

coverage a fully adequate program cannot be provided and positive training is substantially offset by the negative influences of a poverty culture.

I believe that the only existing institution capable of meeting these tests is the public school system. It already has the major training responsibility in the poverty communities. It is organized to cover all the geographic areas involved, however defined. It is a permanent continuing institution in being with established staff and facilities. It is well accepted in the public mind. Its program can be authoritatively organized so that it does not have to depend on voluntary cooperation of other institutions for its effectiveness.

Without the help of something comparable to title II, however, a public school system is unlikely to do much more than it is now doing.

The basic reason for this conclusion is that the dollars will not be available from local tax sources to finance the kind of program needed. The poverty classes of cities are predominantly Negroes. White voters, however, predominate in the total population of most northern industrial cities. They think that their own schools and other public service agencies should be improved. As a matter of practical politics it is too much to expect that white voters will vote for the diversion of general tax funds to the special and expensive solutions of poverty area problems. When this is coupled with the well-known difficulty of getting levies approved for any purpose, even though the opposition voter shares in the benefits, it seems clear that only a massive national effort can solve the poverty problems dealt with in title II. Such effort should, of course, be directed at the special solutions needed and limited to the poverty areas. Local districts should not be permitted to pass on to the Federal Government their normal routine school costs.

In addition to finances, the school systems need an almost revolutionary approach to a program if it is to have any reasonable chance of success in reducing poverty. New objectives, new curriculum, new facilities, new teacher training, new family relationships, new coordination with other public and private agencies, new time coverage, new cultural involvement—in short, a whole new set of concepts must be adopted to make headway in eliminating poverty. Few school systems are apt to take these steps except as an incident to a major overall program supported by substantial outside financing. Yet, the situation clearly indicates that present methods are inadequate. In a comparable situation, a business institution would shake up its methods, research solutions, apply newly tested techniques—or it would die. A city and a nation should do no less to solve their biggest domestic problem.

Mr. LANDRUM. I believe the desired plan is to proceed with a statement from all three of you gentlemen before any discussion takes place.

We will ask Mr. Nichols, of the Olin Mathieson Co., to proceed.

**STATEMENT OF THOMAS NICHOLS, CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE, OLIN MATHIESON CO.**

Mr. NICHOLS. Thank you.

I will identify myself as Thomas Nichols, chairman of the executive committee of the Olin Mathieson Co., also director of Fruehauf Corp. and other companies, and a life trustee of Johns Hopkins Uni-