

This indicates a trend, if continued, of Federal establishment of programs within the States, rather than Federal support for the States' programs.

This trend toward program writing in Washington should be reversed. Federal involvement should be largely financial, in support of State plans made in States independently, and these plans should be controlled by the Federal Government only within broad policy objectives.

The States would become true partners in the enterprise, not applicants for participation in new programs about which they were not consulted.

A Tennessee superintendent recently stated:

Categorical aid may have been necessary in the beginning to by-pass the historical roadblocks of church-school and segregation issues. Is there a chance that this type of aid may continue because the philosophy of those who initiate legislation deem it desirable?

Perhaps too many are naively assuming a happy marriage between Federal assistance and local administration of the money made available. Just as marriage has been defined as a compromise, the compromise intelligence makes with nature, perhaps with Federal aid we made a compromise between what was urgent and what was important.

On the question of philosophy, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, who, in a publication entitled "Education 1965: A Report to the Profession," said:

The 88th and 89th Congresses, responding to the desires of the people, enacted laws enabling the Federal Government to take its place in the local-State-national educational partnership—toward this end, the Congress has enacted 24 major pieces of education legislation in the past three years. These new laws are channels through which billions of Federal tax dollars will go into our elementary schools, vocational schools, colleges, and universities.

But this money is not simply handed out in the pious hope that it will be put to good use. Each of the education laws is quite specific. Categories and conditions of aid have been established to insure that these funds are spent in an efficient and prudent manner.

Dr. Eric Lindman, writing in the September issue of the *School Administrator*, states that:

This new federalism in education rests upon four rather clear premises:

First, it assumes that State and local school leaders, including State legislators and local boards of education, will not spend Federal funds prudently and in the national interest without specific Federal direction.

Second, it assumes that a series of Federal categorical aids for selected services or programs, with accompanying guidelines, audits, and reports, will result in better local school management.

Third, it assumes that public schools throughout the nation have uniform strengths and weaknesses which can be remedied by categorical aids applied uniformly throughout the nation.

Fourth, it assumes that State and local tax sources will provide in the remaining 90 percent of the school budget the funds needed to improve existing programs and services.

These conflicts suggest a reexamination. For this examination, each partner should look at the problem through the eyes of the other partner. Perhaps, if this were achieved, the word "improvement" would become more significant than the word "innovation," and elementary and secondary aid to give every child the opportunity to develop according to his potential would become a reality.

I have some additional statements, and two or three letters from one particular board of education, which I won't read at this time, in the