

best catalyst for bringing people together, bringing the rich and poor together, bringing the races together, bringing different religious groups together to focus on the problems of these children, so it actually is creating communities where communities did not exist before.

This is particularly true in some of the States in the deep South and elsewhere, so we see Headstart as a community action program, not as an education program. But the very idea of community action is novel. It is very new in this country. Therefore, you can't expect lawyers automatically to see legal services as a community action program.

They are beginning to see it more and more but at the beginning it was not quite that clear. You don't expect to see all of the doctors understand that these neighborhood health centers are community action programs right at the beginning.

A large proportion of brightees, sort of most imaginative of them, do see it that way and they do not object, but others do object.

That goes for all of our programs. When we start a program, any program in any field, if it is a manpower program, an educational program, a health program, a justice program, there is always somebody already in existence who says, "Well, I ought to run that program." What they don't see frequently is the community action of it is more important than their little piece of it. We have a tough time explaining that.

I am confident myself that it has not penetrated enough people yet to make it advisable to turn it over to anybody else, especially to a group which looks upon it primarily as being an education rather than a human renewal program as Bill Kelly sometimes talks about the Job Corps.

Jules Sugarman said he would like to make a few more points on that issue and perhaps with that permission we could give him a minute or two to do that.

MR. SUGARMAN. As I said earlier in my testimony there are many excellent Headstart programs that are run by school systems. But taken as a whole the typical school system has difficulty with at least three of our concepts.

No. 1 is the involvement of parents. Most school systems have yet to really understand and feel the need for involving the parents in the process of child development.

No. 2 is—and this is limited to certain parts of the country largely—the school systems have been unable or unwilling to operate in accordance with the requirements of the Federal law. The existence of an alternative system which would operate within the requirements of Federal law has been a constant thorn in their side and I think much of the opposition has come from that particular group.

Thirdly, I think too many school systems have been more or less closed societies, not only closed to the parents but closed to volunteers, closed to nonprofessionals, closed to many other kinds of people who could make an effective contribution to the program. This is changing. We have seen some changes in the city of Chicago in the last year and I think it is changing in many communities in the country, but it is only changing because OEO exists as an alternative, and OEO has the ability to insist that certain kinds of things be done in a program.