

in the Job Corps, we urge that the States take full advantage of the 1962 amendment that permits the corpsman's allocation to his family to set aside in part at least for his future identifiable needs including educational plans and therefore not counted as income to his family deductible from the assistance grants.

THE CATALYTIC POTENTIAL OF THIS LEGISLATION

The proposed community action program—title II—will in our judgment be the most difficult one to initiate and administer. Except in times of crisis, the “mobilization” of resources, public and private, to combat some social problem, is one of the most difficult tasks in human affairs. The history of social welfare is strewn with good intentions—in the form of plans to mobilize and coordinate public and private health, welfare, education, and related programs so as to prevent or control this or that social problem—good intentions stranded on agency competitiveness or jurisdictional claims.

An extensive research concern at the Florence Heller Graduate School at Brandeis is the study of the dynamics of effective community action program in urban renewal, programs for the aging and other areas of health and welfare. Not unexpectedly, we have reaffirmed that there is no substitute for solid, inspired community leadership which has a workable plan and the power and resources to translate this plan.

We find high significance in the fact that this legislation places responsibility for the leadership in this war on poverty in the Office of the President. We do not know of any other instance in the history of our Government where the resources and leadership of such a wide range of key Federal departments such as Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; Interior; Agriculture; Commerce, and even the Department of Defense, have been so extensively related in an attack on a social problem. This impresses, particularly, the many of us who have labored often with indifferent success with the use of coordinating devices like the omnipresent interdepartmental committees.

At the Federal level this represents the sort of leadership which has a workable plan and the power and resources to translate the plan into action. This is a “can do” approach and philosophy which can and should assure a “can do” response in the local community.

We attach, also, high significance to section 202(a)(3) which describes a community action program as one “which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups referred to in section 204(a).”

We think this is particularly important in getting the cooperation of members who will be involved. We think this is one of the few pieces of Federal legislation which emphasizes this particular point of a partnership between those administering the program and those who are the beneficiaries of it. This is a principle frequently subscribed to in theory but frequently overlooked and ignored. In 1 to 1 personal services we recognize that a helping service does not begin until the individual wants it and participates actively in the helping process. We know, similarly, that programs directed toward groups of people achieve a much more significant level of participation if the members