

Again, if a district says—and we are encouraging districts to say this—that one of the pressing needs, or the most pressing need, to which a project is addressed is the elimination of isolation and separation, we feel that this falls completely within Title I.

Let me add just two more examples: School districts which recognize that in the education of deprived children motivation for achievement may be increased by racial integration, can develop a plan for using the funds to assist deprived pupils who will be involved in an integrated situation. And in school situations where classroom space is available, Title I funds may be used to develop a program whereby children would be transported from a target school and placed elsewhere in the district. This procedure should not only facilitate racial integration but also reduce the class size in the target school.

We also feel very strongly that under the State's responsibility to judge the size, scope, and quality of a project, we must help school districts to use Title I funds properly.

With regard to construction: We have received a number of projects that contained a component for reducing class size, and had to make a judgment as to whether we would permit building permanent structures in ghettos. In the \$74 million we have allocated we have not approved one permanent construction component. We have taken the position that the youngsters need help now, and not 2 or 3 years from now, after a building has been constructed.

Thomas F. Pettigrew, associate professor of social psychology, Harvard University

I think we can all agree that Title I establishes a great precedent for public education in the United States.

But Title I also has one great danger. If, through its special programs, it acts to separate the poor and the disadvantaged from other children in the public schools, it may prove self-defeating. I am not talking merely about racial segregation now, but about the separation of disadvantaged children in general from advantaged children.

In the recent study which the Office of Education completed under title IV of the Civil Rights Act, one of the chief findings is that the aptitude and achievement scores of disadvantaged children are more related to the characteristics of the children with whom they go to school than to other school variables. That is, it is important for the education and the achievement scores of disadvantaged children that these children be

in schools with advantaged children. If Title I funds should be used, directly or inadvertently, to separate the disadvantaged from the advantaged, we would be losing what the survey has shown, on the basis of very clear data, to be the most important means of raising the achievement of disadvantaged children.

Frankly, this danger in Title I concerns me a great deal. And, to be blunt, most of the examples that we were given as we came in of Title I projects involving desegregation do not greatly reassure me. But two of them are, I think, reassuring—and it is about these that I will talk here.

Many projects are really hashed-over examples of measures that have failed in the past, that is, special arrangements for the disadvantaged treated separately from others. The past record of education is literally crammed with the failures of such programs.

But two programs among the samples we were given do reassure me, particularly because they have long-range potentials. These are the East Orange, N.J., program for an educational plaza and the Hartford plan for regional desegregation [see exhibits A and B]. It seems to me that these two commendable programs, taken together, contain the ingredients and show the direction for long-term solutions to the problems, solutions that must and, we hope, can be supported with Title I funds.

The idea of an educational park for the entire school system is one ingredient that we will need. The other idea, contained in the Hartford plan, adds the suburban dimension.

It is hardly a secret that in Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, and other cities, we are simply running out of white children to desegregate in the inner city. We are not running out of whites in the United States, however. Whites are also coming to the metropolitan areas, just as Negroes are. But, before there can be any ultimate solutions to the desegregation of the public schools in our inner cities, we must involve the suburbs. These have been well called the white noose that surrounds the Negro neck: they will have to become something more positive in educational terms than they are now.

I would hope that Title I would be the source of funds for such a program as the Hartford plan, and that it and other similar plans (for example, METCO in the Boston area) might serve as experimental pilot models for us to watch, particularly with a view to combining such plans with the educational park idea.

I accept the point just made by the gentleman from California that we have to do something immediately. But let us not fix our exclusive attention on short-run