to fund programs for these children. As programs for the new children had to be funded from the $1.05 billion requested by the President, the effect was to reduce the ongoing programs to 70 percent of the authorized amount.

However, in California our appropriation for fiscal 1967 is only 67 percent of our authorization. We are faced with providing programs for *more* children than last year with *less* funds than we received last year. Last year's appropriation amounted to $252 per eligible child. The fiscal 1967 authorization would have provided $259 per eligible child. But our actual appropriation was drastically reduced to $180 per eligible child. This means that California either will not be able to include all of the children programmed in the authorization, considering the additional children Congress added, or the quality of the entire program stands to be severely impaired by spreading the funds too thinly.

To add to the seriousness of the problem, it is our understanding that the President's fiscal 1968 appropriation request for ESEA Title I is based on the fiscal 1967 figures. This means that the deleterious effects of the cutback will be projected into the future, despite the fact Congress' authorization bill increases the income eligibility formula to $3,000 instead of the current $2,000 figure. While the authorization for fiscal 1968 is $2.4 billion, the President has requested an appropriation of $1.2 billion—exactly half of what is needed to reach the number of children the Congress intended. Because California's cost of living is higher than that of many other states, the use of a $3,000 allocation formula with no significant increase in appropriations means that California's share of the national appropriation will be substantially reduced compared to that of other states. In other words, California is likely to receive even less per eligible child than it did under the current year's already-reduced appropriation.

More than 90 percent of California's school districts have an entitlement under ESEA Title I and are affected by Congressional action on this appropriation. In the program's first year, close to 300,000 California children in 1,044 school districts benefited. But even last year's appropriation was only enough to begin the job since it provided a meaningful compensatory education program for less than half of the California children in need of compensatory education. A 1964 survey by the Governor's Advisory Committee on Compensatory Education found that about 700,000 California children from poverty backgrounds were not succeeding in school and needed special help. Even more funds will be needed if, indeed, we are to reach all of the children who need compensatory education. We cannot serve more children in 1967 than were served in 1966 with a reduction of funds without seriously diluting the program to the extent that it will not make an appreciable impact on the children served nor contribute to raising their achievement level.

[Carnegie Quarterly, Vol. XIV, No. 4, Fall 1966]

THE RICH GET RICHER & THE POOR GET POORER . . . SCHOOLS

"The present allocation of fiscal resources works against education in the central cities. The lesser resources applied to education in the cities apparently hold down educational performance, particularly in the low income neighborhoods. Additional resources, if massive enough, would probably improve educational achievement. The political possibility of finding such resources for central city education is, at the best, uncertain."

In those dispassionate sentences, Alan K. Campbell, professor of political science and director of the metropolitan studies program at Syracuse University, sums up some of the early findings of a series of Carnegie-supported studies of large city school systems. Economists and political scientists are looking at the policies which emerge from school politics and at the ways in which the decisions which produce these policies are made—by whom, how, why, and in what environments.

Professor Campbell gave some of the findings in a paper delivered last summer at Stanford University's Cubberley Conference (copies are *not* available, so please do not request them; however, a list of books and journal articles which are forthcoming from the study will be found at the close of this article). He presented an array of facts, figures, and analyses which add up to a totally disheartening picture of the present efforts and future prospects for financing education in American cities. It is not merely that those that need it most—the city