

success of compensatory education, for example, is not unrelated to the availability of jobs for the parents of school children or the prospect of jobs for high school graduates. The effective delivery of medical services in the inner city is related in part to the training and use of inner city residents as sub-professional medical personnel. Water pollution abatement in a river basin brings in the Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Service. Assistance to accelerate the development of economically depressed areas involves investment planning by a host of Federal agencies. More generally, the interdependence of programs requires the concerted action of many government departments and agencies, each of whom, organizationally, is independent of the other.

*Second*, in its newer social programs the Federal Government is directly involved in program decisions at the local level in thousands of individual communities throughout the Nation. Decisions have to be made in the field—on the spot. Unlike the more traditional programs—Defense, agricultural price supports, veterans' benefits, and the like—policy coordination at the Washington level, difficult as that is, is no longer enough.

*Third*, all of the newer Federal social programs are joint ventures with State, county and city governments—in some cases with all of them at the same time. In any program involving both education and health—for example, a Head Start program including medical examinations for the children—it is necessary to involve at least two Federal Departments, the local school board, the State controlled public health service, the city welfare department, and the local community action agency.

Dealing with this incredible array of different political jurisdictions, and different but co-equal agencies within the same jurisdiction poses tremendous problems at every level of decision making. Much of the difficulty is inherent in a Federal system in which a multiplicity of governments is encouraged. But much of it also inheres in the functional organization of the Federal government itself. Combining different functional components into a single program package is difficult enough when it must be done in Washington among Cabinet Departments. But when it must be done in thousands of communities among co-equal departments of a number of political jurisdictions, the difficulties increase by orders of magnitude.

Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, a major part of the problem stems from the fact that it has no regional structure as a government. It is organized functionally with individual lines of authority running parallel to each other directly from Washington to the field. Even within many individual Cabinet Departments, there is no meaningful regional authority for the Department as a whole. Individual operating Bureaus have their own independent field establishments, which are not responsible to any overall Departmental official in a region or a city.

In short, the organization of the Federal Government has not caught up with the substantive nature of the problem it faces. On the substantive side it is attempting to deal with social problems in a region or a city through comprehensive programs which combine a host of different elements. On the organizational side it has no overall regional structure. It has no good mechanism at the regional level to plan, allocate budget resources, and handle day to day operating conflicts among the different functional units whose programs must be combined in a single package. Moreover, the mayor, or the governor who wants to gain control of his own departmental bureaucracy has no place to turn. His own, usually independent, departmental bureaucracy deals directly with its Federal counterpart in negotiating Federal aid. There is no Federal Government at the regional level, only a series of independent Federal agencies.

The Federal Government needs to develop a regional structure—a regional presence as a government. Not only do individual Departments need to strengthen the power of their own Departmental regional officials, but even more important, the Presidency itself needs a regional presence, a regional umpire and mediator among the various Federal agencies—someone who can act jointly with mayors and governors in carrying out tremendously complicated joint enterprises, in which education and training, and slum rehabilitation, and public facilities each form but a part of a comprehensive program.

I cannot predict or prescribe the particular nature of the necessary regionalization. But I believe a regional structure for the Federal Government, with sufficient power to deal with problems which arise among co-equal Federal agencies, is a major necessity. It would permit the *geographic decentralization* of decisions from Washington to the field, which the variety of local conditions