.¹ We know too that housing segregation is extremely resistant to change. Fair housing laws and government regulations work very slowly. Community pressures for equality run counter to entrenched habit, financial commitment and deep emotional involvement.

Thus, the factors that breed de facto segregation will be in operation for decades to come. It is not surprising that its victims are impatient with the logical advice that the only way to treat racially homogeneous public schools, is to eliminate the ghetto. This means turning one's back on a whole generation of school children.

The facts of de facto segregation in public schools have often been reviewed, most recently by Will Maslow. He pointed out² that almost half the Negroes

¹ Comprehensive surveys of the problem may be found in U. S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *1961 Report, Book 4, "Housing;"* Comm'n on Race and Housing, *Where Shall We Live?* U. Cal. Press, Berkeley, 1958; and other authorities cited in Robison, "Housing—The Northern Civil Rights Frontier," *Western Reserve Law Review*, Vol. 13, 1961, pp. 101-105.

² Will Maslow, "De Facto Public School

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Atlantic City, June 5, 1962.

in America now live outside the South and that segregation in housing is closely reflected in the public schools. This has been made plain by studies in such cities as New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Boston, Los Angeles, Indianapolis and Youngstown. While there is not too much published data on the smaller—particularly the suburban—school districts, we do know they also face this problem.³

Some of this segregation is undoubtedly deliberate. Artful drawing of school zone lines, complaisant attitudes toward transfers of white children and other procedures have been used to achieve a modified Northern version of "separate but equal." Such practices, however, are beyond the scope of this paper. They raise no issues of either law or principle. The chief problem in dealing with them is to prove their existence.

It is important to note that that is the issue on which the celebrated decision in the New Rochelle case turned.⁴ Although broader questions were raised, United States District Judge Kaufman rested his decision (and was affirmed) on a finding that the situation before him was due to past practices adopted for the purpose of maintaining segrega-

Segregation," 6 *Villanova Law Review* 353, 1961.

³ Thus, in New Rochelle, New York, as revealed in the litigation mentioned below, one of the more than a dozen grade schools had a Negro enrollment of 94%, a second was over 50% while at least five others were under 10%. In Englewood, N. J., where the public school segregation issue has recently been in the news as well as the courts, Negroes constitute 36.9% of the enrollment. The proportion of Negroes in the five elementary schools is 98.7, 63.1, 11.7, 4.6, and 0.2%. Report to Englewood Board of Education, *Englewood, Its People and Its Schools*, 1962, p. 46.

⁴ *Taylor v. Board of Education of New Rochelle*, 191 F. Supp. 181 (S.D., N.Y., 1961), affirmed 294 F.(2d) 36 (1961), cert. den., 82 S. Ct. 382 (1961).

tion. He drew his power to issue a corrective decree from that finding. Hence, he did not have to determine what are the obligations of public school officials when they are administering a system which is disfigured by segregation not created in any way by official conduct.⁵

De Facto Public School Segregation

Having gotten all these preliminaries out of the way, we can settle down to a study of the public school system in which, at least as far as we know, a pattern of "racial imbalance" exists entirely without malicious intent or discriminatory practices on the part of school officials.⁶

The first question that arises is: are such segregated schools *per se* unequal? In the legal sense, that question must be regarded as open. In the 1954 decision,⁷ the Supreme Court found that education in legally segregated schools was unequal *per se*. It can be argued that the rationale behind that finding was in-

⁵ This is not to say that the New Rochelle decision made no important advance over the Supreme Court's decision of 1954. It established a number of important principles in the application of that decision, including (1) that illegal segregation may exist even in the absence of a segregation statute or other formal regulations, (2) that it may exist even though separation of the races is not complete, (3) that it may exist even though the present school officials have not discriminated and are chargeable only with failing to correct a discriminatory situation inherited from their predecessors, (4) that, in correcting such a situation, a court has broad discretion and may even modify such accepted practices as "the neighborhood school" and (5) specifically, that a system of permissive transfers is one acceptable way of dealing with such a situation.

⁶ It may be that de facto segregation has been helped along more frequently by school officials than this paper assumes. However, as long as official misconduct cannot be proved, the situation must be treated as though segregation is entirely the result of outside factors.

⁷ *Brown v. Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

DE FACTO SEGREGATION IN NORTHERN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

dependent of the fact that the segregation there condemned was imposed by law. The Court's key holding, that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (p. 495), rested principally on a set of six reports on studies of segregated schools, referred to in the famous, if not notorious, footnote 11. When these references are examined, it appears that, in four of the six, nothing limits the finding to the case of official segregation.⁸ Nevertheless, one cannot escape the fact that official conduct was involved in both the facts and the decision in the *Brown* case. The Supreme Court did refer in its opinion to "segregation with the sanction of law."⁹

There is little doubt that this issue will ultimately be decided by the courts. A number of cases raising it are now pending or in prospect. In one of these a preliminary decision by a Federal District Judge appears to uphold the view that inaction by school authorities in the face of de facto segregation is unconstitutional, regardless of whether the authorities contributed to the situation.¹⁰

The Evidence of Inequality

While we cannot say that the courts have resolved the issue of inequality in

⁸ The only two of the cited studies that dealt with "enforced segregation" are Deutscher and Chein, "The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion," 26 *J. Psychol.* 259 (1948) and Chein, "What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities," 3 *Int. J. Opinion and Attitudes Res.* 229 (1949). In the other four, much of what is said applies squarely to de facto segregation. See, for example, Frazier, *The Negro in the United States*, 1949, pp. 674-681.

⁹ 347 U.S. at 494. And see the lower court cases cited in Maslow, *op. cit. supra* at p. 356, to the effect that the Fourteenth Amendment does not affirmatively command integration.

¹⁰ *Branche v. Board of Education of Hempstead*, decided April 9, 1962 (U.S.D.C., E.D., N.Y.).

de facto segregated schools, yet there is ample evidence that such schools are different. To begin with, they are ordinarily inferior even by objective physical standards. As a rule, they are older, less well-equipped and generally less attractive. They are likely to have inferior teaching staffs when judged by such objective criteria as the proportion of licensed teachers. In addition, as the United States Commission on Civil Rights has found, "The relative overcrowding of schools that serve the Negro population in the urban North and West is notorious."¹¹ One court has held that inequalities in teacher assignments and pupil density, which are within the control of the school authority, constitute a denial of constitutional rights that the courts can correct.¹²

However, the real test of equality of opportunity in education is in what the pupils achieve. The physical and other inequalities would be unimportant if pupils were performing according to their capacity. There is ample evidence that the achievement of pupils in predominantly Negro schools lags behind the general average.

One of the earliest and most striking of the studies reaching this conclusion was made in New York City. It was conducted by the Public Education Association, assisted by the New York University Research Center for Human Relations. The study considered an elementary school to be a "continental white" or "Group Y" school if its Negro and Puerto Rican population was below ten percent. The school was treated as a "Negro and Puerto Rican" or "Group X" school if its Negro and Puerto Rican population was over ninety percent. It was found that the Group X schools were inferior to the Group Y schools in a

¹¹ U. S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, 1961 *Report, Book 2, "Education,"* p. 113.

¹² *In the Matter of Skipworth*, 180 N.Y.S.(2d) 852 (Dom. Rel. Ct. N. Y. C., 1958).

number of respects, including age, physical facilities, maintenance, teacher experience and regular class size. In pupil achievement, the difference was striking. The norms from Group X schools fell 1.2 to 2.7 years behind those for Group Y schools in reading and arithmetic.¹³ It is now generally accepted that these figures reflect a nationwide phenomenon.¹⁴

The Economic and Cultural Factors

It is a mistake, however, to assume that these differences in achievement are due entirely to the racial segregation in the schools, or even to the all-too-common deficiencies of the schools in Negro districts. It seems likely that neither of these factors is as important as the economic and cultural handicaps of children dwelling in slum conditions.

¹³ Public Education Association, *The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City*, October 1955. The tables on pupil achievement were as follows (p. 24):

TABLE 18

AVERAGE READING TEST SCORES

Grade and test	Group Y Group X	
	Norms	Norms
3rd grade-Metropolitan Achievement (Primary)	3.7	2.5
6th grade-Metropolitan Achievement (Intermediate)	6.9	4.7
8th grade-Metropolitan Achievement (Advanced)	8.4	6.0

TABLE 19

AVERAGE ARITHMETIC TEST SCORES

Grade and test	Group Y Group X	
	Norms	Norms
6th grade-Metropolitan Achievement (Intermediate)	6.4	4.8
8th grade-New York Arithmetic Computation (C)	8.7	6.0

¹⁴ U. S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *1961 Report, Book 2, "Education,"* pp. 117-18; James B. Conant, *Slums and Suburbs*, McGraw-Hill, 1961, pp. 12-13; Richard L. Plaut, "Closing the Educational Gap," *Journal of Inter-group Relations*, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 138-139.

These handicaps operate independently of race. Note, for example, this description of a public school:

The parents of at least one-third of the children are either in penal institutions, are on probation, or have prison records. At least 100 children are on probation to the Juvenile Court. There has not been a day since I've been at the school that there has not been one or more children in detention at the Juvenile Court. . . .¹⁵

This is not a ghetto school. It is a school in a white slum.

Yet, while economic and social factors can impair educational progress regardless of race, there is no doubt that, in our society, they weigh most heavily on the underprivileged minority groups. Equalization of educational opportunity today does not wipe out the effects of past inequalities, particularly the effect they have on the child's home environment.

Analysis of these factors is one of the most important contributions of Dr. James Conant's report, *Slums and Suburbs*, published last year.¹⁶ Dr. Conant reached some very unfortunate conclusions in that report and its pages reveal repeatedly that he is noticeably misinformed about civil rights forces.¹⁷ But this should not blind us to his valid observations.

It would be unwise to challenge Dr. Conant's statement that "... it has been established beyond any reasonable doubt

¹⁵ Conant, *op. cit. supra*, p. 16.

¹⁶ *Op. cit. supra*.

¹⁷ Thus, Dr. Conant attributes the demand for movement of Negro children into predominantly white schools to "political leaders" (p. 28) whereas the pressure has come from Negro and white civil rights organizations. He believes, quite wrongly, that "Negro leaders and their friends have placed a taboo on the use of the word 'Negro'" (p. 38) and that "Negroes do not like to be designated as Negroes in the press" (p. 44). He also accepts the myth that the effort to achieve equality in the South after the Civil War was that of a "vindictive Congressional majority" (p. 9).

that community and family background play a large role in determining scholastic aptitude and school achievement" (p. 12). Or the stress he places on the fact that, in slum areas, ". . . when the children leave the school they never see anyone read anything—not even newspapers" (p. 25). These and other factors are the product of centuries of oppression, of deeply entrenched and continued patterns of discrimination in employment and housing, of long practiced segregation in education. They preclude the conclusion that the low achievement of pupils in schools in economically underprivileged areas is due solely to *present* de facto segregation.

Indeed, it must be remembered that these factors operate on the individual child. They do not disappear when the child is placed in an integrated class. Thus, educators believe that reading instruction in the schools is most effective when it is supplemented by reading at home. The child who returns to a home where there is nothing to read, and frequently no place to read, loses that vital part of his education, no matter how much stimulation he gets in school.

Of course, the environment in the school is also important. One of the strongest arguments for breaking down de facto segregation is that integration tends to ease the intellectual starvation of the underprivileged children. The segregated school, on the other hand, may extend the emptiness of the home environment. In fact, we may assume that elimination of segregation is at least one of the prerequisites to equalization of educational opportunity. Hence, the maximum amount of desegregation that can be achieved at any given time must be one of our goals.

The Direct Attack on Segregation

There is a number of procedures that can be used to reduce de facto segregation.

Among these are (1) deliberate drawing of attendance zone lines to break up concentrations; (2) the "Princeton plan" or any of its variations under which, for example, two schools, predominantly Negro and white, and serving children from kindergarten through the sixth grade, are revamped so that one takes all the children for the first three or four years and the other for the balance; (3) "permissive" transfers or "open enrollment" under which parents may transfer their children out of crowded schools into under-utilized schools, simultaneously, and almost incidentally, achieving better racial balance; and (4) complete abandonment of zoning. Any or all of these may involve transporting children by bus to schools far from their homes. All involve weakening or abandonment of the "neighborhood school" policy.

These procedures have been opposed on grounds of both principle and practice. The objections based on principle have been endorsed by Dr. Conant, who says flatly: "To my mind, the city school superintendent is right who said he was in the education business and should not become involved in attempts to correct the consequences of voluntary segregated housing."¹⁸ More recently, Dean John H. Fischer of Teachers College has objected to "manipulating people to create a structure pleasing to some master planner."¹⁹ In New Rochelle, the majority of the School Board, in defending their decision to rebuild the predominantly Negro school on the same site, insisted that "to send the Lincoln School children to other schools solely because of their race . . . would be a violation of the

¹⁸ *Op. cit. supra* at p. 30.

¹⁹ John H. Fischer, "Educational Problems of Segregation and Desegregation of Public Schools," paper delivered at Fourth Annual Conference of the Commission on Civil Rights, 1962.

basic principle of non-discrimination”²⁰

Educational Aspects of Desegregation

The answer to this is that it ignores the purely educational aspects of de facto segregation. If educators conclude that learning is impaired in segregated schools, they have an obligation, or at least a power, as educators, to correct it, even if no duty arises out of the constitutional command of equality.

This obligation was recognized by the New York City Board of Education in a resolution adopted on December 23, 1954, pledging efforts to do away with de facto segregation. It took this action on the assumption that “public education in a racially homogeneous setting is socially unrealistic and blocks the attainment of the goals of democratic education, whether this segregation occurs by law or by fact.”²¹ Subsequently, on January 28, 1960, the New York State Board of Regents adopted a statement of policy which took the position that de facto segregation “may damage the personality of minority group children” and “impair the ability to learn.”²² Accordingly, it undertook to seek solutions to the educational aspects of the problem.

Dr. Conant argues that, if racial integration is *per se* desirable, the same must be true of other forms of integration. “One might argue,” he says, “that all slum schools ought to be integrated with schools in economically favored areas” (p. 31). This is not so novel an

idea. Educators have tried to draw zoning lines so as to make schools representative of different economic groupings.

Dr. Conant’s objections to desegregation measures rest on a fallacious assumption. He seems to believe that the civil rights forces cannot work for improvement of presently segregated schools if they also support reduction of segregation.²³ There is no reason to accept this “either-or” approach. We can work for both desegregation and improvement of those schools that are lagging behind others.

The Limitations of Desegregation Efforts

The argument that the various procedures for desegregation are impractical is more troublesome. Procedures like the Princeton plan can achieve substantial gains in suburbs and other small districts. If a district is small enough and the problem not too severe, desegregation efforts may be completely successful. Moreover, educational retardation is probably less of a problem in these areas because the minority group families involved are higher in the economic scale.

In the larger districts, complete desegregation becomes more difficult.²⁴ In the cities, it becomes impossible.

Limited gains can be made, perhaps,

²³ *Op. cit. supra*, p. 31. He also asserts that those school districts that have made no effort to desegregate “are more likely to make progress in improving Negro education” (p. 29). However, he offers no evidence to support that statement.

²⁴ The City of Stamford, Conn., recently applied the Princeton approach to its two high schools, one of which was predominantly white and the other predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. It directed that one school cover the ninth and tenth grades for the whole city and the other the eleventh and twelfth grades. *New York Times*, May 4, 1962. This is certainly an improvement. Yet one cannot help wondering what is to be done with the smaller grade schools. Presumably, de facto segregation will continue there.

²⁰ Statement issued by Board, November 30, 1959. Printed in full in *New Rochelle Standard Star*, December 1, 1959.

²¹ The resolution is set forth in New York City Commission on Integration, *Final Report, Toward the Integration of our Schools*, 1958, pp. 24-26.

²² New York State Board of Regents, *Statement on Intercultural Relations in Education*, January 28, 1960.

along the borders of our Harlems, but the hard core of dense segregation in these areas will be broken up only when the areas themselves cease to be ghettos. Eliminating segregation in the schools of a large city, while housing discrimination continues, would require daily movement of tens of thousands of pupils out of the Negro area and movement of an equal number of white children into it. To repeat, there is nothing wrong in this, in principle, when done to achieve legitimate educational objectives. Yet it seems clear that this solution is not practical on so large a scale.

Apparently recognizing this, Negro groups in large cities have relied primarily on systems of permissive transfers or open enrollment. The theory here is that the de facto segregated schools are inferior and parents of children in those schools have the right, at their option, to move them out to the superior white schools. Assuming they have that right, what is the long range effect of this practice? It does not achieve any significant degree of integration. For one thing, the number of transfers is necessarily limited by the number of vacancies in the receiving schools. More important, the ghetto school is still there. Some of its students leave. No white pupils take their places.

This is borne out by the experience in New York City. For several years now, New York has had an open enrollment program. In addition, it has been transferring pupils from crowded to underutilized schools, with an eye to racial balance. Yet it has not even held its own against the factors producing segregation. Only last April, Stanley Lowell, chairman of the City Commission on Human Rights, reported:

Three-fourths of the children in public elementary schools in Manhattan are either Negro or Puerto Rican. In the city as a whole, 40 per cent are from these two groups. And the latest figures suggest that the per-

centages may be going up. In 1957, for example, there were 64 elementary schools in which the Negro-Puerto Rican enrollment exceeded 90 per cent. By January of this year, the number had increased to 102—constituting about 17.8 per cent of all the city's public elementary schools as a result of declining white enrollments.²⁵

Of the 256,968 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City elementary schools in 1961, constituting 44.8 per cent of the total student body, 123,239, or 21.5 per cent, were in "Group X" schools. The 1960 figures were 242,874 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, or 42.8 per cent of the student body, with 113,691, or 20 per cent, in "Group X" schools.²⁶

Undoubtedly, open enrollment does give a measure of relief to those parents who find the present segregation intolerable. Providing such an escape valve for rising tensions may be necessary. Some of its results are desirable. But it can hardly be viewed as a solution.

The hard fact is that the large scale de facto segregation that exists in the public schools of our larger cities will continue until the ghettos are broken up. The most optimistic among us will agree that this will take a long time. What is to be done in the meantime?

Overcoming Educational Retardation

The attention of the civil rights organizations must be given not only to desegregation but also to the problem of educational retardation in the ghetto schools. That retardation is an obstacle to the elimination of discrimination and segregation. On that count alone, it is as legitimate to our area of concern as, let us say, programs for public housing or

²⁵ Stanley H. Lowell, Remarks Made at Yeshiva University, Sunday, April 29, 1962.

²⁶ Board of Education—City of New York, Central Zoning Unit, *The Problem of Pupil Growth*, March 1962.

federal aid to education. As the United States Commission on Civil Rights said recently:

Whether these handicaps are the result of segregation in the schools, economic and cultural deprivation, or some other cause, is immaterial. They exist.²⁷

Programs designed to deal with this situation have been started in a number of school systems; e.g., the Demonstration Guidance (Junior High School No. 43) Project and the Higher Horizons Program in New York City, the Banneker Group Program in St. Louis, the Greater Cities-Gray Area Program in ten cities, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, and others described in the 1961 Report of the Commission on Civil Rights.²⁸ The basic assumption of these programs is that the educational retardation in ghetto schools is the product, at least in part, of environmental factors. Their basic approach is to overcome those factors as far as possible.

Even in the short time these programs have been operating, they have produced results bordering on the spectacular. In the schools under the Banneker Group Program in St. Louis, 74.2 per cent of pupils covered were reading at the district or group standard in 1960, compared with 46.6 per cent two years earlier. The number assigned to "Track 1" (that is, the curriculum for "above-average achievers") had risen from 7.1 to 20.7 per cent in the same period.²⁹ The Demonstration Guidance Project in New York City has seen similar results:

In 1957, 26% of the students had scored in the 110 I.Q. category and above; in 1960, 58% scored 110 and above; 2.5% had scored 140 and above in 1957 while 12% scored in that category in 1960. What is particularly interesting is the increase in the I.Q. in view of previous findings that boys and girls from

this background usually show a decrease in I.Q. as they grow older.³⁰

The Waste of Talent

The striking improvements made in relatively short periods by these efforts are vastly encouraging. But it must shock us into a realization of the appalling waste of talents that now takes place in most de facto segregated schools. The simple fact is that hundreds of thousands of minority group children in Northern public schools are falling one to three years behind their undoubted capacity. As a result, they are not getting the basic training that they are capable of receiving—training they will need in our increasingly industrialized society. Tens of thousands of these pupils fail to get the college degrees that they could and would get if their primary and secondary school education was all that it could be.

This waste, this debasement of potentially educable citizens, goes on month after month and year after year, accumulating the material for a social disaster. Desegregation of housing will take a long time. Full desegregation of schools in our larger cities will not be accomplished much sooner. During the transition period that stretches ahead of us, we must halt the present waste of talent.

This is not in any sense a reversion to the discredited "separate but equal" philosophy. For one thing, this kind of effort is needed even where desegregation is proceeding. Even there, children whose education is in arrears because of prior segregation and other handicaps must get special attention. Moreover, this is not a program based on race. It is a program for special attention to those children who are educationally retarded, regardless of race. The validity of such a program is not destroyed

²⁷ U. S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *1961 Report, Book 2, "Education,"* p. 117.

²⁸ *Id.* at 123-137.

²⁹ *Id.* at 126-127.

³⁰ Board of Education of the City of New York, *Fifth Annual Progress Report of Demonstration Guidance Project*, p. 5 (1961).

by the fact that, because of past discrimination, the bulk of the pupils are non-white.

I submit, therefore, that civil rights groups have to do more than they have in the past to support and demand programs for improving educational achievement. It is not enough merely to equalize educational opportunity.

Program Implications

This has a number of implications. At the simplest level, we must address ourselves to the fact that the necessary special programs cost money. I need not tell you about the competition for the school dollar. Money will not be allocated for special assistance to underprivileged children—the programs will not be started or extended—until interested groups express more than mere interest.

However, we will have to go beyond this. The special problems of city schools require special consideration from the state legislatures which determine the flow of state funds. Discrimination against city areas by state legislatures is an old complaint. The civil rights forces must enter the fight for more funds for city schools. They must do so on the express ground that the cities face a special problem in overcoming the educational retardation among economically underprivileged children. In addition, support will be needed for aid from the Federal Government specifically earmarked for this purpose.³¹

³¹ The bill for federal aid to education supported by the Kennedy Administration provided that 10% of all sums allotted to any state should

Finally, let me return again to Dr. Conant's report. One of the facts he established dramatically is the inequality among school districts, particularly between the suburbs and the cities. Disregarding the matter of de facto segregation and of city slums, the rich suburbs spend more for each school child than do the cities. In other words, the suburban pupil gets a lot more public education than his city cousin. This is the result of a system that we have inherited from a time when inequalities of wealth did not show up so clearly in geographical distribution. At that time, the establishment of hundreds of separate school districts did not automatically create vast discrepancies in the way schools were operated.

This system is not sacrosanct. There is no reason why we should put up indefinitely with a structure in which some children receive far greater educational benefits from their government than others. It will take a long time to change to a system that channels school funds as and where they are needed. The sooner the demand is heard, the better.

The Higher Horizons Program and its various parallels have shown that we can do better by our underprivileged children. We have begun to develop the procedures and techniques. We should now develop the demand. It is time to stop a waste of human resources that has already continued too long.

be devoted to special programs designed to meet public school problems, including "the needs of deprived or disadvantaged pupils." 87th Congress, First Session, S. 1021, Section 109.