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This paper describes and analyzes, by means of network analysis, a social conflict which occurred in Missoula, Montana during the summer of 1973. The conflict was between a Community Action program (CAP) and a Head Start project. The Missoula chapter of the American Indian Movement (AIM) was allied with CAP. The conflict, which presented characteristics of both "class" and "racial" warfare, embroiled not only social categories, defined by class and ethnicity, but federal bureaucratic agencies and, ultimately, Montana's delegation to the U. S. Congress.

Descriptions of the social categories include differences and similarities between the social organizations, economic structures, and ideologies of each. Structural differences between Head Start as a segmentary organization and CAP as an administrative organization are also described, as is the role of personality within each organization.

This paper presents a dynamic view of the interplay between the three social orders—structural, categorical, personal—under conditions of conflict, drawing primarily on the works of J. Clyde Mitchell, Adrian Mayer, and Jeremy Boissevain. Lastly, it attempts to determine the process by which the conflict was begun, ran its course, and was terminated.
For C., who persevered during the hardest of times,
For Art Sakaye, who gave everything and received less than nothing in return,
But especially for Chara Moon
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Figure 1: Organizational Chart (Early June, 1973)

--- Shared responsibility on matters pertaining to Head Start.

OEO: Office of Economic Opportunity
HEW: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
OCD: Office of Child Development, an HEW component
CAP: Community Action Program

I have included on this chart only those persons, groups, and sub-groups which, at local level, actively participated in the conflict or sent representatives who participated in the conflict. I have not included Missoula AIM (American Indian Movement), which was not officially affiliated with the CAP agency. Neither have I included the neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) which was housed in the agency but was not involved in the conflict. (NYC's funding agency is the Department of Labor.) Nor have I included the Head Start Nutrition component, most of which staff maintained neutrality throughout the conflict; nor CAP staff personnel who were not involved.
Figure 2: Factional Chart (Late June, 1973)

OEO: Office of Economic Opportunity
HEW: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
OCD: Office of Child Development, an HEW component
CAP: Community Action Program

On this chart I have omitted the position of Fiscal Officer, as she resigned prior to the conflict becoming overt. Neither have I included seven teachers and teacher aides who were not in Missoula during the conflict or who would not openly commit themselves. One teacher aide who was allied with CAP prior to summer, 1973, left town at the outbreak of hostilities. Although OEO's Regional Director stood in opposition to CAP's Executive Director, the former's influence by late June appears to have been negligible. The Executive Director maintained his influence for several weeks after he left the agency.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

America's War on Poverty

was the boldest national objective ever declared by the Congress—to do what no people had ever done, what the Bible says cannot be done—to eliminate poverty from the land. It was reviewed by the Congress with the minimum of care, in the shortest of time, and with the least understanding of what was about to happen. It granted the broadest of power and discretion to a single administrator—Sargent Shriver—to upset and remake, if he could, the institutional structure of community after community across the land. It became—and remains—the most controversial of all the domestic programs of the Kennedy-Johnson era (Sundquist 1969:3; emphasis Sundquist's).

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was designed "not only to eliminate poverty but to restructure society" (Levitan 1969:ix), the assumption behind the plan being that one could not be accomplished without the other and that both were desirable objectives.

Yet, if the professed objectives of the war on poverty were considered desirable by both its promoters and the public, it is not clear what consequences the achievement of these objectives were intended to bear. Donovan states that "the evidence available suggests that the Johnson war on poverty was conceived in a mood of political optimism
which bordered on naivete" (1967:113). Referring to his own research, he says, "Throughout this study one gets glimpses of the White House which raise doubts that the President had a clear view of what his war on poverty contained or of how he ought to take it" (1967:122).

Sundquist describes Kennedy's desire for an anti-poverty campaign alternatively as "the normal yearning of an idealist for ideals, of an activist for action, or the search of a politician facing a reelection campaign for a measure that will dramatize his principles and bear his name" (Sundquist 1969:7).

Levitan saw the war on poverty as a natural extension of the civil rights struggle: "the issue of civil rights inevitably led to the problem of poverty, for economic deprivation was an integral part of the overall discrimination and injustice suffered by Negroes" (Levitan 1969:15).

Cloward and Piven viewed the anti-poverty war as a means by which the administration hoped "to mute civil disorder" which had been "produced by mass unemployment" (Cloward and Piven 1971:xiii).

To Kramer, the war against poverty was "to be a novel and substantial departure from the conventional approach to the planning and administration of social service programs" (Kramer 1969:10).

Richard Rovere saw it as "set up to deal with the distress of the cities. . . ." (quoted by Moynihan 1968:5).
Whichever way we might wish to view the anti-poverty war—as an instrument of a budding presidential campaign, an extension of the continuing quest for social justice in America, a method by which to reduce unemployment and revitalize the decaying cities, or as a confused hodgepodge of sacred notions coalesced around a common ideal—the White House and the nation professed itself determined to eradicate American poverty within the lifetime of the current generation, perhaps even by the end of the decade of the '60's.

The war on poverty represented America's commitment to its own "underdeveloped" people—the poor, particularly the Black urban poor. Framed in such inspirational terms, who could argue against so noble an endeavor?

It began as a popular program for who could be on the side of poverty? To criticize an anti-poverty program would be like being against Mother. It began as a plausible program for surely a great society as wealthy and powerful as ours could wage war and win over poverty (Alinsky 1965:41).

The Office of Economic Opportunity

In October of 1963, the President's Council of Economic Advisors submitted for the President's review a concept called "The Poverty Cycle." It was this "life cycle," the Council believed, that served to perpetuate the poor in conditions of poverty. Moynihan defines the
cycle of poverty as follows:

"Poverty" leads to "cultural and environmental obstacles to motivation" which lead to "poor health, and inadequate education, and low mobility limiting Earning Potential" which lead to "Limited Income Opportunities" which lead to "Poverty" (Moynihan 1966:4; emphases Moynihan's).

As there was no single weak point at which to break the cycle, in order to eradicate poverty and its concomitant social ills, the Council suggested directing anti-poverty efforts at all points simultaneously. The most effective way to do this, they decided, was to create Community Action Programs (CAP's) which would: (1) attack the problem at grass-roots level; (2) organize "local initiative, action, and self-help under Federally-approved plans and with Federal support"; and (3) devise "programs to evaluate and coordinate existing Federal, State, local and private programs and to test and demonstrate new ones" (Moynihan 1966:4-5).

All of this was to be done under the guidance and supervision of an agency yet to be created, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

The program [OEO] was described as human development . . . , emphasizing human resources. . . . It was aimed at the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty, the rehabilitation of people and neighbor­hoods. . . . It was described as a "high risk, high pay-off" program: high risk because it departed from the traditional standards of categorical welfare programs and made great demands on individual initiative; high pay-off because it could be adapted to the specific problems of particular communities (Yarmolinsky 1969:35).
As opposed to traditional welfare programs OEO (Levitan calls it a "strategy" rather than a program [Levitan 1969:109]) was "to get at the root causes of poverty, not to ameliorate its consequences." Implicitly, "these root causes were taken to be the lack of capacity or opportunity to earn a decent living, rather than the simple lack of money" (Yarmolinsky 1969:34-35).

"It is not dependency [on Public Assistance] we want to encourage," Paul Ylvisaker of the Ford Foundation's "gray areas program" a predecessor of and model for OEO, said, "but independence and choice" (quoted by Levitan 1969:19; Cf. Kramer 1969:7).

If, then, the war on poverty was to eliminate poverty from the land while reconstructing society, and if OEO was created and commissioned to direct the course of the war, it fell to OEO's Community Action Programs to wage the battles on the ground.

Community Action

Moynihan states that Community Action was understood by its designers, distinctly and incompatibly, in four ways:

Community Action Programs would coordinate new and existing programs so as to have maximum effect in the war against poverty. "The guiding principle is efficiency. Community Action Programs may begin by costing money, but in the end they save it."
[Drawing from] such disparate sources as sociological theory, trade union practice, and accumulated evidence that the poor are more readily mobilized in opposition to things than in support of them, policy designers had been convinced that the most important need of the poor was to acquire power, and a sense of power, by means of community organization. This was to be achieved by inducing conflict . . . clearly, the guiding principle here is not efficiency, but conflict, not coordination but . . . disruption.

Community Action was to perform as a kind of domestic Peace Corps in the service of the poor of the United States who comprised an underdeveloped people similar to those of Third World countries.

[The package sent to Congress] was the work of a small task force assembled under the direction of Sargeant Shriver from among the political executives of the administration. The point of view of this group was pragmatic, experimental, and, given the individuals involved, somewhat intellectual in the sense of an awareness of various currents of thought and a certain skepticism about them all. The task force wanted a program that would pass the Congress, help win the presidential election, and eliminate poverty, in perhaps that order.

For the task force . . . the guiding principle was not efficiency, nor conflict, nor yet services, but political effectiveness. The occasionally-to-be-encountered observation that Community Action Programs are a Federal effort to recreate the urban, ethnic, political machines that Federal welfare legislation helped to dismantle, would not misrepresent the attitudes of the task force. By and large the task force consisted of men who had had some contact with such machines, and had perceived their usefulness and functions even as some had fought them. The task force wanted programs that would work so
as to help the President, the party, and the poor, . . . (Moynihan 1966:5-7; emphasis Moynihan's).

To provide needed services to the poor while at the same time organizing them to take into their own hands political power, to revitalize the old programs and to coordinate these and new ones in a multiple spearhead against the causes of poverty, all of these things to be accomplished as efficiently and expeditiously as possible—this was the mission of Community Action.

If the underlying principles of coordination, disruption, service, and political effectiveness seemed to enclose basic contradictions, if politicizing the poor so that they may appreciate the power available to the taker was incompatible with providing and coordinating services (Kramer 1969:15-17), if "political effectiveness" at national level might not correspond to political activism at local level (Moynihan 1969:142-144), if fiscal responsibility and efficiency might preclude administrative flexibility (Donovan 1967:73), if, in short, Community Action's policy designers were blissfully ignorant of a real or potential gap between the vague desires of the White House and the aspirations of the nation's poor, then they were exceedingly careful not to show it. For them, the war on poverty was an exercise, albeit a grand one, in social engineering. Professional intellectuals and reformers, they "addressed themselves to professional rulers, rather than the public upon whom their
power ultimately rested" (Marris and Rein 1967:31).

If there were conceptual contradictions in the design of the Community Action strategy, there appears also to have been a political dichotomy between the will of the Executive Office and the practice of established institutions; one which could, however, be overcome by a dedicated, elite band of reformers.

To . . . federal officials working on the initial phases of the war on poverty, community action occasionally seemed the incantation of a mystical cult. By reading, and even more by listening, one learned a few salient features: community action was fervently anti-establishment; schools, employment services, welfare agencies, city hall were all part of an "establishment" or "system" which served "the disadvantaged" (another key concept) by referring them from one "helping service" to another without ever really understanding or challenging "the culture of poverty" and with no real ability to move families and individuals out of poverty. Community action involved the use of federal funds to exert pressure on local bureaucracies, to encourage them to innovate and challenge them to create new institutions. Community action was a means whereby the poor themselves would participate in administering their own local programs of social reform (Donovan 1967:41; emphases Donovan's).

Ideally, the model Community Action Program would work in this way: a community would study those problems of poverty which were locally germane, identify the pockets of poverty and designate them as "target areas;" that is, areas requiring special efforts in order to eradicate poverty. The community would then plan and implement a
program for these areas that would coordinate the activities of those institutions which were, or should have been, concerned with the elimination of poverty in their community. These institutions would include various service organizations, existing public assistance programs, employment services, and schools. The political leadership as well would be included in the implementation of anti-poverty programs and so would representatives of the poor, the residents of the target areas themselves.

The model Community Action Program would require a "central local authority" to make decisions for the local programs. Thus were non-profit corporations created and chartered, to provide boards of directors composed of representatives of those institutions mentioned above (public sector), of the business, or private, sector, and of the poor themselves (low-income sector). The board would be responsible, at local level, for coordinating community service organizations and institutions, for lending direction to their efforts, and for allocating the federal resources needed to eradicate poverty (Kravitz 1969:60).

Staff members, who would conduct the daily operation of the Community Action agency, would be hired by the board and paid by OEO. Thus, staff members would be responsible both to the community, as represented on the board, and to the federal government, as represented by OEO.
Among OEO-initiated programs which eventually would come under the Community Action umbrella were the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Legal Services, Upward Bound, the Job Corps, VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America), Planned Parenthood, Head Start, and others. All of these would be delegated to funding agencies other than OEO during the latter years of the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration. Some, however, while funded by the Department of Labor or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), would remain under the aegis of the local CAP agency.

Since its inception in the summer of 1965, Head Start has been the most popular of all the OEO programs (Head Start was delegated to HEW in 1971). Indeed, owing to the public's readiness to accept it, OEO often placed Head Start in a community before placing a Community Action Program which was likely to encourage greater controversy. This apparently was the case in Missoula, Montana, where Head Start arrived in the summer of 1965, to be followed by Community Action in the fall. In many areas, as Levitan has shown, Head Start has been the only justification for the existence of the local Community Action agency (Levitan 1969:153).

Head Start was intended to prepare the children of the poor for entry into public school and for successful achievement there. The program was developmental, including health, nutrition, and parent involvement components, as
distinct from kindergartens, which limit their goals to social and emotional enrichment. Head Start would provide the intellectual stimulation and emotional adjustment which children from impoverished families often lack. Thus, by compensating for the deficiencies experienced in the child's home life, Head Start would bring him closer to the achievement level of his middle-class peers (Levitan 1969:134-135).

The Conflict in Missoula

Throughout the summer of 1973, the Community Action agency in Missoula, Montana--Missoula Mineral Human Resources, Incorporated--was rent by an internal conflict which threatened ultimately to lead to open and violent warfare between Community Action and Head Start. At the same time, other Head Start projects in other parts of the country--i.e., Seattle and Spokane, Washington; Ogden, Utah--similarly were revolting against their patron CAP agencies. Obviously, some historical and organizational similarities existed which must account for such similar occurrences in such diverse locales. It is my intent to describe the conflict in Missoula and the events and, perhaps more importantly, the perceptions of the events leading to the conflict. In this way, I may be able to shed light on what apparently, was a national trend. Second, I shall try to explain, in the light of the conceptual dichotomies which I have already brought out, and others, the ostensible causes and progress of the
conflict.

I shall be concerned with three groups: a sector of the urban Indian population of Missoula, who identified themselves as members of the American Indian Movement (AIM); the Community Action staff, board of directors, and certain Head Start employees; and the remainder of the Head Start staff, the Head Start Policy Council, and parents.

I have regarded urban Indians as attempting to create a new identity for themselves—an "Indian" one, as opposed to their traditional tribal identities. Insofar as Indians are undergoing dramatic cultural and social changes within their own lifetimes, I have viewed the urban Indian condition as a dynamic one.

Similarly, I have taken the position that the condition of impoverished whites is dynamic. Within the parameters of the lower class, there appears to be quite a lot of movement between jobs and public assistance as the primary source of income. This movement corresponds with changing ascribed statuses as well as those which are achieved, the person on welfare occupying a lower status than the laborer whose income is no greater than that of the former. Structural changes are also associated with the changing source of income, the best known being the correspondence of the matri focal family with public assistance as opposed to the correspondence of the nuclear family to labor (Cf. Moynihan 1965; Cloward and Piven 1971).
I shall also be concerned with two bureaucratic agencies: the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). I shall attempt to show by what process the Weberian model of the impersonal bureaucracy responsive to the will of its leadership is "corrupted" (Wallace 1971), and the manner by which it protects itself against both its clientele and its "owners;" in the present case, the poor and the United States Congress, respectively.

Lastly, I shall be dealing with the course of the conflict itself. This, for two reasons. First, it was under the stressful conditions of the conflict that most of my data was gathered. While, as nearly as I can tell, surprisingly little of my original data was distorted by human emotion, still, one cannot avoid acknowledging the impact of knowledge and information upon the actors in the drama; nor can one avoid recognizing the use to which information was put in order to manipulate opposing factions into desirable courses of action.

Second, the conflict itself engendered changes in the interpersonal relationships within each faction and in the structural relationships between factions. An understanding of these relationships, both prior to and, in their altered states, during the conflict, is needed to appreciate the decisions made by the leadership of each faction and the course of action taken by each. In turn, in order to
appreciate the effects of the conflict among the different factions, we must understand the effects of individual actions upon the various relationships.

It would be nice, perhaps, to be able to say that certain social problems appealed to me, and so I set out to find a social conflict in which these problems were thrown into high relief in order to attempt to resolve them. But that was not the case. The case was, rather, that I stumbled into a hornet's nest without any idea that the nest existed.

From the autumn of 1972 through August 1973, I was a member of the Missoula Mineral Human Resources Head Start Policy Council. During the conflict in the summer of 1973, I found myself sharing the leadership of Head Start in its fight against Community Action. In short, I participated as fully as any Head Start parent prior to the open conflict, and during the conflict I participated to a greater degree than almost any of the Head Start staff and parents.

As a participant, the conflict was, for me, a moral one. On some issues I willingly took a particular stand because my own values would permit no other. On other issues, I stood for a particular course of action because I felt that I had no choice. In every circumstance, I tried to advance the cause of Head Start.

The reader is justified in suspecting biases in my attitudes toward the several parties involved in the conflict. I would maintain, however, that whatever biases are manifest
in this paper are offset by the presentation of an "insider's" knowledge of detail and intricacy.

While recognizing that the data may be interpreted in a number of ways—e.g., from a purely economic standpoint, or from a psychological one—I have opted for a socio-political "network analysis" of the data. Originally, I intended to employ structural techniques of analysis alone to portray and explain the conflict. But the broad normative rules and behaviors thereby evoked are too simplistic; they cannot convey the meaning or the emotional impact the conflict presented for its participants, nor do they allow the reader to observe the inter-workings within and between institutions which make for an overall dynamic context. As Mitchell says:

An institutional analysis utilizes partial networks to erect a logically coherent structure of norms and behaviour patterns as for example, the kinship system, or the religious system. Its success depends upon the simplifying process by which only a single aspect of the complexity of human behaviour is considered at a time. The network approach on the other hand deliberately seeks to examine the way in which people may relate to one another in terms of several different normative frameworks at one and the same time and how a person's behaviour might in part be understood in the light of the pattern of coincidence of these frameworks or "contexts".

Because social networks ramify across and between institutions they provide a means of examining the interrelationships of the behaviour of people in different contexts, a feature which the very abstraction necessary in institutional analysis precludes. Institutional analysis by its very process of abstraction must minimize the connection between institutions. In so doing it allows
the analyst to represent a vast set of actions in terms of a common normative framework in highly compact form. The relationship of one institution to another, however, must remain a postulate. An analysis using social networks on the other hand, through the notion of multiplexity allows the behaviour in terms of one normative framework to be related directly to that in another. The interconnection between institutions, if it exists at all, can be demonstrated empirically in this way: it is not a postulate of the procedure (Mitchell 1969:49; emphasis Mitchell's).

Yet, network analysis does not replace the structural approach but complements it (Mitchell 1974:282). To ignore institutional relationships would be to ignore an entire order of social relationships. In his 1969 essay, Mitchell speaks to this point:

There appear, in fact, to be three different orders of social relationships which are characteristic of large-scale societies--possibly of all societies--. . . . These are:

a. the **structural order** by means of which the behaviour of people is interpreted in terms of action appropriate to the position they occupy in an ordered set of positions, such as in a factory, a mine, a voluntary association, a trade union, political party or similar organization.

b. the **categorical order** by means of which the behaviour of people in unstructured situations may be interpreted in terms of social stereotypes such as class, race, ethnicity, "Red" and "School" among the Xhosa in East London.

c. the **personal order** by means of which the behaviour of people in either structured or unstructured situations may be interpreted in terms of the personal links individuals have with a set of people and the links these people in turn have among themselves and with others,
such as the social networks of families in Bott's study.

These are not three different types of actual behaviour: they are rather three different ways of making abstractions from the same actual behaviour to achieve different types of understanding and explanation (Mitchell 1969:9-10).

In the following chapters then, I shall be looking at the relationships between individuals as determined by their structural and categorical statuses. I shall also be concerned with the effects of personal links and sentiment upon the structural and categorical orders.

Although the Community Action agency in Missoula, Montana administrated all anti-poverty activities in Missoula and Mineral Counties, I have, for the most part, limited the setting to the city of Missoula, as this is where most of the action occurred.

Generally, I refer to Indians or Native Americans in the present tense, although several of the individuals to whom I have referred have left Missoula since the actions described in the following chapters occurred. I use the present tense insofar as its use reflects my view that the quest for a new identity continues to this day among Native Americans in Missoula and elsewhere.

Proper names, when used, are pseudonyms. Exceptions are the names of those persons not directly involved in the conflict but to whom mythical qualities were ascribed.
Where appropriate, I have substituted organizational or job titles for proper names or I have deleted them.

Mistakes in grammar and syntax in the appendices and in informants' statements have been retained.

Dialogue has been taken from tape transcripts when available, from the collective memory of informants, and from my own journal and memory. Where not otherwise noted, the reader may assume that the latter sources have been tapped.

Journal entries from which I have drawn were originally made either during observation or within hours after an episode of participant-observation. In a few cases, entries were delayed by several days.

Whenever possible, I have sought confirmation of the accuracy of my memory by checking informants' recollections. I have been consistently impressed by informants' abilities (and my own) to recall the circumstances surrounding an event, including, sometimes, the exact time of day an event occurred.

I have relied upon my memory alone when no reliable informants were present during an event.

I have endeavored to clearly identify my sources—tapes, informants' reports, memory and journals, investigators' findings—and to indicate the circumstances under which each was used. In one or two cases, I have altered the circumstances under which information was collected in order to
conceal the identities of informants.

Because I have drawn particularly on the findings of one investigator, Arthur R. Sakaye, who worked under the auspices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Missoula County Attorney's office, but have not reported his findings in full, I have provided his actual name.
CHAPTER II

THE CAP INDIANS

Insofar as it pertained to social categories the conflict between Community Action and Head Start in Missoula, Montana during the summer of 1973 evolved, ostensibly, along "class" and ethnic lines. In Chapter III, we shall investigate the "class" aspects of the conflict. Chapter II purports to describe Indian-non-Indian relationships in Missoula, emphasizing what I perceive to be the Indian point of view. I have attempted to abstract this view from a context of cultural and personal stress related to the process of urbanization. I have tried to establish not only the cultural derivation of the Indian middlemen who were active in the conflict but their social placements within their urban culture. Lastly, I have concerned myself with the function of allegations of racism to the cause of certain Indians in Missoula and to Indianness as a cultural movement.

In 1973, of approximately 58,263 people residing in Missoula County, 864 were American Indians.\(^1\) Of this number, 370 were university students or dependents of university students.\(^2\) It is with this latter category that this chapter is concerned. The remainder,
while they may have regarded themselves as Indians, have gone socially and politically unnoticed by Indian students, whom I have regarded as the core of Indianness in Missoula.

In 1973, there were three exclusively Indian organizations in Missoula: Indian Studies, a university program; Qua Qui, a "self-help Indian organization"; and the American Indian Movement (AIM).

Indian Studies, naturally enough, confined its membership to Indian university students. The memberships of Qua Qui and AIM were composed of Indian students and a group called, by some, "CAP Indians". In its most limited sense, the term "CAP Indians" referred to those Indians employed by the Community Action agency in Missoula.

Of the three organizations, only Qua Qui, the only legally incorporated Indian organization, maintained a membership roll, in that it had a board of directors. Membership in Indian Studies or in AIM was defined by personal association with other members or simply by announcing one's affiliation.

Indian students at the University of Montana in Missoula emphasize that they are Indians. That statement is not as simplistic as it might sound. Moyer has noted that reservation or tribal groups, maintain social dichotomies between themselves and other tribal groups, even preferring that Whites occupy the high status positions.
on their reservations rather than Indians from other reservations (Moyer 1972:72). In Missoula, this distinction is de-emphasized in favor of an Indian-non-Indian opposition. In relation to other tribes, the Indian has attempted to maintain his tribal identity. In relation to non-Indians, he has attempted to establish and maintain his Indianness.

The remainder of this chapter will be taken up in attempting to answer three questions: How does the Indian distinguish himself from non-Indians? What social purpose does this distinction serve? By what process is this distinction established and maintained?

Descent

The degree of Indian blood possessed by an individual is laden with connotations of rank. The more numerous one's Indian, as opposed to White, ancestors, the greater one's claim to Indianness. In this regard, a "fullblood" is more worthy than a "halfblood," a "halfblood" more than a "quarterblood," and so on. At the same time, tribal purity is not forgotten, for even among fullbloods, one having both mother and father descended from the same tribe is worthy of greater esteem than one whose ancestry is tribally heterogeneous.

The theme of "bloodedness" has been carried from the reservations into Missoula but its foundations remain on the reservations, for the reservation is the home of the
"true" Indian. The true Indian lives on the reservation but does not live in the reservation towns. Rather, he lives away from town in what we may call, after Redfield (1953:28-31), "folk societies". Wax has indicated the importance of the existence of those he calls "Country Indians" in enabling Indian communities to survive as Indian communities by providing and epitomizing the traditional models of "sharing, voluntary cooperation, equality, and solidarity" (Wax 1971:72-77).

In Missoula, Country Indians are referred to as "the old people," greater age implying closer adherence to tradition and closer proximity to ancestry. While the existence of the old people is of great value culturally, it can also be a source of embarrassment to Indians who have achieved some prestige in the eyes of the White world. In this context, there is such a thing as being "too Indian". Nor are people who are too Indian limited to the old people. Anyone can be too Indian who brings discredit to his achieved status by behaving in a fashion that is stereotypically Indian - the stereotype defined by non-Indians but the perjorative applied by some Indians of comparatively high social and economic status.

On the reservations, there are people who still practice the old ways but who are comparatively young (Wax's category, Country Indians, would include these people.). They are not old people but appear to be
considered by Indians in Missoula as apprentices to the old people. When mentioned in conversation, the reference is made either in tones of admiration or in an offhand manner. These disparate attitudes appear to be based on the status of the one regarding them, some of those who have achieved higher vocational status appearing to regard them with some embarrassment, those who have not acquired status regarding them with appreciation.

In Missoula, the old people represent an Indian identity, regardless which tribe they descend from. I have seen, for example, an Arapaho man express satisfaction and admiration upon learning that some of the older Flatheads still make medicine.

On the reservations, the old people represent tribal, rather than Indian, traditions. To my knowledge, there is no single expression used to classify the old people of one reservation group which is acceptable to the members of other groups.

Enrollment

The tribal council on each reservation establishes the degree of blood required to qualify for enrollment on the reservation. All reservations in Montana require that a person be at least a quarterblood to qualify for enrollment.

While a few Indians are "landless", whether enrolled
or not, still, the identification of Indianness with reservation lands is fundamental. The idea of land itself carries two attitudes: economic and symbolic. Most Indians profit to a greater or lesser extent from tribal land revenues. However, even the landless Indians maintain a sentimental attachment to land that goes beyond the present-day economic motif into the historical and mythical past, for the reservation is a symbol of home and tribe. Some landless Indians have become spokesmen on behalf of those who wish to maintain tribal holdings intact. And even those Indians who are for dividing and selling tribal lands express the sentiment that they are betraying by their very thoughts not only their particular tribes but themselves individually as well.

Economics

Brophy and Aberle (1966:3,191) have referred to the "special relationship" Indians maintain with the federal government. Joan Ablon (1972:413-14) and others view this relationship as an "attitude of dependency". These analysts are discussing a type of welfare dependency germane to the reservations, one which includes a kind of psycho-social dependency admixed with the economic aspects, for the federal government, as represented by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is the main decision-maker on the reservations insofar as the problems of daily life are concerned.
(Jorgensen 1971: Officer 1971). As one rather idealistic social worker who had worked with Indians long enough to begin to make sense of her initial impressions but long enough also to begin to despair of any prospect for peaceful social change explained:

You see it every day; this is why the men are so frustrated and the women are so bitter. Unless you own land and are rich so you can get outside the reservation, you are always being told what you can do and what you can't do, what the guidelines say you can do and what they say you can't do.

My informant, herself obviously frustrated and embittered, while correct (I believe) in her analysis of the psychological consequences of welfare dependency, has assumed that Indians want to "get outside the reservation". She has not taken into consideration the strong ties to home and family that so pervade Indian sentiment. It would seem that Indian emigration to the cities has been promoted by the effects of a dwindling land base, overpopulation, chronic unemployment, and, in some cases, personal difficulties with the BIA rather than the desire to escape a "total institution" (Cf. Brophy and Aberle 1966:67-68).

The reservation Indian is poorly equipped by training and experience to cope with the complexities of urban life. In Missoula, away from his cultural setting and his family, yet sustaining his "attitude of dependency", he tends to turn to those bureaucratic agencies which can assist him in somewhat the same way as did the BIA: the Office of
Economic Opportunity (OEO), the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), and, at the University of Montana, Indian Studies and Special Services.

Indians regard that they are by right entitled to economic compensation for lands ceded in treaties. This right is theirs by virtue of their being Indians, whether they happen to live on the reservations or in the cities. Opposed to this is the thinking of probably most Whites who are unaware, except in the most abstract and sentimental terms, of Indian legal history. If the Indian regards economic subsidy as a right, Whites tend to regard it as a privilege and to equate Indians with lower-class Whites and Blacks and other groups who are notably dependent upon public assistance. The Indian is resentful of this and, through his spokesmen, has attempted to clarify, in sometimes regrettable terms, the distinctions between himself and Blacks or Chicanos. This appeal is directed toward Whites who hold power and influence in political and economic spheres but who tend to view the world in primarily materialistic terms and so maintain the equation: Indian equals Black equals Brown equals Appalachian White (Cf. Moyer 1972).

Poverty and its complement, "cultural deprivation", mean more to the Indian than is implied by simple economic criteria. To be Indian is to be poor. To be other than poor is to be White. The reverse of the latter statement is also true: to be White is to have money, regardless of the economic facts. In perhaps dozens of conversations...
with Indians in which we talked of poverty and the poor, although my informants used such terms as "low-income people" and "the poor", almost invariably they were referring only to low-income Indian people and poor Indians. On one occasion, I was accused of being a liar when I said that I personally knew White people who, I was certain, were as poor as most Indians. Only when I had managed to re-establish my sincerity did my informant take the position that I was simply mistaken and naive, which could be forgiven.

Poverty is not only Indian but its conditions symbolize, as well, the ideological purest of Indianness. Among the old people, there are sanctions against wealth, or, at least, the display of it. Poverty conditions represent simplicity and even particular social and behavioral patterns. Close kin and friendship ties, while pronounced in Missoula compared to the less personalized relations by which most Whites conduct their daily lives, are not nearly as emphasized as among the old people on the reservations. As one Indian woman explained:

The difference between low-income [Indian] people and middle-class [White] people is materialistic. The middle-class is ambitious for material gain while low-income people have each other... On the one hand, you want more comforts, more of the necessities, like central heating instead of a wood stove. But on the other hand, if you get them, then the rest of the community resents you... I want my children to have what I didn't have, but I want my parents to have what I didn't have, too. But I can send them something and they'll just put it away somewhere and wear the same old rags they've always worn.
It would appear also that feelings of guilt and betrayal accompany a rise in the economic level in that the acquisition of greater material wealth signifies a denial of both family and culture.

Expression of Ethnic Solidarity

How does the Indian communicate the fact of his Indianness to other Indians? For official purposes, say, in applying for a BIA grant in order to attend the university, the question of enrollment is asked. But until an Indian speaks of "home" in conversation, others may not know where he is from. To ask about bloodedness appears to be regarded as improper, although most Indians are curious as to the degree of Indian blood each possesses. The most common way to determine the biological aspect of ethnicity is by obtaining knowledge of the lineage of the person in question, generally from others who know him, rather than by asking him directly.

Another way is simply through physical appearance—e.g., facial construct—although this can be misleading ethnically. Chicanos are often taken as Indians by Indians themselves.

Aside from physical appearance, one of the most obvious manifestations of ethnic solidarity is symbolic behaviour taking such forms as teasing or "joking relationships", esoteric references in conversation when outsiders are
present, and expressed empathy over mutual but exclusively Indian concerns such as the initiation of a son into the tribe or the latest frustration promoted by the tribal council or the BIA.

In the following illustrations of behavior there is noticeable variation between groups. While, generally, there appears to be a distinction between Plains Indians and Indians from the Flathead Valley, this distinction should not be regarded as rigid.

Indians from the Flathead Valley especially, but other groups as well, have a certain manner of light teasing: an Indian will make a patently untrue statement while maintaining the most serious facial expression, thereby giving the impression that the statement is true and accurate. Then, when convinced that his conversant believes the untruth, he will say "No" and tell the truth of the matter, smiling the while at the success of his trick. The woman, especially Flatheads, Kootenais, and Crows, also put their hands over their mouths upon saying "no."

Indian men tend to be less mobile of face and body gesture than either the women or Whites. Yet neither is this strictly true, for I know an Arapaho man who punctuates his speech with arm gestures that I have not seen anyone outside of the Arapaho group use (Cf. Lowie 1937:71). Neither men nor women use such gestures as shoulder shrugs or nods of the head to communicate their sentiments to the
extent non-Indians use them. This bodily "inscrutability" is more pronounced among the Plains Indians than among the Flatheads and Kootenais. The use of the eyes, however, to establish or break rapport is uniformly common.

Among the Plains Indians, the speaking voice tends to be deeper than the White voice, as though issuing from deeper in the chest. However, surprisingly many men have rather high-pitched voices, although the nasal quality that often accompanies the White voice when it is high-pitched is noticeably absent among Indians.

Such adornment symbolic of Indianness as turquoise or silver rings, beaded necklaces and pendants, headbands, leather shirts and trousers, and braided hair worn by both men and women, noticeably increased in use during the period beginning with the Trail of Broken Treaties in the autumn of 1972 and lasting through the summer and early fall of 1973. Since that time, the wearing of such dress and jewelry and the braiding of hair has fallen off to a degree, although not entirely.

As there are a number of shops which sell Indian jewelry, it is obvious that non-Indians also can purchase rings and pendants, and they do. It would seem to both Indians and non-Indians, however, that a White who wears a Cree pendant does not attach the same sentiment to it as does an Indian. One shop, for instance, owned and managed by Indians, sells hand-made jewelry at higher set prices to non-Indians than to Indians, indicating
that the sentimental value of the jewelry is perhaps more important that its aesthetic qualities. To the White who buys a silver ring, hand-made by Indians, the ring is something of a curio, qualities of beauty and finesse aside. To the Indian, the ring represents an aesthetic and, perhaps, spiritual expression of a common culture, of solidarity. (In a similar vein, a car dealership in Missoula which sells cars at a higher price to Indians and low-income Whites than to better established Whites may be said to be reinforcing ethnic and class exclusiveness. In both illustrations, I have not overlooked the simple profit motive but have presumed it and have attempted to look beyond it into the sociology of marketing.)

But even to Indians themselves, the wearing of symbolic dress can convey different messages. The Indian student who braids his hair thereby identifies himself to all the world as an Indian. But the same hair style worn by a member of the Indian Studies staff serves a twofold function. Not only does it identify the wearer to non-Indians as an Indian, but it also identifies the wearer to Indian students as a model for Indianness. As the old people on the reservations represent tradition, so does the Indian Studies staff represent the new, savvy, urbane Indian to the Indian student.

Assimilation

Missoula, like other cities, has provided Indians with
a setting in which they can "become" Indians, in which Indian identity becomes more important than tribal affiliation (Olson 1971:55) and in which Indian problems are presented as just that: the problems of Indians in the aggregate rather than of particular tribal or reservation groups.

While the setting provides for interaction between members of different tribal groups, it is the relative length of time spent in the city that determines the extent of interaction. Thus, the longer an Indian resides in Missoula, the more important becomes his Indian identity and the less important becomes his tribal affiliation. Assimilation, then, as it pertains to Indian university students, does not characterize the transition from Indian to White ethnicity, but from tribal to Indian ethnicity.

The staffs of Indian Studies and Special Services appear to be assimilating into White society insofar as they maintain an urban, White lifestyle and rear their children to fulfill the expectations of the dominant culture, the while maintaining knowledge of and pride in their Indian heritage. At the same time, they are demanding of themselves in trying to exemplify the most positive aspects of Indian solidarity and in inspiring loyalty to Indianness among the Indian students.

The theme around which Indian students coalesce is of both a political and a religious nature, with either aspect predominating at different times. The ethnic
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dichotomy, inferred more often than stated explicitly, is Indian-White or Indian-non-Indian rather than, say, Blackfeet-Assiniboine. The pre-Columbian harmony which is said to have denoted the relationships between Indians and the Spirits and the Earth and between different Indian tribes, the Indian as the first ecologist, and as a great warrior - these ideals are contrasted with the more real consequences of European invasion: disease, famine, war, decimation, the prostitution of Indian cultures.

The patterns of residence location, marriage, and social interaction indicate the directions of ethnic movement of Indian students and staff members.

Students tend to live in the university district. Married students generally try to obtain university housing or, if they cannot, they try to live peripherally to the university district, as do the unmarried students. While Indian students have not established an exclusive enclave, they do tend to live and congregate together on the south side of Missoula, drawn by the university.

The Indian Studies and Special Services staffs tend to live peripherally to the university district. Choice of residence location, in the case of staff members, appears to be determined by proximity to place of work and by income, the better-paid and higher-status personnel tending to live in more expensive dwellings.

Student marriages are made up almost entirely of
partners coming from different tribal groups. Through informants, I was able to discover only two confirmed instances of student marriages in which both partners came from the same tribe and four confirmed instances of student marriages between Indian men and White women.

The Indian Studies and Special Services staffs, in the summer of 1973, together numbered twelve members, of which four were not American Indians. Of the remaining eight, one was married to a member of the same tribal group, two to members of different tribal groups, and two Indian women and three Indian men married to or divorced from White spouses.

In describing the social interaction of Indian students, we must first distinguish two categories of students. The first we may describe as younger - late 'teens to middle or late twenties - and tending not to be married or, if married, having few or no children. Without exception, those with whom I talked expressed a desire to return to their reservations after graduation in order "to help the people there."

The second category is that of the older students, those in their thirties and early forties. Aside from age itself as a distinguishing characteristic, they have resided longer in Missoula or in other urban environments than the younger students and they tend more to be married and to have more children than the younger students.
Associated with longer urban residence appears to be a loss of rapport with the reservation accompanied not by assimilation into the White mainstream but, rather, by a loss of social identity. Too Indian to find acceptance in White-dominated higher-status occupations, too "citified" to be welcomed back without qualification by more traditional reservation Indians, as a group they appear to consist of a kind of "floating population," alternating between reservation and urban residences, with increasingly more time spent in the city. They do not have the same confidence in the future as the younger students, who seem to believe that life in general will somehow get better. Some, when I asked, hoped to get a federal grant in order to return to the reservation to accomplish something there. There is some precedent for this. A few considered that their homes, and especially their children's homes, were now in the city. Others did not know where their futures lay.

Students tend to associate with others in their general age groups. In terms of Indian-White interaction, until the events occurring on the Trail of Broken Treaties and the occupation and siege of Wounded Knee in the late winter and spring of 1973, Indian students associated to some extent with Whites of their own ages. Following the occupation of the BIA building in Washington, however, younger Indian students and, to a lesser extent, older students became noticeably cooler in their relationships.
with Whites, often straining them, sometimes severing these relationships altogether. Several of the younger students had participated in the occupation and when they returned they told stories of fear and bravery in defiance of the federal marshals, of experiencing for the first time in their lives "what it feels like to be an Indian."

On the caravan itself, on the way to Washington, some Whites and members of other minorities attempted to join the Indians but were turned away. Once in Washington, however, they did appreciate some logistical support which came from the Black Panthers, especially since the Panthers apparently desired no publicity for themselves. This particular aspect of their experience - the support given by Blacks - for a time diluted the prejudice so many Indians feel toward Blacks. However, within a few months following their return to Missoula, much of this tolerance appeared to have been lost.

Members of the Indian Studies and Special Services staffs interact with Indians and Whites freely. Interaction here appears to be based on occupation and common interest rather than on ethnicity.

"CAP Indians"

The label "CAP Indian" was applied by some of the Indian students, in the spring of 1973, to those Indians who were employed by the Community Action Agency in
Missoula and, in a less formal sense, to those who congregated in the Indian Cultural Center in the basement of the Head Start building. It was a derogatory term, somewhat equivalent to the no less descriptive term "apple" (Red on the outside, White on the inside) and it implied that the bearer of the label was something of a "lower-class" person or, more properly, one of lesser rank and esteem.

The expression applied to the same individuals who represented themselves as AIM. As far as I have been able to determine, everyone who was a member of Qua Qui was also a member of AIM, although not everyone who was a member of AIM was a member of Qua Qui. However, we are essentially dealing with the same individuals who maintained formal or informal affiliation with AIM, Qua Qui, and Indian Studies and who congregated for social and political purposes in the Indian Cultural Center.

Actually, only five Indian women were employed fulltime by CAP and technically they were not employed by CAP but by Head Start, one of the programs for which CAP had overseer authority and fiscal responsibility. Of the forty-seven Head Start employees, sixteen were Indians if we consider only biological make-up as the criterion for Indianness. However, the five who identified themselves as CAP employees did not consider the other eleven to be Indians. In 1974, for instance, one CAP Indian stated that she did not regard a certain Head Start employee to be
Indian although she recognized the man's sister as an Indian. Brother and sister had the same mother, who was Indian. The eleven who were considered non-Indians by the CAP Indians did not make a symbolic display of Indianness and were regarded by Whites, as well, to be White.

Of the five women who worked for CAP/Head Start, one was married to an Indian university student, one was married to a White university student, and three were unmarried. There was no pattern to their residence, one woman living out of the county in a predominantly White area, the other four living about town. Three of the five communicated freely with both Indians and Whites. Of these three, however, two obviously preferred the company of Indians to that of Whites, the third appearing not to discriminate. A fourth woman was very embittered and limited her communication almost exclusively to Indians, save for those occasions of confrontation with Whites, during which she was in the forefront. The fifth, in the spring of 1973, had only recently fully embraced Indianness, an apparent consequence of having been convinced by CAP's Executive Director that White racists in Head Start wanted to fire her. She, too, during this period, communicated primarily with Indians, her voice changing in tone and quality when she spoke with Whites.

Regarding the aspirations of the Indian employees through the eyes of informants, a clearer picture emerges,
One of the five appeared to desire to be of service to disadvantaged people, regardless of their ethnic affiliation. Indeed, she was the singular exception to all of the mean connotations of the expression "CAP Indian" and, in fact, was not regarded as a CAP Indian even though she was an agency employee.

Three others were simply content to be jobholders. The fifth, the Head Start Parent Involvement Director, was regarded by my informants without exception to be "ambitious." That single word, "ambitious", was used by every one of my informants, Indian and White. Indian informants are agreed that, had the Parent Involvement Director the educational qualifications and managerial abilities, she would long ago have tried to secure for herself one of the staff positions at Indian Studies. She had been on the Trail of Broken Treaties and had written an article about it for the Missoulian, the local newspaper. Her husband claimed to have been at Wounded Knee during the conflict there in the winter and spring of 1973. Both Indian and White informants resented her recent conversion to Indianness, recalling that, three years before, she had denied being Indian at all while in 1973 she claimed to be a full-blood. Informants accused her of dyeing her hair black.

The other eight or so CAP Indians, those who affiliated with AIM or Qua Qui but who were not employed on
a permanent basis by CAP, were students or the spouses of students deriving from the "older student" category. Most were in their middle to late thirties with two or three somewhat younger and one in his forties. Several had been employed by CAP as consultants or "Indian coordinators" in past years, and most had had a continuing association with OEO programs in Montana for several years (When I suggested to an informant that the most prestigious member of the Missoula chapter of AIM would be known as an apple were it not for his militant guise, she responded, "I've heard him called 'apple' more than I have 'militant,' Everybody knows he just does what Dan Newman tells him to do." Dan Newman was the Director of the State Economic Opportunity Office during the period of this study.).

Despite the general contempt expressed by my informants for them, the CAP Indians were considered by Indians generally to be Indians, if Indians of lesser status. If they were suspect in the eyes of other Indians, they still professed the general themes of Indianness: concern for other Indians, economic impoverishment, ethnic or "racial" purity, values of cooperation, equality, and harmony.

If the profession of these themes was belied by behavior, and it was obvious to Indians and Whites alike that it was, it was also obvious that their aggressive behavior had met with some success in winning personal
rewards from some Whites—the CAP leadership—while intimidating other Whites.

However, it was the manipulation of another theme—racial oppression—that confirmed their Indian identity, at least to the extent that other Indians would not publicly challenge their claims of representing the entire "larger Indian community." Insofar as CAP Indians were persecuted by White racism, they were as much Indian as any other.

During the Head Start Policy Council meeting in May, 1973, the Council was discussing geographical representation. Two of the Council officers and one of the community representatives lived on the south side of Missoula and had children attending the Southside Head Start center. Including the parent representative, the possibility existed that as many as four votes could be cast favoring the Southside center in any dispute (In the case of a tie vote, the chairman cast the tie-breaking ballot.). Someone pointed out that, actually, three more representatives lived on the south side: two community representatives and the Daycare representative, all of whom were affiliated with AIM or Qua Qui.

"Oh, no," the oldest and bitterest of the CAP Indian employees shouted out, "Indians represent all [Indian] people, not just those from one side."

Yet, informants to whom I related this anecdote were contemptuous. "Don't associate me with them," one Indian woman told me. "They don't represent anybody but themselves."
(Several years earlier, this informant had been the target of a campaign of intimidation and harassment in another Montana city. The campaign had been initiated by a man who was currently affiliated with Missoula's Community Action agency. She hated him and feared him. She was quite willing to talk with me on a personal level, but reminded me constantly that I should not expect her to take any public posture.)

During the period of this study, the CAP Indians, Qua Qui, and AIM composed a single body of people. But they identified themselves to Whites as representing AIM, Qua Qui, and even Indian Studies (An informant on the Indian Studies staff disputed that they, or anyone who was not a staff member assigned the mission by the Director of Indian Studies, had the authority to represent Indian Studies.), thereby lending the impression that Indians presented a solid bloc against white racism and that they, the most visible Indian element, did, indeed, represent Indian aspirations.

"Racism is a tool," one AIM member told me. And, in 1973 and 1974, it was. It was a tool by which the CAP Indians, by exaggerating and advertising their roles as the victims of racial oppression, could invoke the sympathy and passive support of at least some other Indians. And it was a tool by which to manipulate to their own advantage the latent feelings of social guilt (and social sympathy) many Whites shared. The following anecdote illustrates this last in some detail.

In April, 1974, the Cultural Integrity Center
(formerly the Indian Cultural Center), which housed two Head Start classrooms, one Indian, one White, demanded that the White children who attended class in the building be removed, as their parents and teachers had shown themselves to be racists.

The background on this incident is as follows. About a month earlier one of the bus drivers called an Indian teacher from the Indian class an "ass." It is unclear what promoted this incident. At any rate, the bus driver shortly apologized for his outburst but maintained that he had been justified in losing his temper. Nevertheless, the outburst was interpreted by several of the Indian parents to be a slur against all Indian people on the part of Head Start generally and demanded that the bus driver make a public apology to the Indian People. This was not done.

A joint meeting of the parents from the two classrooms was called by some of the Indian parents in an effort to reconcile differences. During the course of the meeting, the same Indian parents who had called the meeting accused the White parents of racism. The White parents eventually left, having accomplished nothing.

Shortly after this incident, an Indian parent used abusive language toward one of the White teachers from the White class. She retorted in kind. He reported her to the Head Start Parent Involvement Director who in turn reported to the Head Start Director that the teacher had used abusive language toward a Head Start parent. The Head Start Director
then rebuked the teacher for her action.

The next step was to take matters to the Policy Council, which brings us to our starting point. The Head Start Director wanted to acquiesce by simply cancelling the White class with only two weeks remaining until the end of the school term. The grantee's representative was unavailable.

The attitude of the Council had been that Indians, as an underprivileged minority, should be given preferential treatment as a sort of recompense for wrongs done them. (I might add, at this point, that the classrooms were segregated at the insistence of Qua Qui, which purportedly held the lease on the building and rented it to Head Start, with the acquiescence of Head Start's grantee. The Policy Council had been excluded from decision-making in this matter.) There had also been a growing sentiment, which conflicted with this attitude, that unreasonable demands were being made and that Indians have not suffered nearly as much as they say they have.

Representatives from the Cultural Integrity Center stated to the Policy Council that, unless the White children were taken out of their center, they would go to the newspaper and accuse the Council of being racists.

The Council had to consider these points: 1. Qua Qui, as far as the Council knew, held the lease on the building and rented it to Head Start. The contract was between the Head Start grantee and Qua Qui, neither of which had made
its provisions available to the Policy Council. 2. No one knew how the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would respond to another conflict in Missoula, the Head Start - Community Action conflict of the previous summer having attracted adverse national attention to HEW's regional office. There was supposition that HEW was looking for an excuse to close the program. 3. The White parents whose children attended class in the Cultural Integrity Center objected to their children being pulled out and denied being racists. (Unknown to the Policy Council, several of the Indian parents whose children attended class at the Center also objected privately to the demands that were being made in their name. One Indian parent complained that, at Center meetings, whenever he tried to object he was told by certain others to shut up and that he did not know what he was talking about.)

The Policy Council acceded to the demand. Their reasoning was that, if they resisted, the children were likely to suffer, and Head Start is, after all, a children's program.

Summary

I began this chapter by asking three questions: How does the Indian in Missoula distinguish himself from non-Indians? What social purpose does this distinction serve? By what process is this distinction established and maintained? I shall conclude by providing the answers to these questions and reviewing the relationship that
exists between the CAP Indians and other Indians and Whites.

The Indian distinguishes himself from non-Indians through the combination of several criteria: bloodedness, enrollment, economics, and the expression of solidarity.

The greater the number of Indian ancestors an individual has, the greater is his claim to Indianness. Fewer Indian ancestors connotes less social rank among Indians. Almost always, an Indian must be registered on the tribal rolls on a reservation. All reservations in Montana require that an individual be at least a quarterblood to qualify for enrollment. An Indian maintains his "special" economic relationship with the federal government. Some social scientists describe this relationship as one of dependency. In Missoula, this analysis seems to be borne out. Indians express their uniqueness by word, by gesture, and by symbolic dress and adornment.

On the reservations, tribal groups maintain social dichotomies between themselves and other tribal groups. In Missoula, this dichotomy is de-emphasized in favor of an Indian-non-Indian opposition. Assimilation, as it pertains to Indian university students in Missoula, characterizes the transition from tribal to Indian ethnicity. Indians in Missoula appear to feel threatened by the possibility of assimilation into the dominant society. Thus, they express their Indianness in terms of opposition to Whiteness.
In order to maintain their economic relationship with the federal government they must identify themselves as Indians. In order to establish themselves as social beings, they must enter into an interpersonal network composed of other Indians.

CAP Indians, as have other Indians, have been drawn to Missoula by the prospects of acquiring a university education. Approaching middle age, they have not successfully completed their university degrees. At the same time, they appear to have lost rapport with their reservations. Several are regarded as tragic figures by other Indians. Nearly all are regarded as "lower-class" Indians.

CAP Indians, at least in 1973 and 1974, sought to maintain the Indian-non-Indian dichotomy, and their economic rights, through political action. Ethnic antagonism was beneficial toward that end. By manipulating the theme of "racial" oppression, they sought, also, to close the social distance between themselves and other Indians in Missoula and to represent themselves as leaders in the fight against oppression. To Whites, they identified themselves as representing the aspirations of the "larger Indian community."
Footnotes


2. Statistics furnished by Special Services, University of Montana.

3. There appears to be some discrepancy regarding the legitimacy of the Missoula chapter of AIM. An informant in AIM's national office in Minneapolis denied that Missoula AIM's most visible members (in 1973) were AIM, saying of its most prestigious member, for instance: "He wants to be one of the higher-ups. He's always asking me to do things for him, talk to people for him, but he doesn't want to do anything for us."

While AIM was organized "so that each AIM chapter was autonomous" (Burnette and Koster 1974:280), each chapter was also expected to support the national movement. If, to at least some Indians, Missoula's AIM chapter, in 1973, was not really AIM, nevertheless, the membership of Missoula AIM claimed that they were and no one openly challenged their claims.

4. I am indebted to Professor Carling Malouf of the Department of Anthropology, University of Montana, for pointing out to me the existence of these communities on several reservations: personal communication.

5. "Cultural deprivation," as it seems to be defined by Indians in Missoula, means that, owing to Indian status as a distinct but subordinate culture, certain goods and services and especially the possibility of greater wealth and prestige are withheld by the dominant culture.

6. A grantee, or sponsor, contracts with the federal government through one of its agencies—in this case, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Child Development—to provide Head Start with those services required by federal regulations. Almost always, the contract provides for the grantee's taking a percentage of each grant awarded.
CHAPTER III

IN THE SERVICE OF THE POOR

Discussions of poverty and the poor usually deal with two opposed concepts. The first has come to be called in some of the anthropological literature, the "culture of poverty" (Cf. Lewis 1966a). Proponents of this concept argue that, for whatever reason the poor became poor, they tend to perpetuate themselves in their poverty situations (Cf. Moynihan 1965; Lewis 1966a). Further, those caught up in the culture, or subculture, of poverty, can be qualitatively distinguished from other people.

Rossi and Blum (1968:38-40), after reviewing all of the empirical research published up to the time of their study, have derived a qualitative description of the "culture of poverty" or "lower-lower class" (Cf. Warner et. al. 1963:43) which they summarize under six headings:

1. **Labor-Force Participation.** Long periods of unemployment and/or intermittent employment. Public assistance frequently a major source of income for extended periods.

2. **Occupational Participation.** When employed, persons hold jobs at the lowest levels of skills, for example, domestic service, unskilled labor, menial service jobs, and farm labor.

3. **Family and Interpersonal Relations.**
High rates of marital instability (desertion, divorce, separation), high incidence of households headed by females, high rates of illegitimacy, unstable and superficial interpersonal relationships characterized by considerable suspicion of persons outside the immediate household.

4. Community Characteristics. Residential areas with very poorly developed voluntary associations and low levels of participation in such voluntary associations as exist.

5. Relationship to Larger Society. Little interest in, or knowledge of the larger society and its events; some degree of alienation from the larger society.

6. Value Orientations. A sense of helplessness and low sense of efficacy; dogmatism and authoritarianism in political ideology; fundamentalist religious views, with some strong inclinations toward belief in magical practices. Low "need achievement" and low levels of aspirations for the self.

From their survey, Rossi and Blum conclude that, although social scientists have stressed qualitative distinctions between the poor and non-poor,

...in almost every case it is clear that the alleged "special" characteristics of the poor are ones that they share generally with the "working-class" or "blue-collar" component of the labor force. In other words, the poor are different, but the difference appears mainly to be a matter of degree rather than of kind.

Rossi and Blum then go on to establish the differences quantitatively:

According to the literature reviewed,
the lower the socio-economic level:

1. The higher the incidence of family disorganization: divorce, desertion, unhappiness in the marital relationship, illegitimacy, etc.

2. The greater the sense of alienation from the larger society, the poorer the knowledge concerning matters of public interest, the less participation in voting, parapolitical organizations, and associations in general.

3. The higher the incidence of symptoms of mental disorder, the higher the degree of maladjustment as evidenced on personality tests.

4. The less competence with standard English, the more likely to score poorly on tests of verbal and scholastic ability, and the more likely to drop out of school before completion.

5. The higher the rate of mortality and the incidence of physical disorders, although there is some evidence that such socio-economic differentials have been declining over time.

6. The lower the "need for achievement" and the less likely individuals are to manifest what has been called the deferred gratification pattern.

7. The less likely are parents to socialize their children through the use of explanations for obedience to rules and the more likely to assert such rules without presenting rationales.

8. The higher are crime and delinquency rates (when based on arrests and convictions), although there is some evidence that law-enforcement agencies treat lower-class delinquents more harshly and that when adolescents are asked whether they have committed delinquent acts, the socio-economic differentials tend to decline.
9. The more likely to be liberal on economic issues but somewhat less liberal regarding civil liberties or toward political deviants.

"If there is a culture of poverty," Rossi and Blum conclude, "then it is a condition that arises out of the exigencies of being relatively without resources and of being negatively evaluated by the larger society."

We may reconcile the qualitative cultural model with the quantitative classificatory model simply by recognizing that each class maintains its own subculture by which it partially defines itself in relation to other classes and by which other classes tend to define it (Cf. e.g. Warner et. al. 1963:400-403; Barth 1969:27; Schneider and Smith 1973).

If, however, we dwell overlong on the sub-cultural aspects of any class, we tend to emphasize cultural variation to the point that we regard each class as a discrete, self-articulating unit divorced from the socio-economic continuum. We are thereby drawn to the view that the poor comprise a socially immobile, self-perpetuating community, one which, for generation upon generation, has been excluded from political participation and economic opportunity in and by the American mainstream (Miller 1968:280).

Another consequence of favoring the cultural model over the classificatory one is the presumption that the poor need middlemen who are wise in the ways of bureaucracy, who
can organize "local initiative, action and self-help under Federally-approved plans and with Federal support" (Moynihan 1966:4-5; Cf. Donovan 1967:47), who could, in short, do for the poor what the poor are unable to do for themselves.

Adherence to the classificatory model suggests that the poor have aspirations of upward mobility, that some, at least, will rise socially and economically while others will fail, and that the poor have less money, less education, and therefore, fewer occupational opportunities (Cf. Warner et. al. 1963:400-403; Rossi and Blum 1968:45). According to this view, what the poor really need is a larger and more stable income and/or social welfare services which would help fill the needs for which a low income cannot provide.

Proponents of the classificatory model tend to view the world in primarily economic terms, and to disregard social and cultural distinctions that exist between the various groups that make up the poor (Moynihan 1968:24).

Schneider and Smith's pluralistic model in which "one finds a multiplicity of overlapping status groups based upon occupation, income, style of life, ethnicity, and race" (1973:28) more closely approximates the statuses of the poor in Missoula and Mineral Counties than either the qualitative or quantitative model when taken separately. Whether or not one is a student, or one works, or one is
dependent upon public assistance, whether one is Indian or White, married or not married—each of these variations contained within the parameters of poverty has particular values ascribed to it and, to some extent, an individual's identification with one determines his or her behavior in relation to all.

I have employed three indices in order to discern similarities and differences between those who supported Community Action during the summer of 1973 and those who supported Head Start and to show the relationships which existed between each organization and its supporters. These indices are economics, socio-political organization, and expression of social exclusiveness.

Economics

CAP supporters were comprised of its Board of Directors, its own employees, CAP Indians, the Parent Involvement Director (one of the CAP Indians), three Head Start outreach workers (two of whom were CAP Indians), the Head Start secretary (one of the CAP Indians), a nutrition aide, and one former Head Start parent. At the beginning of the summer, Head Start's Daycare center was also allied with CAP but changed affiliation later in the summer (Cf. Chapters IV and V). The Northside Head Start center, on the other hand, began the summer in alliance with the other Head Start centers but later transferred its loyalties to Community Action (Cf. Chapter V). As a group, all but
the Board, most Daycare parents, the Northside parents and the former Head Start parent, were employed, or had been employed by either Community Action or Head Start.

CAP directorships (not including Head Start directorships) were filled by White university-educated "professional" activists ("I consider myself a mercenary," the Executive Director told me in March of 1973.).

While the public and private sectors of the Board were economically self-sufficient, the larger portion of the low-income sector subsisted on one or another form of public assistance and a ten dollar monthly board meeting allowance (not available to the public and private sectors). For some people, this allowance represented a nine to ten per cent increase in monthly income.

The Head Start faction included, at any given moment (the Northside and Daycare centers reversing loyalties in opposite directions, but not simultaneously), five or six of the seven Parent centers, the bulk of the teaching staff (the Daycare staff was divided), the majority of the Policy Council, two outreach workers, the Education Director, Supportive Services Director, Head Start Director, a minority of CAP's Board of Directors, and eight to ten former Community Action and Head Start employees. Two outreach workers, the Nutrition Director, and a Health Component worker (one of the CAP Indians), were neutral. With the exception of most of the parents and Board
members, all were employed by Head Start or were formerly employed by either Community Action or Head Start.

Head Start directorships (excepting the Parent Involvement Director) and teaching positions were filled by university or college educated service-oriented "professionals." Where the CAP directors were outspoken conflict-oriented activists, most of the staff of Head Start were dedicated to the performance of their jobs. Head Start administrative positions and teacher aide positions were filled by low-income Whites, CAP Indians, and others who identified themselves biologically, if not socially or culturally, as Indian. The Head Start Director was Anglo-Japanese.

Distribution of federal monies extended, as we have seen, to CAP's Board of Directors in the form of meeting allowances. Head Start parents were entitled to Parent center meeting allowances of five dollars per meeting, not to exceed ten dollars per month, plus baby-sitting reimbursements. Parents who sat on the Policy Council were entitled to no greater economic benefits than were other parents. They were entitled to a maximum of ten dollars per month plus baby-sitting allowances, regardless of the number of Parent center or Policy Council meetings they attended per month (There were one or two exceptions to this regulation, requiring waivers authorized by the Office of Child Development.). Community Representatives
on the Policy Council received no benefits.

Rossi and Blum have indicated divorce and desertion as disrupting the stability of the husband-wife dyad. These factors apply without qualification in the cases of White women who supported Community Action. This is not to say, however, that every White woman who received benefits from Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) supported CAP, only that those who did were recipients of AFDC, Social Security, or other public assistance benefits. There were approximately twenty such women, most of whom were agency employees or members of CAP's Board of Directors.

Head Start's clientele, on the other hand, tended to consist of complete nuclear families of which the husband was the breadwinner or both marital partners worked to support the family. Of 128 Head Start families, 41 were single-parent families. While a minority of Head Start families consisted of single-parent matrifocal families, another minority (approximately twelve families) was made up of families in which the male was physically incapacitated and unable to work. Incapacitation almost invariably was the result either of accident or of work-related injury. In these latter cases, economic responsibility for the family fell, in large part, to the wife.

Of all Head Start families, 44 received public assistance of one sort or another. The fact that the large majority of Head Start families were economically
eligible to enroll their children in Head Start (average yearly family income: $3,550; average family size: 5.4) indicates the economic sector from which most Head Start parents derived: the unskilled or semi-skilled laboring class.

Basing my estimate on the ratio of Indian children to White children (33 Indian children to 132 White children), and assuming that Indians bear children at the same rate and interval as Whites, twenty per cent of all Head Start families were ones in which one or both parents identified themselves, biologically, culturally, or socially, as Indian and identified their children as Indian. One family (husband and wife) affiliated with AIM and had no background of employment with CAP. Another husband and wife affiliated with AIM and Qua Qui and both partners had histories of intermittent employment with CAP as consultants for various federally-funded projects. The male head of a third family also identified himself as AIM and he, too, had a history of several years sporadic employment with CAP. The remainder of the Indian families did not identify with AIM or Qua Qui and appeared to maintain a social distance between the CAP Indians and themselves. Most could not be said to be either CAP or Head Start supporters, but were numbered among Head Start's service clientele.

Differentiating by sex, age, and ethnicity, CAP supporters, aside from employees, were primarily unmarried
White women and Indian men and women in approximately equal numbers. We have already noted that the CAP Indians were among the oldest of the Indian university students or were their spouses. White CAP supporters also tended to be older than the average White, ranging in age from the early thirties to the middle or late fifties.

Head Start's clientele consisted, for the most part, of complete nuclear families, White and Indian. During the conflict in the summer of 1973, active Head Start supporters were White only. The ages of Head Start parents ranged from early twenties to mid-forties. The normative age group were those in their middle twenties to early thirties.

The Sociopolitical Organization of Community Action

Head Start's clientele tended to rely upon various societal institutions such as insurance companies, law-enforcement agencies, churches and labor unions to help them to manage the problems of daily life. CAP supporters, Indian and White, tended rather to be intimidated by these "middle class" institutions and relied instead upon what Schneider and Smith have called "a reticulated pattern of person-to-person ties" (1973:44). The following anecdote will illustrate the contrast between the two life-styles.

Alice, a "middle class" mother unconnected with Head Start or Community Action, lived with her children
next door to Irma and Robert, CAP Indians, and their children. Their children played together, and while Irma got along well with Alice's mother when she came to visit, she seemed to regard Alice with suspicion or hostility.

They parked their cars in the same parking lot. One morning, Robert drove into the parking lot and, as he was pulling into his parking space, he hit Alice's parked car. Alice was notified by a neighbor who had seen the collision and she came out to investigate.

Alice wanted to notify the sheriff's office of the accident immediately. She was afraid that unless a police agency had been notified, her insurance would not cover the damage. Robert asked her not to telephone the sheriff. Any connection with the sheriff's office, he seemed to feel, meant trouble for him. He was uninsured, he had had similar accidents recently, and he had been drinking. He told her that if she would get an estimate on the damage to her car, he would pay for it out of his own pocket.

In the afternoon, she had the repairs estimated at $152. That evening Robert told her that he would not pay for the damage after all. He did not consider himself liable. Alice did not know what to do. She thought that it was too late now to notify the sheriff's office of the accident and she did not have the money to pay for the repairs herself.
That night, Robert and Irma had a violent argument over the issue of the accident and Robert stormed out. The following morning he appeared at Alice's door, handed her $100 in cash and promised to pay the remainder when he could. (Cf. Schneider and Smith 1973:84: "There is some evidence that working-class women are more 'middle class' than the men in their cultural orientation...")

Missoula, unlike larger urban centers and some other middle-size towns, does not have a distinct quarter which may be likened to a ghetto or barrio. In designating "target areas" (geographical areas requiring special efforts to eradicate poverty: Kravitz 1969:60), Missoula's CAP sectioned off the city into five areas: North, South, East, West, and Central, with Mineral County making up the sixth target area. The very poor live in the midst of blue-collar or white-collar workers or, in the cases of some of the older people who are entirely without families or who have been rejected by their families, in hotels in the central part of town.

The apparent effect of this "settlement pattern" is such that the balanced style of economic reciprocity which we might expect to find in the urban ghettos (or we might not: Cf. e.g. Liebow 1967:161-207) is only minimally present in Missoula. Often socially isolated, in the sense that their class peers are often not their immediate neighbors, the very poor attempt to establish relationships with
individuals in more secure social and economic positions in order to obtain services that are not otherwise available to them. When these patron-client relationships are established, they are seldom between immediate neighbors, the client rather seeking a patron who lives in a different neighborhood. It seems probable that the client thereby tries to "pass" as "respectable" in his own neighborhood insofar as he tries to avoid such "negative evaluation" as Rossi and Blum and others have noted is projected upon the poor by at least some of the non-poor.

One woman, a Head Start parent, baked bread. On baking day or the day after, she always gave two or three loaves to a doctor in town, refusing to allow him to pay for them. Rather, she accepted what she called "medical advice" from him. This advice she described in terms of marriage and family counselling. She also considered that her bread was a retainer in the event that a member of her family became seriously ill.

Another woman, a CAP supporter, relied on a friend for transportation, for occasionally borrowing small sums of money, and for advice in the rearing of her teen-age children. In this instance, the client gave nothing material in return for the services of her patron. When I asked the patron why, for instance, she interrupted her daily schedule to provide free transportation to a woman who could not in any way reciprocate, I was asked in turn,
"How could anyone say no to Viola?" In any event, the request for a ride to the supermarket often was only an excuse to have someone to talk with. Both women apparently enjoyed their relationship.

The world of the very poor, say Schneider and Smith (1973:56), is a world of uncertainty, a world which is uncontrollable, unpredictable, and apparently irrational. In such a world one must seek security, adapting to what cannot be avoided and attempting to maximize possible sources of help. The caseworker, the counselor, and the political party Ward Captain are all possible sources of help in time of greater adversity (at no time do things run entirely in the right direction). These sources are not thought of as being specialized or differentiated; they are merely another extension of a traditional network, capable of indefinite extension, of possible sources of help.

The following story will bring out a number of points concerning the relationship which existed between CAP and its clientele.

For several years, Meta had participated in various CAP and Head Start activities. She could be seen almost daily around the agency, listening to gossip more than gossiping, answering the telephone when no one else was available, generally making herself helpful. The agency was for her, as it was for several board members and CAP Indians, a place for socializing with people she liked and who obviously cared about her. I have met no one who
knew her for any length of time who could bring himself
to say anything mean about her. Yet, of all the people
at, the agency who knew her and for all the years she had
made herself available and helpful in agency affairs, only
one person, a Head Start parent, had visited Meta's house.

Meta was devoted, seemingly to the point of adoration,
to the Executive Director of the agency. When, in April, 1973,
the Head Start Policy Council voted "no confidence" in
him, she was one of several older women who burst into
tears at his humiliation. She declared then that she would
never again do anything for Head Start, and she held to
her oath.

In July, however, the Executive Director, under
political pressure from Head Start and possibly from OEO
as well, resigned. The Acting Deputy Director replaced
him as head of the CAP.

Shortly after this, Meta's teen-age son disappeared.
As Meta explained to my informants, the family owned a
small mining claim in the vicinity of the boundary between
two Montana counties. The boy had been mining it and was
due back for supplies, but had failed to return. She sent
a second son out to learn what had become of the first.

The boy, unable to locate his brother at the claim
site, walked to the neighboring site. The owner there,
Meta said, had tried for years to convince her to give
him her claim. In the face of her repeated refusals, he
had made threats against the safety of her family.

As the second boy approached this man's cabin, he was able to see his brother through the window. Then the owner came out carrying a shotgun and told the younger boy to get off of his land. The boy left and reported what he found to his mother.

Meta went to the CAP agency for help. The Acting Deputy Director was also an attorney. He called the Attorney General's office, he told Meta later, which told him that the case was one for the sheriff's office. As it was unclear which county the mining claim was in, the Acting Deputy Director contacted both sheriffs and requested that they investigate the matter. They refused, each sheriff saying that the site of the alleged crime was within the other sheriff's jurisdiction and outside of his own.

The Acting Deputy Director related all of this to Meta, then apparently lost his temper and told her that he could no longer be bothered by her problems, that he had more important matters at hand that he had to deal with.

I learned the story several weeks later. When I asked an informant why Meta had not taken the matter to the FBI herself, she said, "You have to know Meta. It's not her way."

In the fall of that year and in the late winter of the following year, I received conflicting reports as to the conclusion of the episode. The first, reportedly
coming from Meta's second son, was that his brother's body had been found. The second was that someone had seen the boy in Missoula around the Christmas season but that he had since left town.

Several months later, I interviewed officers in the two sheriffs' offices. I reported the story to each office as I then understood it and as I have recorded it above. I was interested primarily in the answers to two questions: Had the Acting Deputy Director in fact contacted them and, if he had, what had been the sheriffs' responses to him? Secondly, did the sheriffs' offices investigate the alleged crime, assuming that it had been reported to them, or had they regarded it as outside of their jurisdictions?

One sheriff's officer remembered the incident well. He had been contacted by Meta, not by the Acting Deputy Director. In fact, he had never heard of the Acting Deputy Director, neither by name nor as Meta's representative. The officer said that officers from the sheriff's office of the other county and from his own office had gone out to the area described by Meta and had discovered nothing. The area itself was not as she had described it to him, but he was convinced that no kidnapping had occurred there. Meta had continued to call him after he told her his findings, insisting now that both of her sons were being held captive in a house inside the borders of his own county. He investigated this allegation and it proved to be false.
It was his feeling that the boys were runaways and were probably in California or Colorado or someplace where they had been able to find work. He thought that Meta was simply unable to face the fact that her children had run away.

An officer in the second sheriff's office also remembered the incident. He could not recall ever having been contacted by the Acting Deputy Director and said that the latter's name was unfamiliar to him. His office had sent men into the area that Meta had described and they had gone to the house in which Meta had said her son was being held. Finding it unoccupied, they had questioned the neighboring residents who expressed surprise upon hearing the story of the kidnapping. The officer's attitude, when I spoke with him, was apologetic. "I don't know what more we could have done," he said. He said that there were rumors of two boys living in the mountains who did not want anyone to know that they were there.

Meta's story presents us with several points which may serve to indicate the various ways, aside from the economic, in which Community Action and its clientele were bound to each other.

1. Affect. Community Action's Executive Director, in the eyes of all who were associated with the agency, was Community Action. He had held his position for eight years, since the inception of Community Action in Missoula in 1965. At least some of his supporters regarded him with a distinctly
religious reverence. When, in March, 1973, the Head Start Policy Council voted "no confidence" in the Executive Director, one woman (Meta) who had been associated with Head Start almost from its beginnings in the summer of 1965 left the meeting, saying that she would never do anything for Head Start again. Another woman wept, seemingly uncontrollably. A third, who identified herself as the first Head Start Policy Council Chairman, called the Council "a bunch of goddamn bastards" and said that she was ashamed that she had ever been associated with the Council and that the Council did not truly represent Head Start parents anymore because the Council was filled with people who had "middle class values."

A man, a Head Start outreach worker, said that the Council did not represent the way Head Start parents felt, that, as an outreach worker, he knew how Head Start parents felt, and that Council members had better watch out for themselves when they went home that night. The man who was at that time Chairman of the Policy Council recalls thinking, as he witnessed the tumult that resulted from the passage of the no confidence motion, "Holy cow, we've just killed Christ."

The woman who was then Policy Council Secretary had quicker perceptions than the Chairman. Recalling the "emergency" Policy Council meeting of February 14th of that year, she later wrote:

I do remember being hit for the first time with the astonishing realization that there were certain low-income people who were so
emotionally dedicated to the [Executive Director] that they would not think of questioning anything he might do. I had never seen human worship like this before and it frightened me. I felt that it was an unhealthy attitude and could be used in a damaging and dangerous manner in the wrong hands. Not the least of these "[Executive Director] worshipers" was the Policy Council Chairwoman.

Others' perceptions implied that a feudalistic relationship existed between the Executive Director and his supporters. The motion picture The Godfather was playing in Missoula in the late spring of 1973 and several Head Start teachers who had seen it began referring to the Executive Director as "Godfather." The chairman of the Head Start Policy Council, at that same time, had recently finished reading Mike Royko's book, Boss (Royko 1971), and so referred to the Executive Director. When, in early summer, an attorney in Missoula who had maintained an observer's interest in the workings of the agency was asked for his analysis of the conflict between Head Start and Community Action, he answered, "That's easy. The king is being toppled."

While not at all widespread, sexual relations between high-ranking male Community Action employees and low-income women must be considered a constant factor in the affective relations between CAP and its clientele. Divorces resulting from such liaisons were not unknown. One former agency employee is convinced that at least one former CAP staff member consciously used sexuality as a device
by which to break up marriages so as to make women more dependent on the agency for emotional support. She recalls how this staff member, after attending a conference in another city, had boasted about "how many Head Start vaginas he had gotten into," and had attached names to some of the women involved. The boast got back to the husband of one, who then used this information as grounds for divorce. A former board chairman felt compelled at one time to take another CAP staff member aside and admonish him to leave off his sexual activities with low-income women, that "he wasn't doing the agency or low-income women any good."

The appeal of certain CAP personnel to low-income women was based in some cases on the desire of the women to be associated with men of comparatively high achieved status.

It is noteworthy that one woman who had achieved a certain amount of prestige and influence through her association with one of the ranking members of the Community Action staff attempted to sexually impose herself upon men of lesser status than her lover-patron. A female friend of this woman attempted to emulate her to the extent that she selected the same individual men for attempted sexual conquest (?) as did the former.

From the vantage point of the CAP staff member, sexual liaison with a low-income woman offered two political advantages: the woman was a source of information as to the
activities and sentiments of the low-income people with whom
she associated and she could usually be counted on to give
voice to the sentiments her lover wished expressed among
her status peers.

Among the poor themselves, information as to the
availability of jobs, which is primarily what CAP had to
offer, tended to be dispersed first through family lines
and then to friends and acquaintances. A number of
extended and joint families were represented both as employees
and as clients to Community Action and Head Start. It is
important to realize, in this context, that Community Action
at most had available only twelve job positions, not including
consultantships of a temporary nature. By 1973, with President
Nixon's freezing of OEO funds and the nationally announced
phase-out of Community Action, job opportunities within
CAP became even more scarce. (In a very real sense, this
is a negligible point. In several years, only one CAP position
saw any employee turnover.) Head Start, however, had forty-
six job positions and, while turnover was slow and sporadic,
it offered much greater employment possibilities. Thus,
CAP favorites or their kin were awarded jobs in Head Start
as these became available. When, for instance, the man
who was Head Start Director in academic year 1971-72 resigned
his position owing to bad health, his wife was hired as
a nutritionist the following day, a position for which she
had neither training nor experience.
An additional advantage to being employed by the agency, especially in the cases of husbandless mothers, was that one's children received preferential consideration in being accepted for Head Start. In academic year 1972-73, nine of the 36 Daycare parents were employed or had spouses who were employed by Head Start but obviously felt that they owed their jobs to Community Action. As there was only one Head Start Daycare center in Missoula (For a time, there were two. Cf. Chapter IV.), compared with four other Head Start centers, parent-employees with daycare-age children clustered here.

The sense of moral obligation felt by those who had been favored by CAP can be seen in the dilemma faced by one Head Start employee. Observing the growing conflict between the two programs in the spring of 1973, she stated that if it were a matter of "issues" she would have to side with Head Start, but the Executive Director had done so much for her and her husband when they first came to Missoula that she could not turn her back on him now. Faced with the conflict between her principles and her feelings of moral obligation, she chose neutrality when the battle surfaced the following summer.

2. The Social Attraction of the Agency. The Community Action agency occupied two adjacent buildings in the northwest part of Missoula. For most of academic year 1972-73, most of the agency offices were located in one of the buildings. The second building, known by Head Start parents as the Head
Start building, was used upstairs by the Westside children's class and downstairs by the Indian Cultural Center. Also upstairs were the Neighborhood Youth Corps office, an office for the Parent Involvement staff, and a conference room.

The term "Indian Cultural Center" began to be used first by the CAP Indians and then by agency personnel and clientele in early spring, 1973. From the autumn of 1972 until that time, the basement of the Head Start building was known as "the AIM office."

The main office building, also known as "the back building" because, from the street, one had to pass through the Head Start building in order to get to it, housed the offices (more properly, desks) of the remainder of the agency staff. But this building was more than simply an office building. Here, on any weekday, one could find Board members, CAP Indians, and Head Start Policy Council members and Parent Center officers come to chat and to discuss business with the Executive Director, the Head Start Director, and various staff personnel.

On the bulletin boards were newspaper clippings concerning the activities of the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO), other clippings indicative of how insensitive to the needs of the poor and to Indians were certain legislators and President Nixon and Howard Phillips. These clippings had particular choice phrases underlined in red or blue and were accompanied by staff comments. Also on the bulletin boards were a photograph of the
burning of a wooden Indian and several photographs of the most prestigious member of the Missoula chapter of AIM in regal pose.

At meetings of the Head Start Policy Council, which were held in the back building (MMHR Board meetings were usually held in the Moose Lodge or another rented hall in town) and which certain agency employees and Board members consistently attended, three or four of these could be relied upon to initiate and carry on what might be called a "defiance ritual" as soon as the Chairman called the meeting to order. Indeed, in the spring of 1973, the Policy Council Chairman, recognizing this pattern, would allot time to this ritual between the opening of the meeting and the reading of the minutes in order that it would interfere as little as possible with the discussion of business. Predictably, one woman would call for the assassination of President Nixon and would offer her help or offer to go along with anyone who would go to Washington to kill him. The others of the ritual "core" could be relied upon to laugh at her suggestion or to comment favorably upon it. Beginning with the opening of the meeting and lasting throughout, the middle class, or, if the speaker was Indian, Whites would be periodically vilified as "unresponsive (or insensitive) to the needs of the poor." Individuals such as the Nixon-appointed National Director of OEO, Howard Phillips, and Phillips' appointee to the OEO regional directorship in Denver, Barney Reagan, were vilified and ridiculed as were certain community leaders.
who were reputedly unresponsive to the needs of the poor or who reputedly disliked the poor.

The ritual took the form of badinage between the three or four participants, but they would also try to involve others by asking them if they did not agree, by making fun of them if they refused to respond to gesticulated invitations to laugh, or by calling them "middle class" when they did not respond. Sometimes these overtures worked to introduce others into the badinage, other times they did not. But whether they worked or not, the atmosphere of tension and intimidation, and the silent resistance to such attempts at coercion were constant features at Policy Council meetings in the spring of 1973.

3. Ideology. As the Executive Director portrayed it, the middle class was an almost mythological entity. Materially, the middle class represented all that was right with America: leisure, education, choice in the planning and making of the future. But it hoarded its wealth and refused to relinquish its power to the poor. Thus, the middle class represented all that was wrong with America: racism, political oppression, and, most of all, the perpetuation of poverty. Whether or not these ideological symbols corresponded to observable reality, or the extent to which they corresponded was irrelevant. The middle class was responsible for the problems of the poor. Middle class people were culpable because they "don't like the poor" and,
implicitly, go out of their way to think of new ways with which to frustrate the aspirations and ideals of the poor. The election of Richard Nixon to the presidency was proof that the middle class hated the poor. Personal enemies of the Executive Director "hate the poor," which explained why they were his personal enemies, for he liked the poor and was their representative. Republicans were to be sneered at, Democrats were good. But not all Democrats were good, Senator Mansfield was bad. Senator Mansfield had had Missoula's Community Action agency investigated because, according to the Executive Director, he suspected that the agency was channeling federal monies to help finance a certain political campaign. This investigation was proof that Senator Mansfield was determined to frustrate the aspirations of the poor and, according to the Executive Director, that was why Senator Mansfield was an enemy of the poor and of himself.  

We can see from Meta's story that a "middle class institution," the office of sheriff, was made into a straw man by the Acting Deputy Director. Nor was this the first occasion on which the culpability of a middle class institution was associated with a request for help from Community Action. Although CAP heralded itself as an intercessor on behalf of the poor against those institutions which were purportedly not responsive to the needs of low-income people, the following selection from the minutes of a
Head Start Policy Committee (as the Policy Council was then called) meeting two years earlier would seem to belie CAP's claim to this role:

...Meta also noted that she cannot get a ride when she needs one. [The Deputy Director] stated that Welfare is responsible to set up a plan for transportation for Medicaid recipients and advised Meta to continue calling until she gets a response.

Nor was Meta the only person to whom the middle class was portrayed in less than objective terms. In relating the following anecdote, I must jump ahead of myself and advise the reader that in the spring of 1973, CAP "reclassified" Head Start. That is, Head Start was portrayed by the staff and, increasingly, by the clientele of Community Action as being middle class insofar as Head Start had middle class values. Prior to this time, Head Start had been recognized as part of the community of the poor (Cf. Chapter IV.).

The Board meeting of August 24, 1973 was a dismal business. The Board had met to ratify an agreement with HEW that would allow the separation of Head Start from Community Action in Missoula and Mineral Counties. Most of the low-income sector of the board had not shown up, leaving ratification to the public and private sectors. The Community Action staff was obviously depressed.

One of the Board members, a CAP Indian, objected that the Indians were not being taken into consideration in this agreement. She was obviously irritating at least
some of the other board members.

Point Six of the agreement stated: "HEW will exert itself to protect and encourage the cultural integrity of Indian children." Indians were nowhere else mentioned, although they had been in the vanguard in the fight against Head Start. She indicated that she felt that HEW was showing contempt for Indians and stated that she wanted Point Six stricken from the agreement. Another Board member finally shouted at her to shut up and let the Board get on with its business.

At that point, the Acting Deputy Director stated that he had been informed by a certain HEW attorney that Head Start had sent a written statement to HEW saying that Indians had been caught "fucking" in front of the children at the Westside Center.

Upon hearing this, the woman broke into tears and, stating again that she wanted Point Six stricken, left the meeting followed by an Indian staff member. (Another Indian staff member, the Parent Involvement Director, stayed for the remainder of the meeting.)

White Head Start staff and parents had forwarded many personal statements to HEW, at the request of HEW, to be used as documentation against Missoula's Community Action agency in the effort to separate Head Start from CAP, I have not been able to find the statement to which the Acting Deputy Director alluded. I have read all of the
statements which passed through the Policy Council Chairman's hands (Personal statements were addressed to him. He forwarded copies to HEW, keeping the originals.) and questioned the Westside teachers and Westside Policy Council representative as well as other staff members who might have been aware of such an incident, had it occurred, or who might have had knowledge of a person who might have forwarded such a statement directly to HEW, bypassing the Chairman.

The only incident of which anyone was aware that bore any resemblance to the one cited by the Acting Deputy Director was one in which the agency bookkeeper, upon unlocking the offices on a Monday morning before any of the other staff (or Head Start children) had arrived, had discovered a Job Corpsman and a girl having sex on the couch in the Indian Cultural Center. Yet, this incident had not appeared in any of the written statements I reviewed. Nor had those who told me of it considered it a matter of any importance. Nor could my informants guess who might have written such a statement.

However, the Acting Deputy Director had stated that he was given this information by one of the HEW attorneys and HEW had earlier stated to the Head Start Director and Policy Council Chairman that several persons had forwarded their statements directly to HEW's regional office in Denver rather than to Head Start in Missoula and from
there to be forwarded to Denver. We cannot, therefore, exclude the possibility that such a statement was forwarded and that an HEW attorney did inform the Acting Deputy Director of it (although, when an HEW functionary who had read all of the materials forwarded was asked if he had seen such a statement, he replied, "No, There's nothing like that there.").

If this second view does represent, in fact, what had transpired, then the burden of knowledge was upon the Acting Deputy Director. It was his to use as he chose, if and when he decided to use it at all.

If this view is not a true representation of what had occurred, then the Acting Deputy Director either manufactured the story or embellished another which already existed. In either case, it was he who told it to the Board, among which sat two Indian staff members and an Indian Board member at a time when it appeared that the latter might prove an obstacle to ratification of the agreement. (He also promised to attempt to recapture Head Start once it began to reconstitute itself under another grantee.)

When the story above was related to the Head Start Director, his response was, "God, those people [higher-ranking CAP staff] can be cruel."

A Policy Council member wanted to call the Indian Board member who had left the meeting in tears to ask her how she liked Community Action now. He was dissuaded by the
Policy Council Chairman, who thought the action would be too cruel.

If CAP encouraged contempt for the middle class, it also emphasized that the "hard-core poor" were possessed of a special uniqueness that distinguished it qualitatively from the middle class. This uniqueness was manifest in the "lifestyle" of the poor. If one obese woman devoured candy bars and sodas for lunch, she was thereby exhibiting the "lifestyle of the poor." If alcohol had so ruined another that her rectal sphincters would betray her at any time of day, whether or not she had been drinking (If she had been drinking heavily one could predict that she would defecate where she sat. If she had not been drinking, she might or might not.), she thereby presented an example of the "true poor" (as opposed, I assume, to the "pseudo-poor."). If a certain man was characterized by some Head Start parents as "lazy" and "a bad one" and by a Board member as "sociopathic," these labels were only evidence that the man was one of the "hard-core poor." If another woman abused her children, it was because she was one of the "true poor." If the homes of some individuals were ill-kept, thereby symbolizing disorganized states of mind, it was because these people were "hard-core poor." Offensive public language signalled a member of the "hard-core poor."

Implicitly, all of these traits were ones not shared by any other class. Implicitly, the middle class
did not produce alcoholics or fat people or, if it did, then it was for reasons unique to the middle class. Implicitly, child abuse was endemic only to the "hard-core poor." Implicitly, only the "true poor" employed profanity in public. Middle class people could not understand the poor. Such specialists, or "professionals," as they were called by CAP, as nutritionists and psychologists were unable to help the poor because, even if they had risen from poverty themselves, their education disqualified them as middle class. The Parent Involvement Director said repeatedly that middle class people could not understand Indian children. When one Indian woman accused the Head Start Director of having "middle class values," he reminded her that he had been reared by Indians and that he had spent his childhood and adolescence in the most abject poverty. "Well, then," she retorted, "you have a military mind. That's your problem, you have a military mind," she said again, referring to his career in the Air Force.

The Executive Director considered the Head Start Director a service-oriented "traditionalist" whereas he regarded himself as an activist. Where the latter encouraged parent participation in all aspects of planning and operation, the Executive Director stressed that the poor already had their representatives in the Community Action staff and, so, did not need to concern themselves with details of the agency's operation. "Why can't we let [the Executive Director] decide. He's the only one who knows what's
going on, anyway," a member of the public sector of the Board said in addressing a policy issue,

"Choosing between "meeting their [low-income people's] needs" and "eliminating poverty" (Missoulian: November 23, 1966)—the service role and the activist role, as the Executive Director defined them—the energies that otherwise would have gone into service were reserved for and applied to political activism. CAP was not concerned with service and found its very calling loathsome. What the poor needed, the Executive Director was fond of saying, was power, not handouts. Clothing and furniture that had been donated by the public, who apparently thought that the agency was a service organization, were stored in the attic of the back building, undistributed. (Eventually, a couple of the employees took some of the largesse for themselves.)

Public Service Careers, the single OEO program in Missoula designed to train low-income people for further job opportunities, was considered "crap" by the Executive Director.

The Executive Director told me that the Public Service Careers Program was "crap" and he was sorry that he had permitted the agency to get involved in it. After saying this several times to me I asked him why he felt this way. I told him that I felt this program was the best training opportunity I had ever seen for low income disadvantaged people and cited several outstanding examples among the staff. He said, "Yeah and what have they done to help other low
income people." I pointed out that they were still low income themselves and were heads of household with children to care for. They have worked steadily at their jobs and have gone to school as well. I then said, "How much more can we expect of anyone that [sic] this and how can anyone help others until he gets through his training and has his own life in order. The Executive Director said, "That's pretty damned middle class." He then walked away.

During this time, [Winter 1973] ... the Planning Director said to me, "I am completely bewildered."  "Don't all these parents and Head Start people know we are in a war, a real war," I asked him who we were at war with and he replied, "The government, all governments." He then gave a tireade [sic] on how Head Start activities in the classroom and with the parents were incidental to the "real goal of community action, to bring about social change, and the teachers and middle class attitudes just build roadblocks" (quoted from an informant's written statement).

The Sociopolitical Organization of Head Start

The Head Start Director was regarded by the majority of the Head Start parents and staff not as a charismatic activist leader but as an able and fair-minded administrator. His personal popularity arose from his obvious dedication to his job rather than, as in the case of the Executive Director, from a sense of moral obligation for personal (as it was perceived by CAP's clientele) favors done. He was concerned with the management and operation of Head Start as a child development program first and, secondarily,
as a vehicle by which to involve parents in the planning of their and their children's futures. He encouraged parents to involve themselves in community affairs as well as those pertaining specifically to Head Start. Two eventually ran for public office. Of these, one, prior to her involvement with Head Start, had never bothered to register to vote. His childhood of poverty and his later success as an Air Force officer provided Head Start with a model of mobility and achievement.

If we regard the CAP Board of Directors and the Head Start Policy Council only by their decision-making capacities, we would have to conclude that each was a counterpart to the other in its respective program. Similarly, if we regard the numbers which voted in Board and Parent Center and Policy Council elections, we would have to say that the number of participants in each program were approximately equal.11

However, if we look at the structural arrangement of each program, we see that, socially, the Board of Directors was comparable rather to a single one of the seven Head Start centers and we can correctly infer from our organizational chart (Cf. Figure 1.) that, while the offices of Community Action were the social focus of its clientele, each Head Start Parent group maintained its own center. Thus, while CAP's target population met once a year to vote for representatives to the Board of Directors and then was dispersed for the remainder of the year, Head Start's
cliente met at least once per month, and often more frequently, in their particular Parent Centers.

Within parent group boundaries (defined by the existence of children attending Head Start classes at a particular center), affect was directed toward the group itself, through its members. When a little girl was killed by a hit-and-run driver, anger against the driver and sympathy for the girl's mother were the immediate reactions of the parents and teachers associated with the Head Start center which the girl had attended. These emotions were channelled into practical activity. Upon the suggestion of the parent center officers and teachers, unneeded clothes were collected from parents and then sold at a rummage sale. The proceeds were then turned over to the mother, who had to provide food for relatives arriving in town to express their sympathies and offer emotional support, and to defray some of the funeral expenses. The physical plant of the center was used to temporarily house incoming relatives.

The girl and her mother were Indians. Some of the parents knew this, others did not. But it was not important that they were Indians. What was important was that they "belonged" to Head Start. Group reaction in this case is perhaps the more remarkable when we consider that the parents had been meeting as a parent center for only two months when the little girl was killed, and that few of those who had attended the past three or four meetings
knew the mother, who had not attended Center meetings.

A former Southside parent recalls another incident that occurred shortly following the one just recounted.

A parent meeting had just adjourned and people were going out to their cars to start them and let them warm up while they came back inside to chat and keep warm. Several parents were standing around, talking and drinking coffee, when one woman came back in, obviously close to tears. From the alcove, she asked if she could speak privately to a particular woman talking with the others. The two women talked, the one finally breaking into tears as the other parents watched from the living room (The center occupied a house in a residential area.). At last, the first woman went back outside while the second returned to the others waiting for some news to satisfy their curiosity.

The situation was this: the woman was divorced, working two jobs, and was enrolled at the university in evening classes. For those times when her children were not attending Head Start, she had to leave them with a babysitter. She used one babysitter during the day, another at night when she had to work.

On this day, she had worked all day, attended her class at the university, had persuaded her daytime babysitter to watch the kids for another couple of hours while she attended a Head Start parent meeting, after which she would transport her children to the other sitter and go on
to her second job.

But her schedule had been disrupted. Following the Head Start meeting, her car would not start. When she turned the key in the ignition, all she heard was a "click." She was afraid that she would lose her job if she was late, and she still had to pick up her children and drive them to the other babysitter's house.

As the men put on their coats, the women told them to go outside to see what they could do.

There was nothing to be done. The battery was dead. Nobody had jumper cables with him. The woman was running out of time and was becoming resigned to losing her job, wondering aloud where she could find another.

The dilemma was resolved when one couple offered to transport her wherever she needed to go that night. The following morning, the male half of the couple would bring his jumper cables, pick up the woman at her house, and drive back to the Southside center to start her car.

The teaching staff was the most important staff component of Head Start for three reasons: it was the largest component within the organization, not including the parents; it had the most direct contact with both children and parents served by Head Start; ultimately, it was upon the dedication and abilities of the teachers themselves that the success of Head Start as a child development program depended.
More than any other element of Head Start, it was the teachers and teacher aides who were the objects of parent affect. Naturally enough, they were highly regarded because of the interest they showed in the individual child's progress and the concern they expressed for the family as a unit. When, during the summer, most of the teachers (some were out of town on their summer vacations; the Daycare staff was not approached. Cf. Chapter V.), threatened to resign if Head Start did not succeed in separating from Community Action, one parent described this action as "the biggest kick in the guts" the parents had yet received. It was her opinion that it was the teachers' conditional resignation that "kept the parents from swinging toward CAP."

Economically, most Head Start parents were dependent upon sources outside of the agency, either jobs or public assistance that had been obtained without going through CAP as the intermediary. The services of Head Start were looked upon rather as temporary benefits than as necessities.

If sexual activity existed between Head Start staff members and parents, it was conducted so discreetly as to go undetected.

Expression of Social Exclusiveness

Generally, group distinctions between Head Start,
CAP, and the CAP Indian clienteles were based on discrete yet overlapping statuses.

All three groups recognized Head Start as occupying a higher socio-economic status than either of the other two. Within Head Start, there was some resentment by some parents against welfare recipients, even by some who themselves had been on welfare.

Some Head Start parents who were collecting benefits owing to physical incapacitation seemed to harbor a special resentment against those of the welfare clientele who were receiving benefits for reasons other than incapacitation. It is my impression that this resentment was owing to the desire not to be labelled as ignorant or lazy but to be accepted as physically infirm.

I do not know which sentiment predominated: sympathy commingled with personal fear of future "failure", or resentment against those who were purportedly "welfare chiselers." As often as I heard a comment representing one view, I could rely upon hearing a retort from someone of the opposite opinion. I do not know how many people were represented by those who spoke for either view. Most people said little, if anything, on this topic and the issue of welfare itself was not one to arouse heated argument. Too many members of Head Start, at one time or another, had been dependent upon public assistance and knew at first hand the personal humiliations dealt out to the poor by
some welfare officials and storekeepers to refrain from defending those who were currently on public assistance or to accuse them too persistently. As well, in Head Start there was always the pervasive fear that the future would be worse than the present, that an unforeseen injury or illness would push the family down into the ranks of welfare.

Resentment against Indians was expressed, when it was expressed, in terms of their being entitled to receive federal education grants and reservation land revenues while poor Whites had no such privileges. Again, too many Head Start parents considered themselves "liberals" to allow "racist" accusations to go unchecked. Neither was the Indian issue one to arouse heated debate.

Community Action's clientele, White and Indian, appeared to resent the Head Start membership their closer proximity to the middle class. Qualities that CAP ascribed to the middle class, as academic year 1972-73 wore on, were ascribed to Head Start as well.

While both the White and Indian clienteles of Community Action stood in growing antagonistic opposition to Head Start, they appeared to ignore each other almost entirely. As the Executive Director presented ever-new evidence of the oppression of the poor on the part of the middle class and its representatives, each group seemed to interpret the evidence in terms of its own self-concept. To the CAP Indian, oppression of the poor was synonymous to
racial oppression. Whites viewed the issue in terms of class struggle (but would have been horrified to hear it expressed in Marxist jargon).

Both the Community Action and Head Start clienteles, whether Indian or White, distinguished themselves from each other behaviorally and symbolically. By observing facial gesture, manner of walk, conversational allusions, word choice, and other subtle and not so subtle mannerisms, a knowledgeable observer would have been able to classify individuals as to group membership as they responded to each other's verbal and body language.

CAP's clientele incorporated into their public performances the liberal use of profanity and sexual allusion. Head Start parents seldom swore in public meetings. They seemed to feel that when the occasion called for it, the use of profanity such as "damn" or "hell" was fitting, but only under extreme duress would one shout "bullshit" and never would one use the word "fuck". More likely than not, following such an outburst, the shouter would show contrition and apologize for his or her language. CAP's clientele, on the other hand, vigorously sprinkled public meetings with the latter expletives.

Informants who were associated with CAP in its early days in Missoula testify that the use of profanity as a tool by which to manipulate audiences was a part of the training and education of the poor by CAP.
Council Chairman noted that, after he had conducted two Policy Council meetings, he had learned to predict the precise moments at which he could expect an outburst by CAP employees or by some low-income Board members. Invariably, such an outburst would follow on the heels of motions or resolutions which had passed and which were unfavorable to CAP. (Strangely, manipulative behavior on the part of the CAP membership seldom occurred during the discussion between the introduction of a motion and the vote, but almost always after the vote, if it was unfavorable.)

CAP employees and, after the Wounded Knee episode in the late winter and spring of 1973, the CAP Indians increasingly employed threats and violent rhetoric, both singling out individuals and referring to Head Start as a whole. A sometimes-employee of CAP told a Policy Council member that what he needed was a "kick in the ass" and maybe then he wouldn't be so smart. In April, Head Start as an organization was threatened with "a Wounded Knee here." A CAP employee, sympathetic to Head Start, was told by a CAP Indian that "We are going to take over this place, man, and then you white honkeys are gonna get burned."

The response of Head Start was one of both anger and intimidation. In public meetings, the Policy Council became increasingly formal in its manner. Where the Chairman had once argued (unsuccessfully) against adopting Robert's Rules of Order to help structure Council meetings, feeling
it to be too inflexible for the Council's purposes, he now found himself imposing an increasingly rigid structure on meetings in an effort to shield the Council behind the "demands" of parliamentary procedure. Head Start Council members and other parents complained that certain CAP employees were belittling them behind their backs but loud enough for them to hear their comments. Accused staff members denied making such statements or hearing them.

The social sentiments of the various groups were symbolized in public meetings by the seating arrangements members of each preferred. A CAP Indian would prefer to sit beside a member of the same tribe. If one was not present, the CAP Indian would seat himself next to another CAP Indian before he would a non-Indian.

Head Start parents sought out other members of the parent group to which they belonged. Secondary sentiments were directed toward Head Start. Head Start staff members might either sit together or sit interspersed among the parents. Indian employees of Head Start, but not CAP Indian employees, also sat near other staff members or among the parents.

Community Action staff members and board members sat together.

Usually, members of each group sat together in clusters of three or four interspersed among members of other groups rather than as a solid bloc. As hostilities became more
apparent, however, the observer could note that fewer groups but larger ones became the rule.

I noticed this trend for the first time during the Policy Council meeting of March 27, 1973. Having noted it, I thought I could recall a hint of it at the February Policy Council meeting. By June, seating alliances had concentrated almost to the total exclusion of outsiders.

Summary

I have presented three models by which social scientists have regarded the conditions of poverty and the poor. The qualitative model of the "culture of poverty" suggests that, for whatever reason the poor are poor, they tend to perpetuate their own poverty. People who are participants in the culture of poverty can be distinguished behaviorally from other people.

The quantitative model of poverty suggests that the poor are different from other people, but that the difference is "a matter of degree rather than of kind." Traditionally, proponents of the classificatory model maintain that the poor are poor because, having lower incomes and lower educational levels, they have fewer vocational opportunities.

Missoula's Community Action agency emphasized the first view, linking it to an ideology which stressed the uniqueness of the poor and which presented the middle class as a straw man responsible for the problems of the poor. At the same time, it discouraged members of "the community
of the poor" from aspirations of social mobility, accusing those who had achieved a higher socio-economic status of having become middle class.

Missoula's Head Start program, in 1972-73, tended to view the problems of the poor in primarily economic terms, thereby ignoring social and cultural distinctions (Cf. Chapter IV.).

Schneider and Smith's pluralistic view synthesizes the qualitative and quantitative models and appears to approach empirical reality in Missoula more closely than either of the other two. I have employed this model in an effort to distinguish between various "status groups based upon occupation, income, style of life, ethnicity, and race."

I have used three indices in order to discern the relationships between Community Action and its supporters and Head Start and its supporters. These indices are economics, socio-political organization, and expression of social exclusiveness.

We have found that CAP supporters were comprised of CAP employees and some Head Start employees. Head Start employees who supported CAP were, for the most part, CAP Indians and the White heads of some matrifocal families. Also, a majority of the low-income sector of CAP's Board of Directors, Missoula Mineral Human Resources, supported Community Action in the fight against Head Start, as did
the other CAP Indians.

CAP, more specifically, CAP's Executive Director, had entered into the "traditional network" of the poor, injecting money and a sense of social solidarity into this network. These actions, performed in an extremely personalized manner, had the effect of instilling a sense of moral obligation into the relationship that was established between the Executive Director and his clientele. This affect at times took on a sacred character when directed toward the Executive Director.

While CAP supporters derived primarily from what we might call the "welfare class," Head Start supporters, at least the parents who supported Head Start, for the most part, came from the lower-scale working class. Other Head Start supporters were the majority of Head Start employees. Other supporters, such as Board members and former Community Action and Head Start employees, joined against Community Action to vindicate their feelings of having been deceived or "used", as one man put it, by Community Action in the past. Although one-third of Head Start families were matrifocal, nearly all active Head Start parent supporters were from nuclear families. Nearly all Head Start supporters were White.
Footnotes

7. Statistics cited in Chapter III, except where otherwise noted, are drawn from a statistical profile of Head Start families compiled by Missoula's Community Action agency during academic year 1972-73.

8. These numbers are based on Head Start teachers' student records (1972-73) and on their personal knowledge of which students were Indian.

9. When asked by one of his listeners what the results of Senator Mansfield's investigation were, the Executive Director replied, "They couldn't prove anything." His audience consisted of several CAP Indians, members of the Head Start Policy Council, and MMHR Board members. It is likely that some of those present would have approved campaign financing for certain political hopefuls on the part of agency.

At the same time, using federal monies to finance political campaigns is in violation of federal law. Had the Executive Director denied using federal funds for this purpose he might have lost some popular support. Had he professed to have used federal monies to finance a political campaign he would have been liable to prosecution. This analysis of the situation in which the discussion took place may explain the Executive Director's equivocal response.

10. I am assured by informants that the Acting Deputy Director did inform Meta that the two sheriffs refused to investigate the "kidnapping" owing to their understandings of where their jurisdictional boundaries lay. I myself recall overhearing conversations between Meta and others indicating that she initially understood that a jurisdictional dispute was the reason for the sheriffs' refusals to investigate. One of these conversations took place in the presence of the Acting Deputy Director.

11. Head Start's adult clientele was composed of approximately 215 people, each of whom could vote in Parent Center and Policy Council elections (Parent Representatives to the Council were elected by their respective centers.).

In the 1973 Board elections, 252 people including an
unknown number of Head Start parents, cast ballots. The 1973 election was the only Board election in MMHR's history in which Head Start parents were permitted to vote.

By way of contrast, in the 1974 Board election, only 80 persons cast ballots. This low turnout may have been due, however, to the reorganization of Community Action, the effect of which was to cut back on the number of staff and on the amount of federal funds made available to it. Or, it could have been a consequence of the fight between CAP and Head Start nearly a year before.
...administrative structures inevitably tend to become corrupt. The corruption to which I refer is a kind of emotional or social entropy. Personal antipathies, for instance, become ingrained, creating systematic blockades in the communication process. Personal friendships and sympathies become so entrenched that personnel changes cannot be made. Cliques or factions become polarized and diverted from the organization's proper goals to the goal of institutional ascendency...A kind of institutional unconscious develops, the repository of unconscionable ambitions and practices which cannot be admitted to open communication in the structure but which remain nonetheless to poison the milieu. The clientele and the owners become the scape-goats; a soft form of vandalism becomes a way of life. In some cases the corruption is decay in the class sense—...equipment and supplies are regularly stolen, production records are falsified, political and domestic nepotism is practiced...But in a less dramatic, more gradual form, the organization's work may...become so out of date, so obsolete, so unsatisfying to clientele or owners or both, that the organization is viewed as an anachronism; yet it refuses to make the major reorganization necessary to restore utility. This too is a form of corruption. Both of these kinds of decay are apt to be lethal unless a major restructuring is achieved from which the old decay is absent (Wallace 1971:9-7).

In the first three chapters of this paper I have attempted to establish the organizational, ideological, and economic backdrop to the conflict which rent Missoula's Community Action agency in the summer of 1973. In this
chapter, we shall be concerned with the events leading to open conflict between Head Start and Community Action and with the perceptions, interpretations, and sentiments of a number of participants in the growing conflict, all of whom were allied with Head Start. In short, we shall be concerned with the dynamics of group formation. The role of the Policy Council Chairman as a central focus around which Policy Council representatives could gather is emphasized, as are informants' perceptions that they allied against an agency oppressive to all.

In February, 1973, Missoula Mineral Human Resources' Board Chairwoman established a committee consisting of five Board members and an agency consultant to evaluate the programs and philosophies of the Community Action agency.

The establishment of this committee was in consequence of two unrelated actions, but which together indicated one conclusion: the agency was not working to its maximum capacity to meet the needs of the poor.

The first action was taken by the Regional Office of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The previous November it had conducted an assessment of Missoula's Community Action agency and found it wanting. Among its criticisms were allegations of misdirection and mismanagement. It alleged that the agency was not responsive to the poor.
The second action occurred at the close of the January 18th Board meeting when a Board member from Mineral County resigned, he said, in disgust. He stated that Head Start was not an antipoverty program and that he didn't know of a single child in the Alberton Head Start class who was qualified to be there. All, he said, were over-income (meaning that their parents had incomes greater than the maximum allowed by federal guidelines for participation in the program).

If his allegations were true, this meant that owing to the presence of over-income children in the program, other children who needed the services of Head Start and who were entitled to them were denied them. The chairwoman instructed the Head Start Director to determine the truth of these allegations.

He discovered that the (former) Board member was essentially correct. The parents of only three children out of fifteen enrolled in the Alberton center were low-income by federal criteria. But he also discovered that neither the Head Start parents, nor the teachers, nor the outreach worker assigned to Alberton were aware that they had violated federal guidelines. The outreach worker and the teachers who had recruited the children had been instructed by the previous Head Start Director and the Parent Involvement Director as to the criteria for enrollment. Thus, incomes and expenses had been manipulated.
so as to allow over-income parents to enroll their children in Head Start. In one case, a man earning $15,000 per year was allowed to deduct everything, including his property taxes, but his savings of $3,000, which were then itemized as his net income, in order to enroll his child. If there were Head Start Manuals available in Alberton, no one there had bothered to read them, but instead had taken the word of agency "officials."

The Board Chairwoman was upset. She was herself from Mineral County and knew that the Alberton Head Start center was more than a children's classroom to the residents of Alberton; it was the only social center in town. People there considered it prestigious to be known as a Head Start parent. Because of these recruitment practices, the Alberton center was in danger of being terminated.

The Executive Director told her that Head Start was permitted to enroll ten per cent of its students from over-income families. He said that he had simply permitted the bulk of that ten per cent to enroll in a single classroom. The Head Start Director objected, saying that the Head Start Manual was clear on this point. It stated that the ten per cent applied, rather, to individual classes, not to the entire program. Therefore, while the program might, in part, be composed of ten per cent over-income participants, no single class could permit more than ten per cent of its enrollees to be over-income. The Manual further stipulated that gross income, rather than net
income, was to be regarded as the income base.\textsuperscript{12}

The Chairwoman asked the two men to give their views to the Head Start parents in Alberton. This they did.

On the drive back to Missoula, the Head Start Director asked the Executive Director why he had said what he had to the Alberton parents. "For political reasons," the Executive Director replied. He never specified the exact nature of those reasons.

The evaluation committee's report was distributed to staff and Board members in three mimeographed parts (Cf. Appendix A). The first part listed the positive and negative areas of MMHR programs.

The first years of Community Action's presence in Missoula, the report said, until 1969, were "the most useful."

The reasons given in interviews with "staff, program participants, low income people and other interested persons..." are that the "action role" brought problems of low income people to the attention of the communities in Missoula and Mineral counties and that local low income persons learned how to organize, speak for themselves, and become appraised of their rights.

The report cited employment provided by CAP and Head Start, Public Service Careers training, and organizational responsibility as having helped "Selected low income individuals (to) have grown considerably..." The annual payroll, it noted, "has substantial impact on the local economy," resulting in the creation of jobs, many of which were filled by low income persons. Supportive services, the report
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further noted, "have been well received by program participants."

Included under "Negative areas" were these points:

An important and long standing polarization exists between supportive services (education, nutrition, counseling, psychological testing, and health) and so-called action roles (such as protests, strategy sessions)...It is interesting that the activities of the action roles are often with the goal of getting more of the supportive services for low income individuals.

Related to the polarization between supportive services and action roles are many occasions reported to the committee of individuals being accused of having "middle class values" and "not understanding the needs of low income people." In some documented cases in which this accusation has been made, the real issue has been that the person has disagreed with an interpretation of an action role.

Staff also report confusion caused by the administrative staff failing to delegate authority and running things on a "make-it-up-as-you-go basis." All but two of the employees interviewed stated that they were not always certain what their job duties were or what was expected of them...

The committee stated that it found "no proof of any individual using any funds illegally for his own personal gain." It felt that the shortage of finances and other resources from which Head Start suffered were matters of management and administration. It questioned "whether Head Start funds are being expended for the purpose of attending meetings which produce little results and taking goods and services from our children in Head Start."

The second part of the evaluation committee's report concerned the Executive Director's "performance." It began
with the suggestion that the Board "consider either the termination or resignation of the Executive Director" and stated that "The suggestion...is done without recrimination and for the best interests of harmony in the future of any local low income community programs."

The report noted "A situation of continual conflict" between the Executive Director and staff members who disagreed with him. It pointed specifically to the Executive Director's attempts to fire the Head Start Director.

"Based on an assessment of interviews there is widespread support for the Head Start Director, especially by those involved in the program.,,No negative reports have been received from a regional level in regard to the work of the Head Start Director."

The report stated that, while the division among the staff had been present for a number of years, it had only recently surfaced. The report further noted the Executive Director's failure to delegate authority "to staff responsible for particular functions" and that the Executive Director "is the staff member who makes comments at Head Start policy meetings," precluding responses from the Head Start staff.

The committee gave an example of a budgeting problem which could have been avoided and concluded the second part of their report with their own comments. Here they noted that

Several staff have commented on their
fear of discussing any sensitive matters over the phone. The reasons for this fear is their feeling that the conversation might be recorded. Evidence exists that phone conversations have been recorded without the consent of the individuals involved.

and that

An almost universal comment by staff members, program participants and others is the accusation by the Executive Director that individuals have "middle class values and to [sic] not understand the needs of low income people." In several specific cases of which the Evaluation Committee has direct knowledge, the accusation was directed towards people who were critical of [the Executive Director] and did not support his philosophy.

The last of the three parts of the evaluation committee's report was its recommendations for Board action. It suggested a number of specific ways in which the agency could improve its fiscal and personnel administration, recommended that component programs such as Head Start "exercise their responsibility for establishing agendas, length of meetings and regulating inputs from staff members," and suggested that the Board admonish staff personnel and program participants "to refrain from labeling other people as having 'middle class standards' and 'not understanding the needs of low income persons.'"

Agency reactions to the release of the Evaluation Committee's report was swift. One member was threatened with a beating. Another man was told that his house would be burned (He sent his family out of town for a short time.). Both of these threats were made by a Head Start
outreach worker. Others on the committee received harassing and obscene telephone calls. A woman from another low-income organization in the state suddenly appeared to participate in a violent verbal confrontation against the Board Chairwoman in a Board Executive Committee meeting on March 30th.

At the regular meeting of the Board, following the Executive Committee meeting, the Executive Director noted the allegations of staff divisiveness that had been made in the Evaluation Committee's report and stated that he was committed to the action role. He advocated turning Head Start into what he called a "mini-CAP." With the coming phase-out of Community Action, he said, the action role could be continued, using Head Start as the vehicle. If the Board wanted a "traditional program" (He did not specify whether he meant CAP or Head Start here. Presumably, he meant Head Start.), they would do well to retain the Head Start Director to lead it. If, on the other hand, the Board agreed with his idea for the creation of a mini-CAP in order to continue the action role, then the Head Start Director had to leave.

The Executive Director denied ever having accused anyone of having "middle class values" or of "not understanding the needs of low income people." He said that those expressions were unfamiliar to him, but that if any of his staff were saying such things, he would certainly put a stop to it.
He said nobody's telephone conversations were being recorded.

As to staff's feelings that there was a lack of leadership and direction in the agency, the Executive Director said that he would have to bear the responsibility for that. He complained that he had been feeling "paranoid" in the past few months and he was certain that the stress he felt himself under was affecting his job performance. He apologized and said that he would correct the problem.

He did not address the issue of fiscal management.

I attended this Board meeting as an observer. The meeting itself did not start until nearly two in the afternoon, although a quorum was present well before lunch. The late start, it turned out, was due to the length of the Executive Committee meeting preceding the regular meeting of the Board.

Once the Board meeting commenced, no reference was made to the meeting that had preceded it. Comparatively trivial issues were discussed and dispensed with. Suddenly, at five o'clock, it seemed that a good two-thirds of those present simply stood up and walked out. As the meeting had progressed, individuals had become tired or bored and had left. By comparison, this was a mass exodus. It occurred to me only later that it was suppertime and these people had gone home to eat.

With so many people leaving, a number of chairs nearer the front became available and there was a good deal
of changing of seats for a short time, Now the Executive Director asked for and received the floor. Now, for the first time openly, he addressed some of the specific points of the Evaluation Committee Report (as I described above). He ended by submitting his resignation, which he already had typed out.

The vote was eight to four to retain the Executive Director. Several people applauded. However, something had struck me as odd. I had seen one man whom I knew to be a Head Start outreach worker (the same who had threatened the two Evaluation Committee members) vote. An informant later told me that she had seen a Daycare mother vote. But she was positive that the woman only recently had been hired by the agency. These two votes were among the eight counted for retention of the Executive Director. (Months later, the Board Chairwoman admitted to me that she had been somewhat shaken during the confrontation during the preceding Executive Committee meeting. By the time she called for the vote to determine whether the Executive Director's resignation would be accepted, it was nearly six o'clock. She said she simply counted hands. She was not concerned with associating faces with the hands.)

Although other informants expressed some dismay when I told them, some months later, that an informant and I had seen two staff members vote to retain the Executive Director, they pointed out that the rest of what I had
observed conformed to a predictable pattern.

In theory, 51 voting seats existed on the Board, with 17 seats open to each of the public, private, and low-income sectors. In practice, while the low-income sector was filled in both the 1972 and 1973 Board elections, the public and private sectors together composed a number only equal to that of the low-income sector.

Board meetings were consistently scheduled during the regular work hours on week days. Thus, a number of members from the public and private sectors could be counted on to be absent. As the low-income sector, for the most part, subsisted on one or another form of public assistance, low-income members could be counted on for regular attendance.

Two other factors helped to ensure that the low-income sector prevailed at Board meetings. Consistently, the most important issues concerning policy were placed last on the agenda by the agenda committee, composed of the Low Income Caucus, formed from the low-income sector. As Board meetings tended to be interminably long—sometimes running five or six hours—the Board gradually thinned as members left for home. But it was primarily the members of the public and private sectors who left, rather than the low-income members, who appeared to derive a true pleasure in making themselves heard.

Only the low-income sector was entitled to a ten dollar allowance for attending Board meetings, helping to ensure their attendance but discouraging attendance from
the two middle-income sectors.

Personalized relations between the Executive Director and several of the low-income sector, as well as a few low-income people who were not voting members of the Board, accounted for the Executive Director's continuing success in maintaining his position. One had only to observe, inside the walls of the agency, who was the recipient of the Executive Director's attention at any given moment to know also who was about to do something for the Executive Director and who would then receive an immediate or future reward, say, four days' per diem to go to Utah to pick up and drive back to Missoula a surplus Air Force sedan, or, say, a temporary consultantship, or a seat on the Board after the elections in May.

The Head Start Director, by observing the most recent objects of the Executive Director's attentions, was able to predict, at the end of April, who, in May, would be elected the new officers of the Board.

The Head Start Director (October 1, 1972-August 31, 1973)

During the summer and early autumn of 1972, the position of Head Start Director was opened three times. None of the more than fifty applicants had been acceptable to the Policy Council's Personnel Committee. The last to apply the third time the position was advertised was the man who ultimately got the job. He was interviewed first by the current Head Start Director, who was resigning for
reasons of health, then by the Personnel Committee. Another man, a former agency employee, was also being considered for the position. One of the Personnel Committee asked him,

"Why do the Head Start classroom staff say they'll quit if you're hired." He replied, "Because of my methods the last time I worked for this agency." He then said that he had changed a lot since them. He also explained, when asked, that he never stayed more than six months on a job because he was an organizer and once groups were organized he left the maintenance to someone else as it "just wasn't his bag" (quoted from an informant's written statement).

The new Head Start Director assumed his responsibilities on October first.

Within two weeks of [the Head Start Director's] hiring and coming to work [the Executive Director] in my presence, said, "The Head Start Director is impossible, he just has no sensitivity to the poor." I asked [the Executive Director] if he had spoken to [the Head Start Director] about it and he said, "He should have picked up on a lot of this stuff by now." What "stuff" he meant was never explained as [the Executive Director] then left for Helena. He and [the Parent Involvement Director] also complained about [the Head Start Director], his insistence on accountability for outreach workers and in claims from parents for meetings and babysitting. Again both of them said that [the Head Start Director] "wasn't a bit sensitive to the poor." Neither of them would explain exactly what they meant by this [,] however. I witnessed almost daily put downs, snide remarks and often crude gestures such as calling [the Head Start Director] "papa san" behind his back by the Indians on the staff and the O.E.O. staff.

Finally there were a series of meetings between [the Executive Director], [the
Head Start Director] and staff for the purpose of rearranging administrative policies and duties. [The Head Start Director], as announced by [the Executive Director], was to have complete charge of all "maintenance" staff's supervision and he, [the Executive Director], would work directly with and supervise all outreach and planning staff. All seemed to be going well until the phase out notice for O.E.O. was received [February 5, 1973]. Almost at once an Executive Committee of the Board meeting was held and within minutes of that meeting the staff heard through the grapevine that [the Executive Director], [the Policy Council Chairwoman] and [a low-income Board member] had urged the firing of [the Head Start Director]. Other rumors concerned the plan to get rid of all possible staff and use all remaining monies to promote a "real action oriented program" with [the Executive Director], [the Planning Director], [the Parent Involvement Director] and others of their persuasion for as long as the money held out (quoted from an informant's written statement).

Of his eleven-month career with Head Start, the Head Start Director was to write, in part:

I spent my first two and one-half months establishing an agency salary schedule where none was evident, submitting a proper budget which was supposed to have been into the Regional Office months earlier and formalizing an agreement with SRS (State Rehabilitation Services) which should have been done nearly a year earlier.

I became moderately critical of the whole MMHR operation in late October and November. An assessment of MMHR made by the Regional Office in November supported my criticisms of misdirection and poor management principles. The assessment alleged that MMHR was not responsive to the poor, etc.

In December I became highly critical and suggested to [the Executive Director] that the agency review all administrative procedure, standardize and provide
written instructions. This was finally
done in late December but [the Executive
Director] suggested to me about February
12 that it would be useless to publish
the standardized procedures because of
OEO's tenuous position.

[The Executive Director] did admit
to me in December and January that he
was burnt out and could no longer control
the staff and felt I could administer
agency programs better. He stated basically
the same to the Board of Directors on
January 18. We briefed the Board that
on February 1st I would take over the
administration of all agency programs
and he would work with the Parent Involvement
staff and Planning Director and main­
tain the position of Executive Director.

In late January I challenged several
positions he had taken concerning Head
Start recruitment priorities and recruit­
ment practices. Both positions were con­
trary to federal guide lines which were
to be followed as part of the federal
grant allocation to MMHR. Violation
of the latter had placed the Head Start
program in jeopardy of closure as it
cased misuse of federal funds.

On February 5, MMHR received notice
of phase-out of Community Action Programs
by June 30. Instead of transferring
administrative controls of the agency
over to me that day, [the Executive
Director] and [the Policy Council Chair­
woman] attempted to get the Board
Executive Committee to fire me by April
1 when my probation period was up.

Earlier in March [the Executive
Director] requested and received permission
to postpone the Head Start annual audit
from March 31 to May 31. He did this
without my, the Council's or Board's
knowledge. This action was illegal
according to federal and agency policy.
I saw no valid reason for this move
and saw it only as a move to postpone
the inevitable. As a matter of note,
this audit was never initiated until
September 16...

During the March 27 Policy Council
meeting I suggested separate accounts, [The Executive Director] became very upset as [sic] implied I was accusing him there was money missing. Later in the meeting he supported the recommendation. I began to wonder why all the fuss about a superior procedure. I had many valid reasons as well as later confirmed suspicions that money was in fact not accounted for.

On March 30, [the Executive Director] told me he could not write my evaluation due April 1st because he could not be objective in view of recent happenings. On April 4, he drove to Superior and met with the Personnel Committee Chairman and asked for a 30 day extension of this evaluation. I told [the Executive Director] if he could not be objective by April 1st, a month would not improve his ability in this respect.

During the March-May period I was often publically criticized for being overly concerned about monthly spending levels and balances. I had grave suspicions that Head Start was not getting all its funds. I knew bills were being paid late for no obvious reason. [The Executive Director] and his fiscal staff denied the allegations made by me although they were true.

[The Executive Director] provided me with the most negative evaluation possible on April 30. Situations described were distorted and often false. I saw it as a desperate attempt to get rid of me although he stated emphatically during the February, March and April Board meetings he had no intention of firing me.

During the months of April and May he was busy maneuvering in the neighborhoods in preparation for the May 18 Board elections. He was also busy trying to undermine me in the eyes of these people by telling them that:

a. I was a political plant from Washington here to close down the OEO programs.

b. I came from a wealthy background instead of what I had described of myself.

c. I was "insensitive to the poor"....
On April 30, when I was given a copy of the evaluation, we discussed his support of [the then former Policy Council Chairwoman's] fraudulent baby sitting claims I reported to the Policy Council. He maintained his was an acceptable procedure and didn't want to bother Denver with a waiver of the... monthly claims allowed.

[The former Policy Council Chairwoman] reflected much of [the Executive Director's] statements in her rounds around the program participants. She also made allegations that I was wealthy and didn't need the job, that I threw numerous drunken parties, etc.

When his son was recruited into Head Start, Andy felt that antipoverty programs were not really directed toward such people as himself and his family. He was a graduate student at the university. If he was poor, he certainly did not suffer from the kind of debilitating poverty that he had read was the focus of the war against poverty. He told this to the teachers and outreach worker who recruited him into the Southside Center. Their response was that, since the agency was using only economic criteria to solicit children into Head Start, his family was eligible.

He was asked by the teachers and then by the Southside Chairman and Vice Chairman to help with the renovation of the Center. It was located in a house in a residential area around the corner from where he lived and part of the lease agreement was that the Southside parents themselves would repaint and decorate the interior. Paint had already
been donated by a paint store in town. Also, some of the parents were making plans to erect outdoor play equipment for the children. Andy found this kind of self-help organization appealing and in August and September of 1972 spent a couple of his evenings helping to paint one of the upstairs rooms blue. Another of the men working in the same room was color-blind and he left small unpainted patches of flat white, the original wall color, on the walls after he had finished with them. The other painters, inspecting the progress of the work as they went along, said nothing about these lapses, but waited until after the man had gone on to the next room and then repaired the job.

Andy's son enjoyed attending Head Start classes and his teacher and the teacher aide were obviously fond of him. Andy and, sometimes, his wife (She worked to put him through school and often was too tired in the evenings to attend meetings. Even so, she sometimes went if he could not.) attended Parent Center meetings and soon became socially involved with some of the other parents.

In early autumn, Andy was elected alternate to the Parent Representative to the Head Start Policy Council. Even before the first meeting of the Council, however, the Parent Representative realized that he would not have the time to devote to at least two meetings per month (at least one Council meeting and one Center meeting per month) and he resigned as Parent Representative. At the
first Policy Council meeting, then, held in October, Andy was the Southside Parent Representative.

Among the issues raised at this meeting was that of "intake priorities." In the past, families dependent on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC or ADC) had been given top priority in the recruiting of children into the Head Start program, even though incomes from AFDC were sometimes higher than those earned by people in the labor force. The new Head Start Director felt that the source of someone's income should be of no concern to Head Start. What was important, regardless of the source, was the amount of income. He wanted current policies to be reconsidered by the new Council. He suggested nine categories pertaining to family type and income and asked the Council to number them by priority or to construct other categories.

The debate that followed focused primarily on the issue of whether AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) recipients, which were matrifocal families, or nuclear families should be given higher priority. After an arduous discussion, it was decided to hold a referendum on the issue, that the parents themselves rather than the Policy Council should determine the priorities. The list of nine categories would be mimeographed and distributed to the Parent Centers. During the debate the Policy Council Chairwoman, a carry-over from the year before and herself a mother on AFDC, had argued in favor of AFDC parents receiving priority. Several Southside parents (The debate was not limited to Policy
Council representatives.) had argued in favor of nuclear families or of lumping the two categories together so that neither had priority. The Chairwoman reasoned that single-parent families needed Head Start more than did two-parent families because a single parent bore the child-rearing burdens of both mother and father. The Southside parents felt that a program such as Head Start might serve to keep families from breaking up by providing relief to severe economic and social burdens; relief which, these parents felt, was already provided AFDC mothers by virtue of their receiving AFDC assistance.

The most time-consuming matter for the new representatives (The Chairwoman was the only carry-over from the preceding academic year.) during their first Policy Council meeting was the budget. Missoula Mineral Head Start's annual budget, since its first full program year, had been $240,000. In September, a budget for $251,000 had been submitted to HEW's Regional Office in Denver. The larger budget had been drawn up by CAP's Planning Director, the Policy Council Chairwoman, and the man who was at that time the Head Start Director (The Executive Director was out of town.). HEW refused to approve the larger budget.

It was now the job of the Policy Council to rework and ratify a budget of $240,000. It could not be done that night. One quarter of a million dollars was too large an amount for most people to comprehend. At the same time,
it did not appear to be nearly enough to meet the program's needs. A committee was formed to meet later in the month with some staff members to investigate ways in which the larger budget could be cut. (The first portion of the grant did not arrive until January, although the budget year began in November. The Executive Director was forced to take out a bank loan of $40,000 to meet Head Start payrolls and expenses for the months of December and January. CAP deducted $400.00 from the Head Start grant in order to pay the interest on that amount.)

Until January 31st, 1973, Head Start had maintained two Daycare centers, one in the Methodist church in the central part of Missoula, the other, known as Satellite Daycare, located at the university.

In April of 1972, Community Action's Deputy Director had arranged for Satellite Daycare parents to travel to Helena the following September to lobby for state matching funds. Matching funds were required if the Satellite program was to remain in existence beyond the end of the calendar year. When the first budget was drafted in September, however, the Satellite Daycare Directorship was written out, ostensibly to further centralize the Head Start organization. The immediate effect of this move was to deprive the Satellite program of effective leadership. In September, new Daycare parents entered the program uninformed of previous lobbying arrangements. The Deputy
Director had taken another job in South Dakota and, apparently, no one else on the agency staff was aware of his activities the previous spring.

Satellite Daycare parents did not identify themselves as Head Start parents but, rather, as low-income students. They took no great interest in the activities of the rest of Head Start but were concerned with their own comparatively unique problems. They sent a representative to the first Policy Council meeting in October and then no one until December.

In late November, the agency's Planning Director informed the Head Start Director that Head Start needed $5,000 more if the Satellite Daycare was to survive beyond December 31st.

The matter was referred to the Policy Council at its December 5th meeting. A delegate from the Satellite center showed up to ask for assistance. This was the first time that most of the Council had heard of the Satellite Center's plight. Some members expressed hostility toward Satellite parents. After all, they had not attended Council meetings nor had they expressed concern in Head Start affairs. The Satellite delegate explained tearfully that the parents in her center had other problems, problems connected with school, to worry about. They did not have the time to do everything. The Council Secretary and the Southside Parent Representative expressed the view that
it was not the job of the Council to punish anyone, nor to retaliate for past grievances. They felt that the Satellite parents were indeed members of Head Start, regardless of how they considered themselves, and that as such they were entitled to any aid that the program as a whole could offer. The Head Start Director pointed out that federal guidelines stated that no Head Start participant shall be penalized in any way for failure to involve himself in Head Start activities. He doubted, however, that there was much that Head Start could do. Money was too scarce. Ultimately, the Council and the Director were able to manipulate the budget enough so that it yielded $900.00. That amount extended the life of the Satellite Daycare for one month.14 (One consequence of this action was that all Policy Council members but the Chairwoman, who said that she simply could not afford to, voluntarily forfeited all claims to meeting allowances for the remainder of the academic year. Parent Center officers were also encouraged to give up their claims. Most did.)

Of the month of January, 1973, a Southside parent later wrote:

At the first of the year we were told [by the Head Start Director] that parent involvement funds were low so babysitting was only collected when absolutely necessary.

It soon became apparent that transportation for children in the program was going to be a problem. The transportation budget from the previous year had been cut drastically and the program was relying
on parent car pools. Many parents felt that this would not work because of the condition of cars, insurance, etc. of low-income persons. Also I had apprehension, knowing from experience that usually a few persons end up carrying the majority of the load. One Head Start parent in particular began an extensive study into why the money had been cut, etc. He really could not come up with a good answer. He became very discouraged.

We tried the car pool for two months, and it became apparent that it simply would not work, at least at our center. We had a very large area, and the distances involved were atypically long. Also, many of the parents in that area worked days or went to school.

It was at that time that I became active and began to study the problem and its alternatives. A few other parents also worked on this. We discovered that the transportation budget had been cut to one-half of its previous level. This action had been done last summer, when [the previous Head Start Director] was director and [the Chairwoman] chaired the council. They had felt that parents could be relied upon to provide the service. It was an unfortunate mistake, but in rectifying it the Council learned to work together and began to realize some of its rights and responsibilities as a parent group. All of the centers were invited to a meeting prior to the Policy Council meeting in January. They discussed the transportation problem. Some of the centers felt they did not have a problem, but could have if existing cars did not run all winter. At the subsequent Council meeting, a motion carried to double the amount in the budget for transportation—providing that it met with Denver's approval.

Prior to that Council meeting I had discussed with my husband the up-coming election. I told him that I had heard reports from different parents of dissatisfaction with [the Chairwoman]. . . . I also felt that the chairman would not have to spend as much time as [the Chairwoman] because
I felt that she attended too many meetings for the Council and that other parents could and should do more of this; even non-Council members. I hoped that there was truth in the theory that the program should involve as many of the poor as possible.

At the meeting I asked [the Executive Director] what the by-laws stated about the election. I asked him if only the few parents on the Council could run for an office or if those offices were open to all 165 sets of parents. He stated that there were no by-laws, that always in the past the nominations had come from the Council membership. I asked why it was so limited. I had understood that this was a program for all of the participants. I asserted that there were possibly many good people in the program with the time to serve, and that would be an asset. In addition, to limit the posts only to those already elected to the Council was to assume that there was only one qualified person in each center. I also felt that much time is required for each, and to be both a representative and an officer was a lot to ask any one person. [The Executive Director] stated that this had never been done before and that this election had been delayed a long time and to nominate parents who weren't there would be unfair. He said it would be too time-consuming to call nominees at this meeting before each vote.

[The current Chairwoman] was then nominated for Chairman. No one had the time to serve in that position, and all the other nominees declined. A hand vote was taken and [she] won. Then nominations were opened for secretary. All those nominated declined, saying they did not have the time. Then someone suggested me. I declined as I was not a Council representative, but a temporary alternate [the Southside Parent Representative was ill with flu]. [The Executive Director] stated that we could make an exception. I could serve as recording secretary with no vote, although I was
not a member of the Council, according to [the Executive Director]. I stated that I could not do this due to financial reasons; that technically as long as I was not a member of the Council I could not draw babysitting and other allowances and that I could not afford a babysitter so that I could attend meetings. I was voted in anyway, and there was a successful motion to pay me babysitting and allowances as though I was on the Council. After the meeting I was puzzled and bewildered, I had not been eligible one minute and was secretary the next. It bothered me a little that [the Executive Director] was so quick to suspend his own rules.

[The election was by show of hands rather than by secret ballot. The Head Start Director attempted to interrupt the proceedings several times, insisting upon the procedure of secret ballot, but was silenced by the Executive Director and the Policy Council Chairwoman. Ultimately, the Executive Director sent him outside to talk to a newspaper reporter about the demise of the Satellite Daycare Center. When the Head Start Director returned, the chairwoman had been re-elected. Also, during this meeting, the matter of the "intake priorities," was finally decided. The old priorities, stipulating that AFDC families receive the highest priority, were re-adopted.]

A few days later [the Executive Director] stopped me in the hall, and stated that I had a good idea. I asked him what he meant, and he said, "that all 165 parents should be eligible. We should think about that in the future." I asked him why it hadn't been thought about in the past. I thought that the program was trying to get as many people involved as possible. Conversation ended.

The first week of February we got the message concerning Nixon's mandate to OEO. There were many meetings around that time and I get them confused in my mind. One was called at our center just to tell us what was going on nationally. One teacher was present and showed us the statement [a directive sent down from the Regional Director of the Office of Child
Development in Denver] that Head Start funds should only be used for Head Start, That was all she said. She stated that she would say no more as the teachers were staying out of the parents' decisions and shouldn't influence them. There was much discussion among the parents and it was felt by them that this message was serious and meant business. We did not necessarily feel that there was any implication that there had been a problem between community action programs and Head Start in the past; but that there was a possibility in the future if those who helped guide Head Start were not wise.

I felt that the parents had a responsibility to the future of Head Start and the kids to become aware of the workings of the program. A few days later the teacher who had been at the meeting asked me to affirm to her what she had said at the meeting. I told her that all she had done was read us the transmittal. She asked if I would state that to some sort of committee if she was called upon to explain. The she told me that a staff member [an outreach worker] who had been at the meeting had reported to some CAP employee that she had been trying to turn the parents against CAP. That was the first time that I felt there was some trouble coming. I felt that if this was true and I was ever called upon, I would state just what I had told the teacher; as it was the truth.

A few days before this there had been an emergency Parent Involvement Funds-Policy Council meeting. It was called in the daytime by [the Policy Council Chairwoman] without any consultation with any other Council member. It was called because the budget committee (I was chairman of that committee, appointed by [the Policy Council Chairwoman]), had started questioning payment for the many trips to the Helena legislature, who was paying for them, who okayed them, etc. The committee wondered if the trips shouldn't be okayed by the Policy Council. The East Missoula center did not want its parent involvement money spent in that
manner. Neither did the rest of the committee members present at those meetings, with the exception of [the Council Chairwoman], who defended the trips. We felt that under this system all of the parent involvement money could be spent in a couple of months with no regard to the following 10 months of the program. This was especially true considering the late budget printouts from Denver. We didn't know how much had been spent until a couple of months later.

There was much dissention because the meeting had been called on such short notice with no consideration to those who worked, etc. There was no quorum present. The quorum was never called for and I as secretary would not have okayed it as there was none. [The Executive Director] and [the Policy Council Chairwoman] ran the meeting at the beginning . . . , parent involvement director, then took over. A number of times the point was brought up that the guidelines stated that parent involvement money was to be used for babysitting, allowances and transportation. I think [the Head Start Director] tried to bring up this point. He finally gave up as [the Policy Council Chairwoman] would change the subject, or misinterpret it. A Parent Involvement Committee was set up, and the funds were frozen pending a decision as to what to do with them.

I had asked at the January meeting and almost every meeting after that just exactly what did they (the Council, [the Executive Director], [the Head Start Director]) want for minutes. They stated that the regular meetings should be recorded, and the motions were all that was really necessary. But most of the Council members that I talked to wanted the high points of the discussion as well. I told them all many times that I did not take shorthand, was not terribly efficient and that verbatim minutes would be impossible. Motions and high points of the discussions were unofficially agreed upon although [the Policy Council Chairwoman] told me many times that I should put everything in the minutes. I had looked at
her MMHR Board minutes and found that this method was not practiced [the Policy Council Chairwoman was also the Board Secretary]. At no time was I asked or instructed to record committee minutes, nor was I made aware of any committee minutes of the Council in the past, nor did I hear any chairman of a Council committee instructed to make sure that minutes were taken. I never took minutes at any committee meeting that I attended, nor did I see anyone else take any, nor did I see any from years past.

In fact, a number of times I asked . . . , Head Start secretary, for copies of [the] past year's Council minutes (for reference and insight) and was told that she had only kept them since January of this year. She sent me to . . . , a community action secretary. I asked [the Community Action secretary] at least three different times to see at least one copy of any old minutes. She told me that she didn't know where they were and was very evasive.

About ten o'clock in the morning of February 5, OEO phase-out instructions were received by the Executive Director. Three hours later the Board Executive Committee convened. The Executive Director stated that, with CAP being phased out, the major resource that would be available in the future would be Head Start. According to an informant:

[The Executive Director] suggested that if Head Start were to continue as a traditional service program, [the Head Start Director] would be the right man for the position of Head Start Director. But, if the Head Start program were to be more Community Action oriented . . . , then [the Head Start Director] would not be the best man for the job. At that meeting [which was attended by several who were not members of the Executive Committee but]
not by the Head Start Director, who had not been invited], [a low-income Board member] blurted out, "Should we fire [the Head Start Director]?". . .

secretary of the MMHR Board and a member of the Head Start Policy Council, also attended that meeting. She left that meeting for a minute and encountering . . ., the payroll clerk, in the hall, asked him what he thought of [the Head Start Director]. He commented positively, and [the Board Secretary] remarked that "We're thinking of firing him."

[The low-income Board member who had earlier brought the proposed firing of the Head Start Director into the open] was later questioned about her remark and related it back to a conversation she had had with [the Executive Director] on Sunday, Feb. 4. At a Policy Council meeting on Feb. 14th, I asked [the Policy Council Chairwoman] directly if she had any knowledge of any discussion concerning the firing, removal or replacement of [the Head Start Director] as Head Start Director occurring at the Executive Committee meeting of the Board on Feb. 5. She hesitated and then gave me an evasive answer. I repeated my question, and she offered to read the minutes of that meeting, knowing full well that the minutes contained no mention of the discussion which I was referring to, as she had written them herself. I was interrupted at that point and the subject was changed. Later on in the meeting [the Executive Director] admitted, under pressure, that the discussion had taken place. He made no mention that [the former Deputy Director's], [the name of a Community Action employee in Helena], and others' names were suggested as possible replacements for [the current Head Start Director]. This did not come out till the next MMHR Board meeting on Feb. 16, when the minutes from that Executive Committee meeting were questioned by Board members as to their completeness and accuracy. [The Executive Director] had also answered one of the Executive Committee members' questions concerning how the Head Start Director could be fired, by noting that [the Head Start Director's]
probationary period was still in effect and thus would present no great problem (quoted from an informant's written statement).

On February 9th and 10th, the East Missoula Parent Representative, as delegate from the Head Start Policy Council, attended a Head Start conference in Helena. While there, she was asked, "Who is going to fire [Missoula Mineral Head Start's Director]?' This was the first occasion on which any member of the Head Start Policy Council (barring the Chairwoman) heard of the possible firing of Head Start's Director.

On February 11th, a meeting of select staff and Board members was held at the previous Head Start Director's house. The topic of discussion was the firing of the current Head Start Director.

On the evening of February 13th, the Policy Council Chairwoman telephoned the Southside Parent Representative to the Council. She spoke of how insensitive to the poor the Head Start Director was and said that he came from a wealthy background. She spoke in this vein for ten to fifteen minutes, her voice projecting angry indignation, then asked the Southside Representative if he did not agree. The latter replied that he would want to hear the Head Start Director's responses to these accusations before he could agree or disagree. The Chairwoman left off with saying that a staff position would be available soon and that she thought that the Southside Representative might
be right for the job.

On the morning of Feb, 14th, [the Executive Director] called [the Head Start Director] and asked him if he had heard about a phone call made by [the Policy Council Chairwoman] to one of the Policy Council members. [The Executive Director] set up a meeting, with himself, [the Head Start Director] and [the Policy Council Chairwoman] to be included, for 11 a.m. the same morning to discuss this matter. At that meeting [the Head Start Director] asked [the Council Chairwoman] [he had heard rumors] if she were going to ask for his resignation at the Policy Council meeting that afternoon. She answered yes. [The Head Start Director] stated that he would not resign (quoted from an informant's written statement).

On February 14, [the Policy Council Chairwoman] called an emergency Executive Committee meeting. Again in the afternoon with little notice, many people were mad because no one on the Council had been consulted by [the Chairwoman] and because they had told her many times that most of them had trouble coming in the daytime. Because of the phone call the previous night [the Southside Representative had informed the Southside parents of his conversation with the Council Chairwoman.] This informant, the Policy Council Secretary, was also a Southside parent.] I felt that [the Head Start Director's] job was to be discussed. I knew very little about the man but felt that there was no reason to fire him until his job description was studied in detail. I was not sure of the proper procedure to act on the problem of even questioning his ability or inability at job success. I had dealt with the man in a number of matters. He had never tried to impose his influence in my decisions and I respected him for that. Up until that time and to this day I always had the feeling in dealing with him that he respected and considered my views on matters concerned with Head Start and had not tried to impose his view on me. Because
of this I had seen no reason to fire him
and although I didn't feel I knew all the
facts in regard to his job performance I
felt that I would really need proof before
I felt that he should be replaced.

Upon arriving at the meeting, which
convened upstairs at first, [the Policy
Council Chairwoman] seemed anxious to get
on to the business at hand. She called
the meeting to order. [She] stated that
all members had been called and that we
should call an emergency Council meeting so
we could get some decisions made. Be­
cause she had not called for a quorum
at the meeting prior to this one and one
had never been established, I brought up
the point that there wasn't a quorum
present. I think that I was instructed
to call . . . . , a member of the Council,
at that time. I am not totally sure on
this. As we were waiting for a quorum
to arrive it became quite obvious that
this meeting was of great interest to
many people. It expanded to a point that
we moved downstairs [to the Indian Cultural
Center]. A quorum was then present and
a long meeting ensued. I was taking
minutes. The meeting was recorded
according to previous agreement. Although
I recall a great deal of the meeting and
now understand after months of contempla­
tion, I was hard put to follow some of
it at that time.

Because I had not yet been instructed
to record the high points of this discussion
(in fact, it was because of this meeting
and the resulting minutes that many Council
members asked that some discussions be
recorded) and because I did not understand
the full impact and importance of the hap­
penings, the minutes I submitted and that
were later accepted were very scanty and
only contained the motions. I do remember
being hit for the first time with the
astonishing realization that there were
certain low-income people who were so
emotionally dedicated to [the Executive
director] that they would not think of
questioning anything he might do. I had
never seen human worship like this before
and it frightened me. I felt that it was
an unhealthy attitude and could be used in a damaging and dangerous manner in the wrong hands. Not the least of these "[Executive Director]-worshippers" was [the Policy Council Chairwoman].

I remember that I was very concerned about the MMHR Board's Evaluation Committee's letter of intended investigation, which was prematurely sent to members of Congress, etc. I felt that it might possibly have been prevented. After . . . , a member of that committee, was cross-examined extensively I understood more fully the reasons but felt that the Council should request that the MMHR Board instruct the Committee to write as positive a report as possible. The Council felt this way too and so moved. We did not want a false report, only that it be written in positive rather than negative language.

As I recall, [Policy Council] member . . . brought up the issue of firing [the Head Start Director]. [The Southside Parent Representative] did not tell the Council of the job reference when he finally told us about [the Policy Council Chairwoman's] phone call to him. I didn't know why he did this, except that [he] has consistently shown that he is very fair minded and slow to jump to any conclusions. MMHR Board member . . . stated that what she had said in the Board Executive Committee [meeting of February 5th] about firing [the Head Start Director] had been taken out of context. However, the idea of firing him had been firmly planted in everyone's mind (quoted from a statement written by the Policy Council Secretary).

Of greater interest to the Council at that time was the demand by the East Missoula Parent Center that the Policy Council Chairwoman resign her position. In the middle of the most heated controversy concerning the firing of the Head Start Director and the Evaluation
Committee report, which the Executive Director appeared to regard as a single package, the Parent Representative from East Missoula announced that she was under instructions from her parent group to demand the resignation of the Policy Council Chairwoman.

The Chairwoman sat on the Council not as a parent, for she did not have a child in Head Start, but as a Community Representative. Community Representatives to the Council came from the public and private sectors of the community. While there were seven seats available for community representation, at this time only three were filled: by a woman who owned a service station (private sector), a delegate from the Central Trades and Labor Council, an association of AFL-CIO affiliates (public sector), who was also a Southside parent, and by the Chairwoman, who claimed to represent the East Missoula parent group.

According to the East Missoula parents, the Executive Director had attended one of their center meetings the previous autumn and told them that each center was permitted to elect its own Community Representative as well as a Parent Representative. He told them that it would be to their benefit to elect the chairwoman as their Community Representative. In the past, she had been an East Missoula Head Start parent, she was experienced in the ways of antipoverty agencies, and she would serve them well. If they did not elect her their Community Representative, the
Executive Director told them, then she would no longer be able to sit on the Council and to serve them.

At later Policy Council meetings, however, they had heard the Executive Director tell the Council that Community Representatives had to come from public organizations or from the private sector but in any case they had to be elected onto the Council by the Council as a whole, rather than by individual parent groups.

As a former Head Start parent, the Chairwoman was considered a member of the private sector and was, therefore, eligible to sit on the Council. But the Council had never elected her. The East Missoula parents felt that they had been duped by the Executive Director and the Chairwoman. They felt that they had been tricked into electing her their Community Representative on the promise that she would be serving their interests specifically, while her official role as Community Representative demanded that she serve the interests of the Council as a whole.

They had already circulated a petition in an effort to force her resignation. The petition told of the alleged deceit which the East Missoula Parent Representative described at the Council meeting. The petition also alleged that the Chairwoman had misused Parent Involvement monies in submitting fraudulent babysitting claims and claimed that she had used Parent Involvement monies to replace a tire that had blown while she was en route to a conference.
in Helena. Although these monies could have come from a different budget allocation, they associated her using them with the lack of money to buy such necessities as toilet paper for use by their children while attending class.

The petition also attacked her personal life. At the Council meeting she attempted to defend herself only on the personal level. The Southside Parent Representative, who was sitting beside the Chairwoman, admired her stamina and fortitude. She would not permit herself to cry, although tears threatened as more and more accusations were hurled against her. She stood her ground as best she could and took the punishment that was dealt her.

At last the Southside Parent Representative could stand no more. He announced that, as far as he could see, nothing productive could be accomplished here today, that he was personally disgusted by the entire display he had witnessed, and that, as far as he was concerned, the Executive Director and the Head Start Director could fight out their differences on their own, they were not the proper concern of the Council. He moved for adjournment. The motion was seconded; the meeting was adjourned.

As the Council members rose to leave, exhausted, the Southside Parent Representative told the Chairwoman, "You've been used, Maggie."

"I know," she replied.

Another Council member then said to her, "You've
been very foolish. Someone has used you."

"I know," the Chairwoman replied again.

Walking out of the building, the Southside Representative was approached by the Executive Director and the Council Chairwoman. The Executive Director said that they were going to have a drink at the Silver Dollar, a saloon down the street, and he invited the Southside Representative to join them. The latter thought that the Executive Director and the Policy Council Chairwoman seemed very gay, considering all that had happened. He refused the invitation.  

Perhaps the emotional intensity of that meeting may be indicated by the reactions of the Southside Parent Representative and the Policy Council Secretary. For two days following, the Southside Representative could think of nothing but the events of the February 14th Policy Council meeting. Try as he might, he found himself unable to concentrate on conversation even with his wife. He simply was unable to comprehend the words and activities of people around him. Mechanically, he attended classes at the university, took notes, did all of the things he was habituated to do, and afterward could recall nothing of those two days.

The Policy Council Secretary experienced a similar but more severe form of the malady. She took to bed and stayed for a week, her household somehow running without
her. She arose in time to attend the next Policy Council meeting. She did recall, however, a telephone conversation she had with the Policy Council Chairwoman two days prior to the meeting of February 21st.

During the . . . phone call, which would probably set a record for duration, we discussed the upheaval in the Council. We discussed the "attacks" on [Maggie]. I did not fully understand them . . . . She related that she had just gone through a week of hell. I sympathized. I told her that I could never survive this type of attack. We mostly discussed the role of chairman. I had some definite thoughts on the subject. I felt that the chairman of any organization should remain as aloof as possible. I felt that the chairman should delegate as much responsibility as possible, for their sake and the sake of the others. I felt that [Maggie] had left herself open for criticism by presenting herself at gatherings as representing the Council with out the approval of the Council in advance.

I told her that I thought that the next chairperson (should there be a re-election) should be very careful and that I felt sorry for the next chairperson. [Maggie] then told me of her intention to quit the Council at the end of March. She added that she wished to remain on the MMHR Board. I asked if she represented the Council on the Board. [She did.] I asked why she didn't tell the Council that she had intended to quit. She did not answer either of these questions. I suggested that she call for a re-election and let the cards fall where they may. I suggested that she tell the Council of her plans to quit. She said that she couldn't handle the chairmanship any more. I sincerely sympathized with her. She agreed to put re-election on the agenda, mostly to prevent, hopefully, the East-side center from reading its petition. [The petition had received limited circulation but had not been formally presented to the Council] . . . . I
think that [Maggie] was sure that they would read it. This petition was a lengthy [sic] complaint against [Maggie], part of which was personal.

During the February 21st Policy Council meeting, the East Missoula and Northside Parent Representatives voiced complaints concerning the Policy Council elections of the previous month, but most of the meeting was spent writing new by-laws (according to rumor at that time, the Policy Council once had written by-laws, but all copies had been lost).

The Policy Council Secretary recalled:

During all of this time parents knew that there was some unspoken and spoken upheaval going on at the [agency]. Parent participation dropped off considerably. I felt and still feel that it was due to OEO phase-out and that upheaval. I knew that this was a "Nixonian" tactic and felt that it was working as predicted. Also the parents were really beginning to see that they didn't know who they could talk to. It was extremely hard if not impossible to get center participation on the Southside anymore. However, I had contact with many of the parents who had participated in the past and we were still on friendly terms. If discussion got around to the program they expressed interest in Head Start but only on a classroom basis. They did not express it on an MMHR basis because people felt intimidated and did not want to get caught in any "cross-fire" between the groups that were beginning to form.

February 26, the Council was to meet as had been agreed upon at the last Council meeting. We did not have a quorum. I had been afraid of that as many people were angry that we had not finished up the [Maggie] issue. It looked as if we had sacrificed a number of participants to protect one. I called those participants
who lived in town and tried to get them to come to the meeting. One was sick. One had another commitment [sic]. One was unavailable to talk on the phone. One stated that she would not come back until we had a legal election. We assured her that this would only be possible when the by-laws were done because without them we had no rules for an election.

[Maggie] formed a committee to work on the by-laws. It consisted of those at the meeting. Unfortunately it was only the southside-based people. [Later, this would provide Community Action with grounds for attacking the Council, saying that it was Southside-dominated.] We worked for a long time, persisted even though we were tired, and finished our proposed by-laws. [The Southside Parent Representative estimated that in a five-day period, the five committee members devoted 125 man-hours of uninterrupted work to this task.] We tried to be as fair as possible, tried to come up with a good election procedure, tried to limit the power of the chairman, tried to outline the duties of the secretary, and tried to give the vice-chairman some duties.

On March 7, the Council was to meet again. The by-laws were accepted, and attendance was excellent. A number of concerned Council members had called those who had not attended the previous meeting in an attempt to persuade them that they should come, check the by-laws (which were sent out in advance) [,] change and accept them, and then get on to an election if that was what they wanted. Slight changes were made in the by-laws before they were accepted; and the people who worked on them were commended and thanked. The Council wished to have a new election.

A number of members made it clear that they wished to have a temporary chairman to conduct the meeting or they would not stay at the meeting. After much discussion [the Southside Parent Representative] was seated as temporary chairman. A date for the election was
established, March 27, and arrangements were made according to the by-laws. Everyone seemed very satisfied with this. It was agreed that the nominees should have a chance to meet the policy council people, so a Meet-the-Candidate party was planned. The ad was placed in the paper.

The Southside Representative accepted the nomination for Temporary Chairman during the March 7th meeting after the Northside and East Missoula Representatives threatened to leave the meeting if the present chairwoman was not replaced at once. They said that they were under specific instructions from their parent centers and that, if they left the meeting, it would signal the secession of the Northside and East Missoula centers from the Head Start program, even at the cost of themselves losing the benefits and services of Head Start.

Following the counting of the ballots, at which the Southside Parent Representative beat out the chairwoman for the position of Temporary Chairman, the Executive Director told him: "In the seven years since Head Start has been in Missoula, you're the first male chairman of the Policy Council we've had."

The Southside Representative has alternately described himself as anarchist, anarcho-syndicalist, populist, Jeffersonian Democrat, and anarcho-syndicalist-populist-Jeffersonian-Democrat, depending on the whim of the moment. (From June, 1973 on, the CAP Indians referred to him publicly and privately as a racist and the White adherents to Community Action considered him a naive student.
and a dupe of the Head Start Director). He had consistently attempted, at Policy Council meetings, to project an attitude of aloofness and impartiality, hoping through this example to encourage the Council to raise itself above the petty factionalism and outspoken jealousies that nevertheless seemed endemic. His dual role as a parent representative, as he explained it to his Southside constituency, involved representing the interests of the Southside at Policy Council meetings but also helping to oversee the welfare of the entire program. At times the latter role would conflict with the former. The way he saw it, he told the Southside parents, was that if he were convinced that the only way the entire program would benefit, on any particular issue, would be to sacrifice the interests of the Southside, then he would feel morally obligated to sacrifice them. The Southside parents agreed with this stance. The Southside Representative and the other Southside parents recognized that the latter had the right to recall him if they ever came to feel that he was not representing them properly and the Southside Representative encouraged them to exercise this right should they ever feel it necessary.

The Southside Representative did not want to be the permanent chairman. He presented two arguments to those who suggested that he accept the nomination on March 27th. First, he did not have the time. He had neglected his
studies as much as he dared and he could not afford the
time that he would be required to spend attending all the
meetings that the former chairwoman attended. It was
pointed out to him that the former chairwoman attended
meetings and conferences unnecessarily, that he should
not have to spend more than one or two hours a week working
on Head Start affairs than he was spending now. His second
argument was that, since most of the more active program
participants were women, it should be a woman to hold the
position of Policy Council chairman. This argument was
deflated when one Policy Council member told him, "I think
it should be whoever we [women] say it should be." When
representatives from five of the seven Head Start centers
informed him that their centers wanted him to be the next
chairman and requested him to accept the nomination, he
agreed to enter the "race." He stated, however, that he
intended to hold the chairmanship only until June, that
he was expecting to receive a fellowship to study one of the
East Asian languages that summer at a midwestern university,
and that all he wanted to try to do was to re-establish the
Council as a coherent policy-making body before he left
for the summer. These conditions were acceptable to those
who were drafting him. He ran unopposed (and won). The
Policy Council Secretary was re-elected and a Vice-
chairwoman elected.

Following the counting of the ballots at the March
27th meeting, the Regional Head Start Community Representative,
who was visiting the program, congratulated the new officers on their election. She then reminded everyone that OEO was being phased out, although the date of closure was uncertain at this time. Head Start did not have to worry about its future, however. Already another non-profit organization in Missoula had offered itself as grantee should MMHR be defunded. The Regional Community Representative pointed out that even if another grantee could not be found locally or was unacceptable to the Office of Child Development (OCD), OCD could itself act as interim sponsor until an acceptable grantee could be found. She said that six weeks would be required to separate Head Start from its current grantee and to decide upon a new one. She once again assured everyone present that Head Start's future looked bright. Evidence of this lay in the fact that although OEO was being defunded, Head Start nationally had recently received an increased budget. The impetus for this increase had apparently been President Nixon.

Following her short essay, the Head Start Director asked the Council to consider separating the Head Start fiscal account from Community Action's. Currently, all federal monies received, as far as anyone immediately connected with Head Start knew, went into a single agency bank account.

The Policy Council Chairman knew that this was coming. The day before, the Head Start Director had told
him that Head Start was approximately $5,000 in the red. The bookkeeper was unable to explain this, as was the Head Start Director. According to the Head Start Director's calculations of Head Start expenditures, Head Start should have been in the black by several thousand dollars.

Now the Head Start Director cited this conversation with the bookkeeper and suggested that Head Start could do better by looking after its own money. He then asked the bookkeeper to confirm that the conversation cited had, in truth, taken place. The bookkeeper confirmed this but said that he had been mistaken at the time he had talked to the Head Start Director. Actually, Head Start was about $1200 in the black. The Council then questioned him as to the source of his mistake and his failure to inform the Head Start Director that he had given him erroneous information initially. The bookkeeper responded that he was a Community Action employee, not a Head Start employee, and as such he was not obligated to keep the Head Start Director constantly informed. On other questions, he was evasive.

The Council decided to call in the Fiscal Officer. She was not immediately available and while they waited for her, they went on to other business. There was the Daycare issue.

Through this time I was the chairman of the budget committee [of the Policy Council]. We had been appointed by [the former chairwoman] in January. She had appointed me the chairman. . . . We met many times early in the year. We soon found that many things
(mostly small but nevertheless items that [were] usually covered in a budget and that certainly have to be paid for) were not included in the present budget. All of the centers had requested a center-by-center breakdown of the budget. This was due to many things—one was that some of the centers were being used verbally as reasons for lack in the budget in other areas [i.e., Purportedly, expenditures in some centers created a dearth of monies in others], also they felt they could better know what their center could do if they had this breakdown . . . .

As I recall, there was a figure written in the Day Care budget cutting their paper supplies by $150. A real tirade came from Day Care. We learned that [the former chairwoman] had gone to their meeting (she is a former Day Care parent) and had told them that we were touching their money, that we were going to cut them, that they were not represented on the budget committee. She implied that they were deliberately not represented. [The former chairwoman] had appointed that committee. She had neglected to place one of them on the committee. I had told [her] in committee and out that we would welcome any and all parent-participants. I felt that there were people that didn't serve on the Council who were nevertheless interested. I had asked if there was any better time to hold these meetings. [The former chairwoman] had made it clear that the daytime was best for her. It was not best for me as my husband went to school and I had to hire a babysitter. I missed the end of a budget committee meeting in which a woman from Day Care arrived and accused us of damaging their budget. The other people on the budget committee were angry because of the strategy. It would have been fine if [the former chairwoman] had reminded the Day Care that they had no one on the committee, and that they should. We would have been glad to see them. But it was felt that she intentionally alienated them from us. I talked to
[a teacher aide who was also a Daycare mother] during this time, knowing that she was an employee who worked with Day Care. I told her that I felt that Day Care didn't know that we were all a part of Head Start and that if we saw each other's problems that we could work together for the benefit of the program. The conversation was very friendly, and I thought that the communication gap would soon be closed. I was told by [the teacher aide] that Day Care was meeting that night. I asked if they might like to have me there for awhile to answer questions. She said she thought they might. I told her that I didn't want to go unless I was invited as I didn't want to have them feel that I crashed the meeting. I told her that I would sit at home that evening with a babysitter and that if they wanted me to come down all they had to do was call. They did not call. [Independently and without the knowledge of the Budget Committee Chairwoman, the Head Start Director had made the same arrangement with the same teacher aide for the same night. He, also, was not called. My own investigation revealed that the teacher aide did not inform the Daycare parents of the offer of either person to attend the Daycare meeting to answer parents' questions. In the late spring and summer, Daycare parents castigated the Head Start Director for his failure to show any interest in Daycare.]

I asked a number of Day Care people later if they had ever been told that other members of the Council and myself were willing to come and answer questions. I was told that messages had never been transmitted. I had sent this same message (that I was willing to answer questions) by way of [the former chairwoman]. Regarding the Day Care and the communication gap: when the new Day Care budget representative attended an assessment committee meeting and all we discussed was budget, she stated that they didn't use the services of MMHR. She stated that they could survive on the same budget without the benefit of the MMHR center.
I had asked her who would do the secretarial duties—didn’t they receive the messages that were sent out almost daily by the center? She replied that they threw that "worthless stuff" in the garbage cans. That same week I was [told] by a Day Care mother who had been in the program for over two months that she had never been given any notes or communications, that she didn’t even know that Day Care had a regular group that met. This gal is not the type to remain uninformed . . . , and she was genuinely surprised to find that they had such a group. I contacted [the Head Start Director] at that time and asked him if he would instruct the teachers to not throw these communications in the garbage, if they had in fact been doing so, and to remind them that this was our chief means of communication.

The Day Care -WIN/ADC\(^{18}\) money conflict had been raised many times. [The Executive Director] stated at one time that the money was reimbursement funds to be used in the agency. Then at the assessment meeting at which only budget was discussed he told the Day Care people that it had to be used in the Day Care section. Day Care presented me with a budget that reflected the WIN/ADC funds in the total figure—about $11,000 over the budget which had been approved by Denver. There had been a lot of time and effort spent on this proposal. They told me that this would be presented at the next Council meeting. I told them that they could but that the Council could not possibly approve it or any other money issue until we knew where the entire budget stood. Even minor changes by the Council in the budget (i.e., teacher raises) which had been made by the Council without first looking at the budget were causing problems. This is not to say that they couldn’t be solved but that the money had to be reallocated. There would be a bottom in the bucket sometime. My principal concern with the WIN/ADC money was to find out the correct use of the money—[the Head Start Director] and [the Executive Director] presented opposing views that day. The Day Care people stated that they wished to expand the program to 60 children.
[The Executive Director] seemed to approve and encourage this suggestion. I did not know if the physical facilities would handle this and I also did not know if the fact that we were funded for 35 children meant that we could only have 35 children there. Later we were told by Denver that 35 meant 35 with the exception that absences could be predicted and the program could be slightly bigger so that even with absences that 35 (approximately) would attend every day. [The Executive Director] seemed to encourage this disheaval [sic]. I told the people there that I thought that this (the use of WIN/ADC money) was a matter of interpretation and that they should both check into it and find the correct answer as they both (the Head Start Director and the Executive Director) seemed to have a point. Later I was told by an MMHR Board member that [the Executive Director] had stated that we could use this money to support the Board if we didn't get re-funding (quoted from an informant's written statement).

Now, at the March 27th Council meeting, Daycare parents objected to the proposed use of WIN/ADC monies by Head Start, as the Head Start Director advocated. They intended to write, or had written, State Rehabilitation Services (SRS, the state agency responsible for distributing Work Incentive/Aid to Families with Dependent Children monies), requesting a letter from them clarifying the use to which such funds could be legally put. (In a return letter, SRS clearly stipulated that WIN/ADC monies could be used only for the benefit of WIN/ADC recipients. This could include expansion or improvement of Daycare facilities.)

The Executive Director stated that he had been given permission by OEO some years earlier to use AFDC monies for
general agency needs. He said that he would look for the letter which had been sent him by OEO's Regional Director at that time and which explicitly gave him the permission he spoke of. (In fact, a couple of months later, the Executive Director was able to produce this letter. It was dated 1971 and bore the signature of the then OEO Regional Director.)

The Policy Council Chairman placed the issue before the Regional Community Representative: Could SRS monies be used by Community Action for purposes exclusive of the concerns of Head Start? The answer was, no. Could SRS monies be used by Head Start for the benefit of the entire program, including but not restricted to Daycare? "It could be interpreted that way," she answered. The Council decided that the safest thing to do would be to do nothing until SRS replied to Daycare's letter.

The Fiscal Officer finally arrived. She was visibly nervous, her body and her voice, when at last she spoke, shaking. At first she was evasive in responding to questions concerning the fiscal status of Head Start. Then she grew angry and refused to answer any questions that the Council put to her, declaring that the Council had no right to call her in like this to question her. The Council decided to ask the Board to separate the Head Start account from Community Action's.

The Executive Director stood up. He said that he could see what was happening now, that he could see that
there was a conspiracy to separate Head Start from Community Action. (It would appear that, at Regional level, there probably was such collusion. In Missoula, however, neither the Council nor the Head Start Director were part of it.)

The Council Chairman stated that the Council did not at all intend to separate the two programs. Another member of the Council said that when she voted to separate the accounts she had not been thinking of separating the two programs entirely, but, given the Executive Director's reaction, she would think about it now.

The Executive Director seemed convinced of the Council's sincerity. He apologized for what he called his "paranoia." He said that he would support the Council's bid for separate accounts, "but for other reasons." He did not say what his reasons were, nor did he specify what he thought were the Council's reasons. (The Council had responded more to the behaviors of the Fiscal Officer and the bookkeeper than to any deep-seated conviction. At this time, the Council had no suspicion of embezzlement but did see evidence of sloppy fiscal management.)

Following the meeting, the Regional Community Representative took the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman out for "a drink" on the occasion of the Chairman's having become a father for the third time. The Chairman did not want to have to think any more that night so he got drunk. His memory of the remainder of that
evening is hazy, but he does recall that, shortly before leaving the bar, he turned to the Regional Community Representative and asked, "What if there is no opportunity?" It seemed to him, he said, that the entire war on poverty had its premise in the notion that jobs were available and all one had to do was to educate and train people so that they would feel self-confident enough to look for and find work. But what if there is no opportunity? If there are no jobs, does this mean that these people are simply being fed on illusion, and that, in actuality, they can hope for no better than to become permanent dependents of the bureaucracy?

The Regional Community Representative smiled and shrugged. She had given up asking those kinds of questions, she said.

After March, 1973, the flow of information between the Head Start Director and the Policy Council was unimpeded. The Policy Council Chairman, recalling his years of military service, felt that no intelligent action could be taken that was not based on accurate information. The Head Start Director agreed. Both men were agreed, too, that regardless of behavioral distinctions that might arise from cultural or class differences, all Head Start parents and children should be treated as though these distinctions did not exist. The Policy Council Chairman, particularly, was convinced that all people responded to reasonable, honest, and fair argument. He endeavored to turn the Council into
an open forum where different views pertaining to the problems encountered in the classrooms and parent centers could be expressed. The Council, then, could also act as problem-solver. All policy pertinent only to Head Start and only to the program in its entirety was to be made by the Policy Council, in accordance with its by-laws (the by-laws were approved by the MMHR Board in April). Larger issues were to be left to Community Action, local decisions to the individual Parent Center, again in accordance with the by-laws.

The Head Start Director was especially concerned with economic matters. He wanted to pursue the matter of the budget. He could not properly administer the program, he said, unless he knew how much money the program had. He said also that he suspected that Head Start monies were being used to finance CAP projects, exclusive of Head Start.

In April, the February issue of the MMHR Action News, the agency newsletter, was finally released. The Executive Director had suppressed it for two months because, according to informants, it contained an article written by the Head Start Director in which the latter advocated "greater involvement of low income people in the political processes which were their rights under the Constitution. He was advocating this involvement at the 'grass roots' level" (quoted from an informant's written statement).
In this article, the Head Start Director stated:

In looking at our [the agency's] position now, it becomes evident that we are barely able to help but a handful of those that need it. With a limited staff, limited funds, and limited time, I think we must stop and re-evaluate our position, and perhaps take on a new direction . . . . Federal administration priorities are based on program effectiveness and efficiency . . . since this is the direction government is taking, we have not any other choice but to follow along, spending our money more wisely and tightening our belts generally. If we do not or cannot do this, we may not survive. And if we don't survive, our 9,000 disadvantaged neighbors will be left out in the cold (quoted in an informant's written statement: emphasis the Head Start Director's).

Apparently, between February and April, the Executive Director had been unable to decide whether or not to release the newsletter for distribution. When it was released, the Head Start Director's article had been excised.

The Policy Council Budget Committee meetings took place on April third and fourth. On the first day, the Executive Director was questioned extensively by the Committee as to monies coming in to Head Start from state and federal sources and to their distribution. The Policy Council Secretary wrote of the events of these days:

Shortly following the meeting in which we had questioned [the Executive Director] extensively on the budget he approached me in the back office . . . . [The Head Start Director] had just left the room. [The Executive Director] asked me if I realized that [my husband] couldn't work while I voted or vice-versa. He really caught me off guard as I had felt that I was following the rules completely.
I also was surprised and hurt as I felt that [the Executive Director] had been asked if we were allright [sic] in this matter and he had said yes. [The previous January the Executive Director apparently had told the Policy Council Secretary that her husband, who was employed as a janitor by the Southside Center, was classified as contract-labor rather than staff. Thus, she was eligible to vote on the Council. The Head Start Director apparently did not know until April that the Secretary and the Southside janitor, who also did public relations work for the agency, were related.] I didn't state my feelings as I couldn't have related properly at that moment. I felt betrayed. I told [the Executive Director] that the matter would be settled before the next Council meeting. When I sat down [the Vice-Chairwoman] made some reference to the fact that [the Executive Director] had approached her but that he hadn't found any broken rules. I don't remember her exact words. I was deep in thought as to the word staff [emphasis the Secretary's]—how could a contract janitor working 30 hours and supervised by the Southside center be staff? When [the Head Start Director] came back I asked him if a janitor was staff. I told him the problem. He said that he would find the exact wording of the ruling and also contact Legal Services for me. I felt that he believed that the working [sic] was staff. I do not condone the fact that the point was not brought out by [the Head Start Director]—except that he may have not known that [my husband] and I were married—but the ruling should have been read earlier in the year for everyone's benefit. When I thought about it more reasonably that evening I thought that maybe this was one of those many Federal rules which is read and not used and forgotten for many years or months and then remembered and rechecked sometimes after an offense. I told my husband this.

It became apparent within a day or two that this was not the case. I am convinced now that [the Executive Director] was trying to find ways to exert [sic] pressure on Council members that opposed him.
[The Executive Director] approached [my husband] and implied that I had over-reacted to the situation. That it had been "unfortunate timing." But towards the end of that conversation he stated that people who had been in this situation before had decided that the money was the most important and had given up the vote. This was the first time that we were aware that this had happened before. We later learned that this had happened many times before, that sometimes [the Executive Director] had let it go on for quite awhile, that he had even contacted Denver before for an exception. I felt that we were being personally attacked. I told my husband that I feared for his OEO sponsored work-study Public Relations job. I said that the next step would be that he would be fired from this to apply more money pressure on us. Before we had reached a decision as to what to do the Council brought it up at a ... meeting. [The Executive Director] denied planning it. He also said that the timing was "unfortunate" that he had also approached [the wife of the delegate from Central Trades and Labor] at the same time. [She] had substitute-taught for a time after [her husband] was on the Council. [The Central Trades and Labor delegate] was another member that opposed [the Executive Director] from time to time. [The Head Start Director] admitted that he was at fault in this matter. We asked if she or [her husband] would be attacked in the future as she had no intention of working again. In fact, she said that she would contribute her hours and work. I don't know if she ever cashed the paycheck. [The wife of the Labor Council delegate never had been paid for her work. Following these meetings, she received an agency check signed by the Executive Director. She called the Policy Council Chairman for advice. He told her that if she needed the money, to cash the check but, if she did not need or want the money, to "void" it and return it. He suggested that she telephone the Head Start Director to obtain his advice as well. His advice was the same. She "voided" the check and,
after having a copy made for her own records, returned it to the Executive Director."

[The Executive Director] said that it was alright as long as it didn't happen again. We learned at that time that [an agency consultant who had served on the Board Evaluation Committee] was also being attacked [in a new way, one which would ultimately destroy his academic career]—that the attacks had all started within one day of each other. [The Executive Director] declared it "unfortunate."

On the second day of the Budget Committee meeting, Thursday, April fourth, the conference room quickly filled with low-income Board members and staff members aligned with CAP, none of whom had been present the day before. As soon as the Chairman called the meeting to order, the Executive Director declared that neither the Policy Council Secretary nor the Labor Council delegate were entitled to vote, as both had violated nepotism regulations. The Executive Director described the violations and said that it was "unfortunate" that these violations had not been caught earlier. The Secretary's face contorted and she began to cry. She left the meeting to go to the bathroom to wash her face. The Labor Council delegate protested, saying that his wife had never received any money for her substitute teaching. The Executive Director insisted that she had.

Later in the meeting the Executive Director stated that he had had the annual HEW audit postponed from March 31st to May 31st. He had taken this action without the knowledge of the Board, the Policy Council or the Head
Start Director.

However, they were not fiscal matters that occupied the thoughts of the Policy Council Chairman for the next week. Rather, it was the fact that "his" people, Council members, had been coldheartedly and publicly attacked and humiliated. He would, by God, have his revenge.

For a week, he tried to think of a way to retaliate. His anger, however, interfered with his reason; he was unable to devise a satisfactory method. The "method" came at last from another Council member. At the next Council meeting, they would vote "no confidence" in the Executive Director.

On the Sunday before the Council meeting of April 16th, several members of the Council met informally at the Southside Center. Others were contacted by telephone and kept abreast of proposed tactics. The Head Start Director was told explicitly not to attend; retaliation would be the business of the Council alone.

The Chairman requested the Parent Representatives to bring with them all parent complaints and documentation of wrongs done by CAP that they might have. He wanted to be able to determine the several alternative tactical directions the Council might go before committing himself to any one.

Proof was available now, in the form of the originals and copies, of fraudulent babysitting claims submitted by the former Chairwoman. (She had not been invited to the
Sunday meeting, although she still retained a Council seat.

One center had taken up a petition to have a nutrition aide who worked with that center replaced. In general terms, the grounds for dissatisfaction appeared to be based on the aide's incompetence and lack of forethought and consideration for the feelings of both parents and children; this, according to the parents' point of view.

The Chairman was already aware of the petition. The Head Start Director had shown him a copy of it the previous Friday. The center concerned wanted to present it to the Council. The Head Start Director, the Policy Council Chairman, and the Policy Council Secretary, who also had seen the petition, were agreed that this was an administrative matter rather than one for the Policy Council. No one wanted to see the nutrition aide fired. The Head Start Director said that he would be able to find another position for her within Head Start. Now, on Sunday, the Parent Representative from that center agreed to withdraw the petition and to allow the Head Start Director to handle the matter if the others in her Parent Center would allow it. She thought that they would. (The petition was withdrawn the following day.)

The Chairman requested the Parent Representative whose center possessed the documentation against the former Chairwoman to "sit on it" for awhile. The immediate target, he felt, was the Executive Director. The Parent Representative agreed.
This left the move for the no confidence vote. All present were agreed on its propriety. There would be no upheaval in the program as a result of it, but at the same time it would allow the Council to satisfy their desire for revenge.

Following this discussion, the Chairman telephoned the Board Chairwoman. He had become aware, by this time, of the Board's concern over the possible closure of the Alberton Head Start center. The Head Start Director and he had agreed that it was through no fault of the Alberton parents or Head Start staff that the center was so grossly over-income, and that all efforts should be made to keep the center open. He now assured the Board Chairwoman that the Council would instruct the staff to canvas door-to-door to locate low-income families and that, if need be, the Council itself would also do this. The Board Chairwoman seemed pleased at this evidence of the Council's new vitality.

On Tuesday, April 16th, the Head Start Policy Council voted "no confidence" in MMHR's Executive Director. I have described the tumult that followed in Chapter III.

The motion to adjourn already had been seconded when a young woman in the middle of the audience suddenly stood up, obviously upset. She said that she really didn't understand what had been going on during the meeting this evening and she didn't really care. What she did know was that she was going to lose her job and that nobody cared.
This was the young woman against whom the petition had been drafted. She knew about the petition and she felt that she was a victim of racial discrimination on the part of Head Start. She was Indian, she said, although from her appearance one could not, with confidence, have classified her ethnicity. (When one of the drafters of the petition was later questioned about his motives in attempting to have the woman disassociated from his center, he denied that "race" had entered into his thinking. "Hell," he said, "I thought she was Italian." But perhaps he did not like Italians.)

The Council Chairman assured her that she was not going to be fired, that she would be assigned to another job in Head Start. "I was scalped once" by racists in Head Start, she said, and she didn't intend to allow it to happen again.19

The Council decided to set up a Grievance Committee meeting for later in the week to try to iron out the problem and especially to soothe popular feelings. Two Council members suggested that, as long as there were several Community Representative seats vacant on the Council, Indian groups should be solicited to submit the names of candidates to fill some of them. This action was in response to the Parent Involvement Director and the Head Start Secretary accusing the Council of racial prejudice. For the moment, at least, aggrieved feelings appeared to have been mollified.
The meeting was adjourned.

Immediately following adjournment the Chairman caught the attention of the young nutrition aide. As he approached her, he noted the Parent Involvement Director also approaching the young woman from behind. It occurred to him that not once since he had become Chairman had he been able to talk to an Indian man or woman at the agency without the Parent Involvement Director participating in the conversation or looking on. She seemed to be omnipresent.

The Chairman told the two women that he would support the Council's seating of Indian Community Representatives, that he thought that much of the hostility that was being expressed was owing to the lack of dialogue between Indians and Whites--"a failure to communicate." (The previous autumn, the Chairman had attempted, somewhat feebly, to establish communications between Indians and low-income Whites. He had hoped to draw the two groups together along an economic idea: that is, that poor people were poor people, regardless of race or ethnicity. He had hoped that, together, the two groups could field a "poor people's candidate" for the City Council elections in the spring. The Whites he spoke with were willing, but he had found Indians in Missoula to be so factionalized that he had given up the idea. Now, he saw the opportunity to get representatives of different Indian groups onto the Policy Council as the chance to resurrect his idea of the previous fall, at least in part.) The two women nodded their heads.
in agreement. The Chairman told them that, owing to his position, he could not treat Indians differently from Whites, even to benefit Indians, for to do so would be racist behavior on his part. The two women agreed here, too.

The conference room, during the Grievance Committee meeting, was packed. A number of Indian people whom the Chairman had not seen before were present, as well as a number of Daycare staff (I was informed by several Daycare staff members some months later that the Executive Director had encouraged them to attend, telling them that all grievances, whether of an administrative or policy nature, would be heard. The meeting was set up, of course, only to give the nutrition aide the chance to be heard in full and, hopefully, to resolve "racial" hostilities.)

One rather striking young Indian man looked out of place. He was younger and taller than the other Indians present and his face and eyes did not appear as hard as those of the others. The Head Start Director asked him what brought him here. "I heard you were a racist," the young Indian told him. He said that he had come to find out if it was true.

The Head Start Director challenged him to cite one fact to support that accusation. The young Indian shrugged. "That's what people say," he said.

The Grievance Committee was especially interested in learning who had planted the idea of "race" as the
motivation behind the petition to remove the nutrition aide
from the particular Head Start center in the mind of the
nutrition aide herself. (She was still under the impression
that she was going to be fired.) Again and again, various
Committee members asked who had told her these things. Again
and again, various Indians insisted that these things were
true and common knowledge. The confusion was abetted by the
Daycare staff insisting how unfair it was that Daycare mothers
who were also agency employees were not permitted to vote
on policy issues in Daycare Parent meetings. (This, of
course, had nothing to do with the matter at hand.)

The Chairman at last threatened to adjourn the
meeting unless he could regain order. He asked those whom
he did not know to introduce themselves. Three of the
Indians identified themselves as representing AIM, Qua Qui,
and Indian Studies (Indian Studies denies having sent a
"representative" to this meeting. Cf. Chapter II) respectively.
The Chairman asked the three how they regarded racism. The
"representatives" of Qua Qui and Indian Studies replied in
humanistic terms, saying how invidious it was and how so
many White people were racists, even without themselves
realizing it. The AIM representative (the tall young man
previously referred to) said, "Racism is a tool." The
Chairman agreed.

The Parent Involvement Director (representing Qua
Qui) then asked the Chairman what were his feelings about
racism.
"I don't have any feelings about it," he replied. This was not quite true. In fact, he had exceedingly strong feelings concerning racism. As a child, he had seen his father beaten by Georgia "crackers" because he had bought a car for a Black man. But he felt now that, as Policy Council Chairman, he could hope only to affect the behaviors of those in attendance at Policy Council and Policy Committee meetings and even then, only while the meetings were in progress. Personal sentiments were not his concern. As long as "his" people acted together toward a common and agreed mission, he did not care whether they thought that Jews had tails or Blacks were the descendants of Ham (provided, of course, that these beliefs were not publicly expressed, as they might then interfere with the accomplishment of the mission). But he said none of this.

"That's the trouble with people," the Parent Involvement Director said. "Not enough people feel anything" (emphasis hers).

The Chairman turned his attention to the Daycare staff. They had not read the regulations prohibiting staff involvement in policy decisions. They knew only that the Head Start Director would not allow them to vote on issues which concerned them. They were not interested in his citing federal regulations.

Both the Head Start Director and the Chairman pointed out that it would be to their benefit to acquaint themselves with the regulations, that, in fact, some of them would be
without jobs now had they not been protected by regulations. The Head Start Director pointed at one of the outreach workers (the same one who had used threats against the Board Evaluation Committee and who had illegally voted to retain the Executive Director at the March 30th Board meeting) and told him that as early as last October the Executive Director had pressured him, the Head Start Director, to fire him because he was not doing his job. The Head Start Director had consistently refused, because, according to the worker's job performance evaluations, there were no grounds for dismissal. (Except in the cases of the Head Start Director and those staff members who responded to his authority, agency employees filled out their own job performance evaluations.) Parents who had complained that the outreach worker was "lazy" refused to put their complaints in writing. (Other informants verify both of these points concerning this particular outreach worker.)

The outreach worker refused to believe it. "If [the Executive Director] wanted me fired," he said, "he'd be man enough to fire me himself."

Others of the Parent Involvement staff held similar views. They felt that they worked for the Executive Director. They were entirely unfamiliar with the process of job termination and could not agree, when asked, what was the process by which they had obtained their jobs in
the first place. (Officially, they should have been hired through the concurrence of the Head Start Director, the Executive Director and a personnel committee composed of Head Start parents.) The Chairman was astounded at their ignorance concerning their own job security. He told them this.

The Committee returned its attention to the nutrition aide. One Committee member asked her point-blank: Who had told her of the petition in the first place? Who had told her that she was going to be fired?

"[The Executive Director]," she answered ingenuously.

"So it was [the Executive Director], after all," murmured one of the CAP Indians.

The Chairman told all present that the nutrition aide never had been in any danger of being fired, that, if she wished, a job on the Parent Involvement staff was available to her, and that all of this had been handled administratively by the Head Start Director before any of the uproar occurred.

"Then what are we doing here?" said someone whose name the Chairman already had forgotten.

"That's what I would like to know," responded one of the Committee members (he meant, apparently, that he was curious as to what had brought so many "uninvolved" people to the meeting).

The nutrition aide, however, still felt that she had been victimized by White racism.
The Chairman took out his pen and scrawled on a yellow legal sheet: "The Missoula Mineral Head Start Policy Council stands unalterably opposed to racism in any form."

He handed it to the nutrition aide. "Is this acceptable to you?" he asked. She read it and said that it was.

He then read it aloud and asked if it was acceptable to the Committee. It was. They would recommend that the Policy Council ratify it as a resolution. (It was ratified in May and was hailed as a moral victory by the CAP Indians. One year later, a new Policy Council, under similar pressure from Qua Qui, passed a similar resolution. This, also, was regarded as a moral victory by Qua Qui.)

In early May the Regional Director of OEO telephoned Missoula Mineral Head Start's Director. "Watch your ass," he told him. "[The Executive Director's] after it."20 "I already know that," the Head Start Director replied. OEO's Regional Director said that there wasn't much he could do to help him.

Throughout the month of May, the Parent Involvement Director, the Head Start Secretary, an outreach worker, two nutrition aides, and the former nutrition aide (now an outreach worker) monitored the Head Start Director's telephone calls on extension lines.

On May 21st, the Policy Council met. The former Policy Council Chairwoman and the Daycare mother who had
illegally voted to retain the Executive Director at the March 30th Board meeting (and who now represented herself as the alternate to the Daycare Parent Representative) moved to abrogate the Policy Council's vote of no confidence in the Executive Director. The remainder of the Council voted against abrogation.

Board elections were held in May, having been postponed for a month to allow the Board time to study various plans for Board reorganization. (No substantial organizational change was made.) One informant, affiliated with Head Start, later wrote: "The MMHR Board elections in May--what can I say--I kissed the Head Start program goodbye. It would only be a matter of time."

Prior to the elections, neighborhood nominating committees held meetings by which to nominate candidates for seats on the Board. These meetings were to have been advertised. The advertisement for one meeting appeared in the Missoulian the day after the meeting had taken place. In another case, one woman learned by reading an advertisement in the newspaper that a meeting was to be held at her house. She bought cookies and cupcakes and prepared coffee for her expected guests. Nobody showed up. But it was from this "meeting" that one of the new Board's officers was nominated.

For the first time in the Board's history, agency staff was to have a representative on the Board. The
Executive Director attributed the staff's desire for Board representation to their feeling that he had become ineffectual as a leader and, so, they needed for their own security to establish their presence with an alternative potential power base, the Board. As staff personnel were prohibited from holding seats on the Board, an outsider would have to be approved and elected by staff. As several Head Start teachers told me, an assistant professor from the university suddenly appeared at the agency one day and began behaving as though he had already been elected staff's representative to the Board. Head Start personnel generally did not like him and intended to vote against him. The election was held at mid-day on a week day, while most teachers, the bulk of the Head Start staff, were in their classrooms. The assistant professor was elected.

For several weeks the Policy Council Chairman had been considering the relationship of the federal government to the poor. It struck him that the poor, that is, the "welfare poor," had no real economic base outside of the Congress and, sometimes, the presidency. It was the Chairman's thinking that, before the poor could acquire a political voice that would be heard consistently, and a measure of autonomy concomitant with that voice, they needed a secure economic base from which to begin. Too often, the political dealing of the federal government included the poor, if at all, only as objects by which to barter for political
advantage; thus, President Johnson's "guns and butter" policy, with the political Right arguing against the butter and the political Left arguing against the guns. The poor had become dependent on the strength and caprice of the Left. If they had any friends within the Right, they were certainly not outspoken. To the Chairman's thinking, such dependence was abhorrent. To the extent that American cultural values elevated individual autonomy and self-reliance, such dependence was also un-American (the Chairman was a patriot; he was also a leveller.)

The Chairman requested a meeting with the Head Start Director, Head Start's Supportive Services Director, CAP's Planning Director (in lieu of the Executive Director, whom the Chairman considered too "paranoid" to accept his views without looking for the personal threat which any idea originating out of Head Start surely must contain), and an agency consultant. The meeting was held one day during the middle of May at a coffee shop in town.

It seemed to him, the Chairman said, that the conflict methodology employed by Community Action in past years was out of date. He advocated, instead, cooperation with locally established institutions. The Planning Director objected. He was committed, he said, to conflict as the method by which to promulgate social change. The Chairman challenged him: what long-range goals had been accomplished by engendering conflict in Missoula? None,
the Planning Director grudgingly admitted. The Chairman stated that, in his opinion, Community Action for several years had been attempting to create a true social class of the "welfare poor," primarily by funneling federal monies to them and by imposing upon them an ideology designed to promote class consciousness ("That's very perceptive of you," the Planning Director agreed).

The reason Community Action had failed, the Chairman said, was that the agency itself was economically dependent upon the federal government and agency employees recognized that the futures of their careers were dependent upon adhering to the purposes of OEO. Despite OEO's rhetoric of militancy, it was essentially a welfare bureaucracy little different from others of its kind (the Planning Director was visibly angry at this point). Because OEO's budget was approved by Congress, OEO was dependent upon congressional political perceptions and behavior no less than was say, HEW. Although Community Action had been periodically successful in using conflict to promote political solidarity among the poor, the only poor people who had remained consistently loyal to the agency were those who had found jobs within the agency or those for whom the promise of jobs seemed likely to be fulfilled. The Chairman suggested that there was a direct correlation between OEO's annually decreasing budget and its decreasing effectiveness at community organization (the Planning Director thought that
this was probably true. To my knowledge, however, no statistical correlation of this problem has been attempted.)

The point the Chairman stressed, however, was that because Community Action was the "tail-end" of a federal bureaucracy dependent for its success on Congress' generosity (and the President's willingness to utilize allocated resources), Community Action could hope for no more than to increase the size of its clientele. The Chairman felt that it had been a mistake on the part of the federal government to emphasize money in drawing the poor together as a community.

The Chairman suggested that they look at the structural arrangement of Head Start. Head Start was organized by Parent Center and, while each Parent Center had teachers assigned to it, political power was in the hands of the parents themselves. While it was true that, initially, it had been economic resources that had drawn parents together, it was the social bonds of empathy and rapport that had held them together. Evidence for this lay in the fact that during the period when the Policy Council and Parent Center officers had foregone meeting allowances, other parents as well had voluntarily given up both meeting allowances and babysitting reimbursements. Yet, these same parents were those most committed to the program. Even those parents who had stopped attending meetings could still be impressed to participate in those Head Start affairs which they found
aesthetically or socially appealing, i.e., classes on bread-baking and butchering wild game, associations for single parents, etc. The growing conflict between Community Action and Head Start had resulted in parent participation dropping off rather than increasing.

The Chairman had noted that Parent Center committees, such as those established to investigate the most efficient uses to which the nutrition grant could be put, developed friendship networks among themselves which cross-cut Parent Center boundaries and ignored the provincialism endemic to the Parent Centers. When the Southside was without transportation to get the children to their classes because the bus had broken down, it was the brother of one of the parents who had prevailed upon his employer, the owner of a garage, to allow him to repair the bus himself (with help from some of his friends, also unconnected with Head Start), using company tools and space. A store in town had been prevailed upon to donate paint when the Southside parents wanted to repaint a classroom.

The point the Chairman was trying to make was that, while Head Start parents were economically linked to the federal government, personal ties and connections were used to get those things done in which the government had no interest. It was no accident that the only community organizations which had been created by the agency--i.e., the Low Income Group for Human Treatment (LIGHT) and the
Senior Citizens' Center—were, in fact, initiated from within Head Start. CAP had limited itself to administering programs given it by federal welfare bureaucracies. Within Head Start, there appeared to be a structural impetus toward expansion.

The Chairman wanted to encourage this tendency by setting up "special interest" groups for Head Start parents, as provided for by the regulations governing Head Start. These groups would be based in the Parent Centers rather than in the agency itself. Thus, they would be free from political turmoil not of their own making. They could be organized around whatever particular interests the parents themselves had—e.g., cooking, sewing, automobile repair, political education. While Parent Center-based, parents who shared these special interests would be drawn together regardless of Center affiliation. At the same time, although these groups would originate from Head Start, there was no reason why participants had to be limited to Head Start parents. Ultimately, he hoped that Head Start participants would be able to establish personal relationships with members of local service organizations. There might be the possibility of performing community service in return for community attention and aid when necessary.

To the Chairman's surprise, the Head Start Director had been thinking along the same lines. He intended to encourage Head Start staff personnel to join various
community service organizations in an attempt to focus community attention, and possibly finances, on the poor. If nothing else, the poor could respond through the voter's ballot for favors done or not done them (provided, of course, that the poor would vote). The Head Start Director had already joined one such organization himself.

Both men wanted a gradual weaning away of Head Start from federal patronage and to establish similar relationships with local organizations. Both hoped that, given enough time and a semblance of economic security, the poor would be able to equalize the status distinctions that existed between themselves and the non-poor in Missoula and Mineral Counties. Both men regarded congressional allocations to the poor to be a function of political deals made in Congress and between the Congress and the presidency. Neither man trusted the federal government to refrain from cutting back these allocations without notice to or consideration of the poor themselves. When resources derived from local sources, the poor, once there existed a basis for their integration into the community, could make their needs more effectively felt by others in the community.

All present were enthused with the idea of self-sufficiency for the poor and of Head Start's integration into the community. The Chairman asked each man to try independently to develop the plan and to consider ways by which to implement it. He suggested that they meet again in six
weeks, on July 1st, to begin to coordinate ideas and methods. (The Chairman had eschewed any idea of accepting the fellowship to study an East Asian language. There was so much work to be done in Head Start! He would entrust his future to luck.) He wanted something, even if only something tentative, to present to the Council by the beginning of September.

He requested the Planning Director to broach the idea to the Executive Director. It was apparent by May that Community Action, despite the President's plans, was not going to be phased out in the immediate future. (OEO was fighting for its life through the Congress and the courts.) The Chairman felt that his idea presented, in effect, a compromise between Community Action's activism and Head Start's conservatism. He felt that were his plan to be adopted in principle, it would allow for political activity while foregoing the methods of confrontation. At the same time it would permit Head Start to remain a high quality child development program.

The Planning Director saw the possibilities of this. He agreed to present the idea to the Executive Director. He never spoke to the Executive Director about it. He told me the following July that the opportunity to speak never presented itself, that the immediate concerns of the Executive Director were far removed from conceptualizing principles of reorganization.
Summary

President Nixon's freezing of OEO funds inspired Missoula's Community Action agency to attempt to turn Head Start into a "mini-CAP". In order to accomplish this, the Head Start Director and other key Head Start personnel had to be removed. Throughout the winter and spring of 1973, several attempts in this direction were made by CAP. Head Start employees resisted these attempts by appealing to the Board of Directors of MMHR. The new Board, elected in May, would prove, predictably, to be unsympathetic to Head Start employees.

During this same period, the Head Start Policy Council, under new leadership, began to show evidence that it wanted to exercise its authority over its own program independently of Community Action. The CAP leadership attempted to discredit a number of Policy Council members in an apparent attempt to force their resignations. CAP's attempts in this area served only to promote sentiments of solidarity among Policy Council members and between the Council and the Head Start staff, particularly the Head Start Director.

Ironically, the same factors which established Community Action in Missoula--the influx of federal monies, personality, and idealism--through abuse, eventually corrupted the agency. Patronage, personal and ideological antipathies, and scapegoating polarized agency personnel.
To the leadership, both bureaucratic and populist, of Head Start, Community Action had become a menacing anachronism. Most Head Start parents seem to have hoped only that their children would have the opportunity to complete the school year before the program fell apart.
Footnotes

   Government Printing Office, Washington D. C.,

13. In an investigation conducted from September, 1973 to April, 1974, under the unofficial auspices of HEW, the FBI, and the Missoula County Attorney's office, Arthur R. Sakaye was able to establish that:
   1. MMHR's bookkeeper embezzled approximately $18,000 in a 19-month period. The man served eleven months of a five year sentence in the Montana state prison.
   2. As early as 1967, at least one CAP officer was consistently "using federal funds illegally for his own personal gain." This information has been supplied to the FBI and the Missoula County Attorney's office, and is accepted as valid by them.

According to one informant, the attitudes of some CAP staff members during the middle to late sixties were that, considering the responsibilities inherent in the positions they held, they were underpaid. Thus, there was an implied attitude that it was legitimate to make up for the wage deficit.

When I admitted difficulty in comprehending how certain people (certain CAP staff) who were apparently so dedicated to helping the poor could use monies which had been allocated for the benefit of the poor for their own selfish ends, my informant replied that they did not regard that they were depriving the poor. Rather, they were helping to sabotage the establishment by misdirecting federal monies. It is important to note that these monies were, after all, government monies (emphasis mine).

14. In order to transfer amounts of $1,000 or more from one budget allocation to another, the approval of the Regional Office of Child Development was necessary. Lesser amounts could be transferred without the approval of higher authority.

15. During a lull in the meeting, the Executive Director and the Southside Representative became involved in
a heated discussion over the former's stated intent to turn Head Start into a "mini-CAP".

This was the first time the Southside Representative had heard that expression and he asked the Executive Director to clarify what he meant. The Executive Director defined mini-CAP essentially as he would six weeks later during the Board meeting of March 30th, as I have reported above.

The Southside Representative objected that Head Start was first and foremost a children's program. It seemed to him that, should the Executive Director succeed in implementing his plan, children would be left out of the picture.

The Executive Director said that while adults initially were drawn to Head Start owing to their children's attending Head Start classes, Head Start was not a children's program but a method by which to draw people to Community Action.

Neither man would concede ground to the other.

16. Head Start's Policy Council had a voting seat on MMHR's board of directors. This seat was held by the Policy Council Chairwoman. The Policy Council as a whole did not know until February that it was represented on the Board.

Head Start's Daycare center was also represented on the Board, apart from its being represented as a part of Head Start. The reasons for this are unclear but it is likely that Daycare's dual representation was the result of three things:

1. A large portion--$58,000--of Head Start's yearly grant was designated specifically for Daycare, thereby helping to set Daycare apart from the other centers which shared the remainder of the grant.

2. Daycare was the only full-day Head Start center. The others were half-day centers--one class in the morning, another in the afternoon. Daycare thus had problems germane only to itself.

3. The dominant faction (although a minority faction) of Daycare parents was composed of those parents who were also employed by Head Start but who were loyal or obligated to the Executive Director of the agency.
17. Locally, Head Start's Policy Council could include up to seven Community Representatives. The Office of Child Development (Denver) also maintained a position entitled "Community Representative." In order to distinguish between the two, I refer to the former as Community Representatives and to the latter as Regional Community Representative.

18. "WIN/ADC money"—Work Incentive and Aid to Families With Dependent Children funds were linked together so that in order to qualify for both, the mother had either to be enrolled in school or to be working. ADC without WIN funds could be received, however, without meeting either criteria.

19. She did, after all, accept a job on the Parent Involvement staff. One month later, the Policy Council Chairman met her again at the Southside Center where, on Wednesday evenings, an "Indian Beading Class" was conducted. She was wearing a beaded pendant and her hair was loose. The Policy Council Chairman asked if she and the other women present would be willing to teach White women to bead.

In the Chairman's mind was the thought that this effort might renew rapport between the two ethnic groups. At the same time, Indian pride might be enhanced in that, as teachers, the Indian women would be able to see themselves as occupying superior statuses, at least situationally.

"Uh-uh," the woman said, "I don't want anything to do with any White women" (emphasis hers).

20. Head Start's Director was widely believed throughout Montana's antipoverty programs and Missoula's university community, to be a "plant," or an agent, of OEO's Regional Director. Other rumors had it that he was a political appointee to the job. I have already shown the process by which he was hired.

I am aware of no evidence to indicate that the Head Start Director was a Regional "plant." The Head Start Director admitted to being well enough acquainted with OEO's Regional Director to have had "two or three drinks with him." They apparently became acquainted in 1972, when both men were active in Democratic politics in Montana.

I consider it evidence of the Executive Director's "paranoia" that he should regard the Head Start Director as a "plant." As we shall see in chapter five, in June he also called the Policy Council Chairman a "plant."
The Vice-Chairwoman was the former Westside Parent Representative. When she was elected Vice-Chairwoman, the position of Westside Parent Representative became vacant and remained vacant thereafter. The Vice-Chairwoman kept those Westside parents who were interested in the workings of the Policy Council informed. The Alberton Parent Representative attended one meeting in January, then was not seen again by the Council. The Superior Parent Representative kept the parents of both the Superior and Alberton centers informed. I have lumped these centers together as "Mineral County."
By August, the Northside Parent Center had allied with Community Action, as had the Daycare Parent Representative. The majority of Daycare parents, however, had allied with Head Start. Westside parents withdrew from the conflict, as they saw it approaching, before the end of the school year.
CHAPTER V

REACTION AND REVOLUTION

June Was a Busy Month

When the Policy Council Chairman called the agency on June 5th, he had not spoken with the Head Start Director in a week and a half.

"You've heard, huh?" the Head Start Director laughed.

"Heard what?"

"I've been fired."

"What!"

"Actually, I've been suspended. Same difference."

"I'll be right over."

"No," the Head Start Director said. The Parent Involvement Director and the Head Start Secretary had been observing his activities all morning. Others, he was certain, were monitoring his telephone calls. He told the Chairman to meet him at his apartment.

At his apartment, the Head Start Director told the Chairman of the events of the past two days.

The day before, a new agency staff member was hired. His title was "Acting Deputy Director." He was the attorney who was representing MMHR in its fight to force the release of impounded OEO funds. (Other CAP agencies throughout
the country similarly had brought suit against the federal government.)

Later in the day, the Head Start Director had received a telephone call from the Regional Office of Child Development informing him that HEW auditors would be arriving in Missoula to inspect the agency's books on the 6th. He informed the Executive Director of the impending visit.

At eight o'clock this morning the Acting Deputy Director suspended him with pay for ten days. He was told that during this period he was to do or say nothing which might jeopardize the future funding of the agency. The Parent Involvement Director would assume his authority and responsibilities.

When he questioned the legality of his suspension, the Acting Deputy Director told him that he was "the toughest opponent I've ever met." They had met for the first time only five minutes earlier.

According to MMHR's Personnel Manual21 "suspension with pay for ten days" culminated in automatic termination unless the Board refused to concur. In the case of the Head Start Director, the Head Start Policy Council also was required to concur with the decision to terminate.

The Chairman regarded the suspension as a slap in his ideological face. If the Council permitted the firing of the Head Start Director it would, in effect, be saying that it had not the power to do otherwise. The Council would be abdicating its decision-making powers as the Board
had abdicated its own.

The Chairman was certain that the Policy Council would resist. He telephoned the Policy Council Secretary, informed her of the Head Start Director's suspension, and asked her to call the other members of the Executive Committee and to request them to meet on the following afternoon. He instructed her not to call the former Chairwoman who was also a member of the Executive Committee, as she would inform the Executive Director of any move that the Committee might propose. (By now, the former Chairwoman was widely referred to as the Executive Director's "mouthpiece" on the Council.)

The Chairman knew that the bulk of the CAP staff would be in Butte on the afternoon of the 6th attending a show-cause hearing in its suit against the government and that the former Chairwoman would be with them. He would telephone her later in the morning, when he was certain that she already had left for Butte. He would not have to lie, then, if he were later questioned as to whether he had tried to inform all Executive Committee members of the meeting.

The Head Start Director and the Chairman decided to hold a "pre-meeting meeting" the following morning at the Chairman's house. The Head Start Director would contact former dissident Board members who had lost their seats on the Board or who had chosen not to seek re-election. The
Chairman would ask the Policy Council secretary and the delegate from Central Trades and Labor to attend.

The following morning brought the "core" of the Policy Council Executive Committee and the MMHR dissidents together for the first time. Head Start's Supportive Services Director and Education Director also were present, as well as an investigator from OEO's regional office.

The investigator had been in Missoula for a week, attempting to confirm reports that CAP had manipulated the recent Board elections. He said that on the basis of information gained during his investigation OEO's Denver office already had decided to reinstate the old Board until new elections could be held.

The investigator suggested that Head Start consider requesting HEW to separate Head Start from Community Action. He said that about six weeks would be required to separate the two programs and transfer Head Start to a new sponsor. He described the same procedure that OCD's Regional Community Representative had outlined in March. He said that HEW would be receptive to such a proposal from Head Start.

Although the purpose of the morning meeting was to clarify the overall situation so that the Policy Council Chairman could present a coherent analysis to the Executive Committee that afternoon, the OEO investigator dominated it from the moment he walked in the door. By morning's end the atmosphere was so charged with excitement and agitation that
everyone seemed to feel that at last revenge was near.

The Policy Council Executive Committee met formally at two in the afternoon in the conference room of the Head Start building. The former Policy Council Chairwoman was not present. She had not answered her telephone when the Chairman called at eleven o'clock.

The Chairman had invited the press. He felt that by publicizing the Executive Committee's actions he might be able to thwart possible violence which CAP might consider using against Committee members.

He met the Missoulian reporter inside the building. As they waited for the last member of the Executive Committee to arrive, the reporter asked if it were true that the Head Start Director was an Air Force officer. The Chairman said yes, that he was a retired lieutenant colonel.

"Why?" he asked. "Does it make any difference?"

The reporter refused to answer, turning her face away so that the Chairman could not see it.

The Chairman's stomach sank. He knew that another Missoulian reporter had admitted having nurtured a prejudice against the Head Start Director, based on the latter's military background. The Chairman wondered whether this prejudice was contagious and how many Missoulian reporters under the age of thirty so hated the military that they could not see anyone who had been associated with it as an individual rather than a stereotype.
The last Executive Committee member arrived. Present were the Policy Council Executive Committee (sans the former Chairwoman), several of the MMHR dissidents, Head Start's Education Director, the Supportive Services Director, the Missoulian reporter, and the OEO investigator. The Chairman had requested the Head Start Director not to attend, hoping to imply by his conspicuous absence that Head Start as a popular body was exercising its authority.

The Chairman requested the Executive Committee to recommend to the Policy Council the following:

1. The Council refuse to recognize the suspension of the Head Start Director and the appointment of the Parent Involvement Director as "Acting Head Start Director."

2. As the agency organizational chart did not provide for an "Acting Deputy Director," the Council refuse to recognize the authority of the person occupying this position.

The second point was intended to challenge particular procedures used by the Executive Director. Two superiors as well as the Board and the Policy Council had to concur in the decision to terminate the Head Start Director. The Board was controlled by the Executive Director. It would appear that he did not anticipate any resistance from the Policy Council. Even so, until the Acting Deputy Director was hired, the Executive Director held the only agency position superior to that of the Head Start Director.
better," the Chairman said (Bloom: June 7, 1973).

The Executive Committee voted unanimously to refuse to recognize the suspension of the Head Start Director, his replacement by the Parent Involvement Director, and the authority of CAP's Acting Deputy Director and to request HEW to disassociate Head Start from MMHR.

The OEO investigator said he had a plane to catch and left the room.

The Chairman asked the reporter not to publish the names of those who attended the meeting except insofar as they had been primary actors.

"Now, look..."," the reporter began.

"All right. Forget I said anything."

She made a gesture of irritation but honored his request.

A letter describing the Executive Committee's action was sent to the Executive Director. A copy was forwarded to HEW, Denver.22

On the morning of the 7th, the Parent Involvement Director telephoned the Policy Council Chairman at his home. She had drafted a letter which she intended to distribute to Head Start staff personnel. It was a short directive warning Head Start staff not to speak about or participate in the conflict. It contained a strong implication that those personnel who did not adhere to the directive would be reprimanded. It did not specify what forms the reprimands might take.
The Chairman reworded the letter as a request to personnel to keep the conflict limited to those parties who already had declared themselves. He deleted all mention of reprimands.

The Parent Involvement Director agreed to the modification.

The Chairman gave her permission to attach his name to the letter, provided it met with one further qualification: she was not to refer to herself as the Head Start Director or the Acting Head Start Director but by the title of her actual position.

She agreed.

She distributed the letter that day, in its original form. She had not attached the Chairman’s name to it but told several of the Head Start staff that the Chairman had approved it.

Head Start’s State Training Officer (STO) invited Head Start’s leadership to share her office in the basement of the administration building on the University campus. Head Start would need office space, she said, even if it was in exile. She also had access to copying machines.

The Policy Council Chairman expressed reservations concerning Head Start’s use of the STO’s office. The STO might be caught in a compromising position, should it become known that she was actively supporting Head Start against CAP.
The STO dismissed his concern, saying that it was her job to help Head Start and she was doing exactly that.

That same afternoon the Daycare Representative to the Policy Council telephoned the Chairman. He demanded that the Chairman convene a meeting of the entire Policy Council as soon as possible to discuss and vote on the Executive Committee's recommendation to separate Head Start from MMHR.

The Chairman suggested June 12th as the meeting date. He said he would need about five days to prepare the agenda and to notify Policy Council representatives of the meeting in time for them to make arrangements for travel and babysitting.

The Daycare Representative said that June 12th was agreeable to him. Suddenly he shouted into the telephone that the Policy Council Executive Committee did not represent Head Start parents but only itself and that on June 12th, it would be made clear to everyone how the Executive Committee had usurped power.

The Chairman was prevented from presenting his views by the other's insistence, whenever the Chairman attempted to speak, that neither the Chairman nor the Executive Committee represented anybody but themselves and so had nothing to say worth listening to.

Both men hung up in anger.

That night, the Regional Director of HEW telephoned the Head Start Director at his apartment. The Regional Director said that he knew of the problems Head Start had had
with CAP and that he intended to separate the programs as quickly as possible. He said that the Deputy Regional Program Director of the Office of Child Development and the Regional Community Representative for Head Start would arrive in Missoula either Sunday, the 10th, or Monday, the 11th. They would inform the Chairwoman of the (old) Board of HEW's intent to suspend Head Start grants which had been awarded to MMHR. And they would review all documentation which would justify separation which Head Start had collected by that time.

The following morning, the Policy Council Chairman issued a letter over his signature requesting all Head Start staff personnel and parents provide statements reflecting personal knowledge of Community Action activities which had transgressed the interests of Head Start. The letter stated that these personal statements would be used as "documentation" to establish grounds for separation. Copies would be forwarded to OEO and HEW, but aside from this disclosure they would be held in strict confidentiality by the Policy Council Chairman. The letter was dated June 6th, one day prior to the Regional Director's Call, two days before it was actually written and distributed. It was worded so as to appear to be a response to the Parent Involvement Director's directive warning staff not to join in the conflict.

When, the previous February, it had become apparent that Community Action was attempting to remove the Head Start
Director from the agency, a majority of the teachers had signed a letter expressing support for the Head Start Director. They informed him of their action and told him that they intended to read the letter at the next Board meeting. The Head Start Director warned them against overtly committing themselves, pointing out that if he were fired they would be without protection from Community Action. The teachers had heeded his advice. They gave the letter to the Board Chairwoman but requested her not to publicize it.

Now, however, with the Chairman's request for documentation and the Head Start Director's approval, the teachers moved to the foreground not only by responding individually but also by soliciting past employees of the agency to record their own recollections or to yield excerpts from their diaries.24

A Head Start teacher and her teacher aide recalled a visit to their classroom in the autumn of 1971 by the Planning Director and the Deputy Director of Community Action. The two men walked into the room and began silently and mysteriously to write in their notebooks. The children were sufficiently intimidated that the teacher felt it best to send them into another room until the men left.

The purpose of the visit was never made clear to the teacher and her aide but they felt that it was meant to intimidate them rather than the children, as both women were known to be critical of CAP's Executive Director and of
the CAP staff generally. They compared the manner of the Planning Director and the Deputy Director to that of Gestapo as depicted in movies.

Until the summer of 1972, Head Start, while under the overall authority of Community Action, had been "delegated" to Missoula's School District Number One for most administrative purposes. At the end of academic year 1971-1972, CAP assumed complete administrative control of Head Start. One teacher aide wrote:

"On July 7, 1972 I received a letter from [Head Start Director] informing me, Quote -- All present and recently hired staff will be reviewed by MMHR Policy Council and personnel committee to determine if MMHR as the new employer can accept former School District #1 staff and salary schedule.

... I had worked for Head Start for 3½ years and felt my job was being threatened by this letter.

The questions asked by the committee at the interview did not pertain to my job or my ability to work in the classroom or with Head Start Parents.

[Questions she was asked:]

1. Define loyalty.
2. Do you have a car?
3. Would you document things about your family?
4. How do you feel about Community Action taking over Head Start?
5. Do you think you can work with Community Action people?

A few days later I received a letter..."
signed by [the then Head Start Director] and by [the Deputy Director] which said, 'Probationary appointment recommended with regular probation and special probation hinged on loyalty to employer, OEO and MMHR Mission."

When I called [the then Head Start Director] and asked why I was put on special probation his answer was, You said things you weren't supposed to say. He never did give me a specific answer.

I also felt the interviewing committee was not qualified to do the interviewing. I knew that the things that were said during the interviews were not kept confidential. One person on the committee told me all about the interviews they had with several of the Head Start people. Also who they were going to rehire and the ones that were not being rehired.

When I approached [the then Head Start Director] about this committee member he said, Quote -- Why don't you expose her?

It was also mandatory that we attend meetings called at any time by Community Action Personal [sic]. It was told to me that if I didn't attend I could lose my job.

Several times we were called to special meetings and told the aides and assistants weren't doing their jobs.

Because of this we had to defend ourselves and our jobs.

No one from Community Action ever came into the classroom or went on home visits [for individual parent conferences] with us to see what we were doing, but they were always ready to criticize and make accusations. (Quoted from an informant's written statement. As we shall see later in this chapter, her impressions of her interview were shared by other teachers and teacher aides, pertinent to their own interviews.)
Teachers and teacher aides were especially bitter about the way they had been treated by Community Action personnel in past years. When I asked why they had not resisted earlier, they cited several examples—a nutritionist, other teachers—of individuals who had spoken out and been humiliated or harassed into resigning. (I was introduced to several of the individuals mentioned. They confirmed the teachers' statements.) They also mentioned individual participants who had dropped out of Head Start and who, in some cases, had been angry enough to withdraw their children from the program. They spoke of one instance in which the entire Policy Council had resigned to protest CAP interference in Policy Council concerns. (I have been able to confirm this incident, as well as discovering another in which the Board of Directors of the Satellite Daycare resigned to protest the dismissal of their Daycare Director.)

I asked several teachers why they chose to fight as a group this time, when in the past they had declined to support those of themselves who had openly opposed Community Action. I suggested that perhaps Community Action was not that bad, after all. They had lived under its regimen for several years and most of them had not looked for other jobs.

They agreed that it had been much worse than they were able to convey to me, that, had they not been convinced of and dedicated to Head Start's mission, they would have looked for other work long ago.
They compared the several Head Start Directors that they had worked under. The first Head Start Director had acted as a buffer between Head Start and Community Action and between Head Start and the school district, with which the Head Start teachers had not been too happy, either. Eventually, she was forced to resign, apparently owing to illness. She was replaced by a "very nice" man who apparently had the technical and professional expertise to administer Head Start, but who lacked the special skills of political in-fighting required of a Head Start Director. The third Director was a minion of CAP's Executive Director. The current Director, in his dedication to Head Start and his willingness to fight on its behalf, was compared to Head Start's first Director. The teachers thought that she, also, would have fought, but that the others, for different reasons, would not have.

The teachers reminded me of the rumors which had recently circulated, of CAP's intention to install its own favorites in Head Start positions once the Head Start Director and, likely, the Education Director and the Supportive Services Director had been driven out of the agency. There had been other rumors, they said, that teachers themselves would be fired in order to make room for the low-income favorites of the Executive Director. The teachers pointed out that none of the latter were certified to teach.

Indeed, I recalled that, a month or two earlier, a wave of
rhetoric denouncing "professional" teachers for their "middle class values" had swept through the agency. (About six weeks after this lengthy conversation I asked the same teachers plus others, as well as teacher aides, who tended to derive from low-income backgrounds, this question: If the choice were between returning Head Start to the control of Community Action and simply removing the program from Missoula to install it in another community, thus depriving them of their jobs, which would they choose? Those I talked with unanimously agreed that they would prefer to see the program removed to another community where it could fulfill its mission to low-income children and parents.)

On Friday, June 8th, in a telegram to MMHR the Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity declared the May Board elections to be invalid.

Specific charges in the telegram included:

--Head Start parents were not notified of all nominating meetings and some Head Start parents were nominated at meetings only two nights prior to the elections.

--The boundary for the south side area was changed after nomination election notices had been published.

--Board officers were elected prior to final runoff elections in some areas.

--Head Start parents were not mailed ballots until much later than low-income persons of the Community Action agency lists.

--Some candidates from the private sector of the MMHR Board were asked to submit evidence of their eligibility to it [sic] on the board only one to two days before the election.
In response to the specific charges, the MMHR telegram [sent to OEO's Regional Director in response to his telegram] stated:

--- Notice of all but one remaining meeting was published in the Missoulian; and all were posted in public places and announced on radio or television.

--- Head Start parents and Head Start Policy Council members requested the board to enlarge the boundaries for the south side area.

--- Election of board officers cannot invalidate the election. An election of permanent officers will be conducted at the next meeting of the board.

--- Only eight Head Start parents were not mailed ballots, but ballots were hand delivered to these persons.

--- Representatives of the private sector can furnish evidence of their eligibility at any time and be seated.

[The Executive Director] told the Missoulian that the recent elections were the most elaborate ever conducted and that MMHR had tried to be honest in conducting them (Bloom: June 9, 1973).

OCD's Deputy Regional Director and Head Start's Regional Community Representative arrived in Missoula the evening of the tenth.

On the eleventh, they inspected the documentation which had been collected. The documentation was spread on a table in a conference room above the STO's office. The visitors insisted that everybody but the Head Start Director leave the room while they reviewed the documentation.
After a while, the Head Start Director returned to the STO's office where several Head Start staff and Policy Council members were waiting. He was angry. The Denver people had told him that there was nothing "substantial" in the personal statements, they were only opinions.

The Head Start Director had replied that the existence of the fraudulent intakes should be sufficient to establish grounds for separation.

The Denver people "talked around" the issue of the intakes, suggesting that they might be able to use the angle of misappropriated funds. It would take time, however, to establish that Head Start monies had been misused, they had said.

That afternoon the Head Start Director insisted that the Denver people go the CAP agency to inspect the intakes sequestered in the agency's files. He offered to go with them. They agreed to review the agency's files but insisted that they would go alone.

They returned to the STO's office an hour later. The Deputy Regional Program Director's normally slicked-down hair was ruffled. At the crown of his head a tuft of hair stood out as though pointing backward, lending the impression of a "banty" rooster. The faces of both people were flushed.

They apparently had walked into a staff meeting, Before they could back out they were confronted by a
number of CAP staff personnel demanding to know what they were doing in Missoula. The visitors finally reached the door. They turned and began walking quickly toward their car. Someone behind them shouted "Let's get them!" The visitors got into their car, locked the doors, and sped (their emphasis) out of the parking lot. They had not seen the intakes.

"We've seen enough," said the Deputy Regional Program Director, referring perhaps to more than the intakes in Head Start's possession.

Daycare had scheduled a parent meeting for that night. Although the Policy Council Chairman had children in Daycare he was reluctant to attend the meeting, feeling that Daycare had allied with CAP. One of the Daycare teachers, however, called him at his house and asked him to attend. She said that the Daycare parents were hearing only what CAP wanted them to hear and she felt that someone should speak for Head Start.

The Chairman accepted the offer of the Supportive Services Director to attend the meeting with him.

About fifty people were present at the meeting and about two-thirds of those present were not Daycare parents but members of the CAP or Parent Involvement staffs or were members of AIM or LIGHT.25

The Chairman and the Supportive Services Director sat beside two women who were friends of the Chairman. One
was a Daycare mother. She refused to respond to the Chairman's queries as to her and her children's well-being. The other, Marta, attended the meeting as the other woman's guest. The Chairman knew her as a friend from school.

Staff personnel dominated the meeting from the beginning. For over an hour they excoriated the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman, who refused to respond. Only Community Action, they said, truly had the aspirations of the poor at heart. Head Start's Policy Council did not represent the poor, but was, like its Chairman, only the dupe of the Head Start Director.

The man who had been Head Start Director the previous year told the Daycare parents that apparently the rest of Head Start was quite serious in its intent to separate from Community Action. He suggested, however, that Daycare need not feel itself bound to Head Start, that regardless what became of Head Start, Daycare belonged with Community Action. On Tuesday, the following day, the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD and Head Start's Regional Community Representative would be meeting with the Chairwoman of the old Board. The former Head Start Director suggested that Daycare parents attend this meeting in order to let the Denver people know how they felt.

The Head Start outreach worker who had previously threatened Board Evaluation Committee members with violence spoke next. He recalled how once, in Kansas City, he had seen
eighteen people take over City Hall. It did not need many people to accomplish something like this, he said. All it took was guts.

Throughout the meeting, the Policy Council Chairman had refused to respond to personal jibes and had answered questions that were put to him as laconically as possible. Finally, one woman asked him why he refused to participate in the discussion. He said that, given the present atmosphere in the room, he felt that whatever he might have to say would be "hooted down" by the CAP staff who were present.

Immediately CAP staff, Parent Involvement personnel, and other CAP Indians began to shout and laugh. One person said that the Chairman was afraid, seeming to imply fear of physical harm. Another said that he was afraid to speak. A third said that whatever he had to say would be a lie anyway.

Finally the Daycare Chairwoman asked everybody who was not a Daycare parent to leave the room. All guests left quietly. The tension eased.

The Daycare parents had a sincere, though vague, conviction that the remainder of the Head Start program discriminated against them. They cited requests that they had made to the Head Start Director to attend their meetings in order to explain changing policies to them. But, they said, he had consistently refused to respond to these requests. Also, Community Action had repeatedly told them
that Head Start wanted to use Daycare's WIN/ADC monies for its own ends, to exclude Daycare's needs. (The parents noted, however, that, despite such statements by the Executive Director as "our books are always open", repeated attempts of the part of Daycare parents to investigate the uses to which WIN/ADC funds were put had been rebuffed by the Executive Director and the bookkeeper. Thus, the Daycare parents did not trust Community Action, either.) The Daycare parents were angry, too, that the Policy Council Executive Committee had moved to separate Head Start, including Daycare, from Community Action without even consulting Daycare parents.

The Chairman knew that both the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Secretary had attempted to meet with the Daycare parents (Cf. Chapter IV) but, according to their interpretations at this time, had been rebuffed by the Daycare parents.

The Daycare parents denied rebuffing the Head Start Director and said that they were not even aware that the Policy Council Secretary had attempted to contact them. The Chairman suggested that it was water under the bridge now, anyway, as he would be attending every Daycare meeting from now on, assuming that the Daycare parents wished him to attend (they did), and he would act as liaison between Daycare and the rest of Head Start.

The Chairman told the Daycare parents that other
parent centers as well as the Policy Council had met with similar rebuffs when they had attempted to ascertain the purposes to which monies had been put. For instance, when he had inquired as to what had become of a $50,000 Department of Agriculture nutrition grant, the woman who was Director of the grant at the time of his inquiry had answered vaguely, "Well, we had a hunting trip one weekend."

He told the Daycare parents that Head Start, as a program, regarded Daycare as an integral part of itself, that Head Start, if state and federal regulations permitted, would certainly like to use Daycare's WIN/ADC funds for the benefit of the entire program, including Daycare. He felt that the funds should be used to meet immediate priorities. He told them that it still stuck in his craw that the Satellite Daycare Center had been lost owing to MMHR's mismanagement, and that, as far as he could see, at the top of the list of priorities to which WIN/ADC funds could be put was the need for another Daycare Center. (The Daycare parents met this portion of the Chairman's response to their questions with some suspicion. They did not want CAP to use Daycare monies, but they did not want the other Head Start centers to use them either.)

As far as the Executive Committee's failure to inform Daycare of its intentions, the Chairman noted that if the current Daycare Representative had troubled himself to attend a single Policy Council meeting, then both he and the
other Daycare parents might have some accurate ideas about the disintegration of the relationship between Head Start and Community Action. In any event, the Policy Council would be meeting tomorrow in Superior. The Chairman encouraged the Daycare parents to attend and said that he would arrange transportation for any who needed it.

The Chairman outlined the separation process to the Daycare parents as it had been described to him by the Regional Community Representative. It would take six weeks to separate and find a new sponsor. For ten days following notification of separation, all Head Start grants would be suspended. This would allow HEW time to separate the books and accounts. However, Daycare could remain open during this period, supported by Head Start monies which already had been received. Following this ten day period, Head Start would once again be funded, either through an interim sponsor or through OCD itself. There would be no shake-up in the program. Head Start would change sponsors with all personnel "in place"; that is, no one would lose his or her job and all classrooms and parent centers as well as the Policy Council would remain intact.

It seemed too easy and the Chairman was, perhaps, too confident. The Daycare parents were skeptical.

They had spoken for more than two hours. Even after most of the parents had left for home, the Chairman had
stayed to continue to talk with the Daycare Chairwoman and Secretary. When he walked out of the room into the corridor, only Marta was there. She laced her arm through his. "I'll walk out with you," she said.

"What's wrong?"

"They said they were going to do terrible things to you."

"Who did?"

She did not know their names, only that they were two men. She felt that if she were with him, they wouldn't hurt him.

Outside, the Supportive Services Director was waiting for him. The only other people present were the Executive Director (who had not been inside that evening) and two or three CAP staff. No words were exchanged between the Chairman and CAP personnel.

Marta returned to the company of the Daycare mother with whom she had come to the meeting. The Chairman and the Supportive Services Director returned to the Head Start Director's apartment where the Denver people and the Policy Council's representative from Central Trades and Labor were discussing the events of the past week.

The Chairman told them that CAP was trying to promote a demonstration by Daycare parents to take place tomorrow during the meeting between the Chairwoman of the old Board and the people from Denver. He also told them that the
parents did not want to have anything to do with a demonstration. (This interpretation of CAP's intentions was reached independently by the STO, who based her conclusions on information furnished by her own sources.)

The Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD asked if the Chairman were certain about the parents' negative reaction. The Chairman replied that he was certain, that if there was a demonstration tomorrow, there would be no Daycare parents involved in it.

After a moment's silence, the Chairman blurted out, "You've got to do something! People are being hurt!"

"What do you want me to do?" asked OCD's Deputy Regional Program Director,

"Separate us. Now."

"Don't worry about it," said the man from Denver. He smiled slightly. It was the first time the Chairman had seen him smile.

"Look at it this way, Andy," said Head Start's Regional Community Representative to him. "You have the entire federal government behind you."

As the Chairman prepared to go home, the woman from Denver told him, "Hang in there."

The following morning, June 12th, the visitors from Denver met with the Chairwoman of the old Board in a conference room in the administration building of the University. The Board Chairwoman was given a letter dated June 15th which informed her that all Head Start grants
would be suspended for ten days beginning at 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973. As reasons for suspending the grants, it cited the following:

1. $2,246 of WIN/ADC monies were diverted from their intended use and instead, used to settle an audit exception with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

2. [CAP permitted alleged members of the American Indian Movement to make] excessive long distance telephone calls costing several hundred dollars. These bills were paid with Head Start funds, although the calls were not made for that purpose. Permitting this use of the facility was gross mismanagement and paying the telephone bill with Head Start monies is a misuse of funds.

3. In June, 1973, you suspended the Head Start Director. This action was not approved by the Policy Council and, therefore, was a violation of regulations.

4. There have been numerous complaints made to this office with respect to the management of the program. The substance of this evidence is that the program is operated in such a way as to divide the community. That program is designed to serve and prevent the management of a quality Head Start program. [I have no idea how this last sentence was intended to read. For the complete text of the letter see appendix B.]

The letter was signed by the Regional Director of HEW.

At the meeting, the Chairman recognized nearly everyone who had been present at the Daycare meeting the night before, except for the Daycare parents, who did not attend. The only Daycare parents who had shown up were
those who were also employed by Head Start. There was no demonstration, no confrontation. The Executive Director and other agency employees objected to the reasoning of the letter in polite, moderate tones. Their objections were passed off by the people from Denver, who said that they were authorized only to present the Board Chairwoman with the letter and to be certain that she understood it. The meeting ended.

The Chairman, the Head Start Director, and the visitors from Denver had only a few minutes to talk before the latter had to leave for the airport to catch their plane. The Regional Community Representative noted that Missoula was not the only place where Head Start was revolting against Community Action. Ogden, Utah was experiencing a similar fight. The Missoula people had not heard of the conflict in Ogden, but had learned that Albuquerque, several months earlier, had witnessed a similar conflict. (Within a few days the Seattle and Spokane Head Start programs would also revolt against their local CAP agencies, for apparently similar political and economic reasons. Within a month, Missoula Head Start's leadership would become aware of the close attention paid to the conflict by other Head Start programs in Montana. They were evaluating their own chances for separating from their CAP agencies, but first they wanted to see what Missoula's program would have to endure.)

As the Denver people walked down the corridor to the
door of the administration building, the Regional Community Representative turned and called out to the Chairman, "Just keep those cards and letters coming."

"What would you think if we went to the Senator?" the Chairman called back.

The Regional Community Representative turned again and smiled, but said nothing.

The Head Start Director drove them to the airport. They were very encouraging. "Stick with it," the Regional Community Representative told him.

J'accuse

The Policy Council meeting was to begin at 7:30 at the Courthouse in Superior. Rumors of violence to be perpetuated against Head Start had circulated for a couple of days. A former agency consultant who had aligned with Head Start had requested the Superior police to provide security during the meeting. When the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman arrived at the Courthouse about 7:00, two policemen were standing, talking together, near the parking lot.

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were the first to arrive. The Acting Deputy Director arrived shortly afterward. The Chairman introduced himself and they shook hands. The Acting Deputy Director was a tall, thin man with lank hair and a smooth, monotonous
voice. It was not a voice made for confrontation; it was too smooth, too sleep-inducing. A good confrontation voice was one that grated on your nerves, that jarred your attention when you wished for distraction. When the Acting Deputy Director swallowed, the Chairman could see his Adam's apple bob in his throat. The Chairman thought that perhaps this evening would not be as difficult as he had anticipated.

The Acting Deputy Director sat down at the judge's bench and spread papers that he had brought in a briefcase before him. It was a good psychological ploy. The Policy Council would be sitting below his scrutiny. If the Acting Deputy Director had the personality for it, he could assume an almost God-like status and might be able to dissipate the confidence of the Council.

"You wouldn't be sitting in judgement on us, would you, Perry?" the Chairman said.

"Aw, now, Andy. Don't be that way," said the Acting Deputy Director.

The Missoulian reporter arrived. She took a seat at the clerk's table.

Other people began to arrive. An Indian man whom the Chairman did not know took a seat at the attorneys' tables which had been pushed together for use by the Council. The Chairman sat behind him in one of the visitors' seats and studied him. He was a large man, not tall, but barrelly.
He was fat and appeared slow-moving, although his movements might be a lot quicker and deceptive in a fight. Where the Acting Deputy Director had a long vulnerable neck and thin arms, it would be difficult to hurt this man. The Chairman decided that, if it came to a fight with this one, he would kick to the knee and the gut and then try to close with him as quickly as he could, in order to gouge. He would have to stay away from the other man's fists, or get inside them.

The room began to fill. When the Policy Council Secretary and the delegate from Central Trades and Labor arrived, the Chairman asked them to sit on either side of him.

Facing out from the judge's bench, the visitors' section to the right of the aisle which divided the section into halves was filled with people allied with Head Start: parents, staff, MMHR dissidents. On the lefthand side of the aisle sat the "loyalists": those who supported the new Board over the old (CAP was disputing OEO's authority to re-establish the old Board and to refuse to recognize the new one), CAP employees, CAP Indians, members of the new Board. CAP Indians occupied most of the seats in the first and second rows facing the tables at which the Council sat. Behind the Indians sat the White CAP supporters. The Executive Director did not sit in any particular place but floated among those on the lefthand side of the aisle.

In the jury box, only four or five feet behind the Chairman's
seat at the end of the Council tables, sat five or six CAP Indians and employees.

Head Start had turned out in slightly greater numbers than had CAP and its supporters. The Chairman estimated that Head Start had approximately 60 people present, not including the Policy Council, while CAP had produced 40 to 50. It was the only Policy Council meeting the Chairman had ever attended where Head Start outnumbered Community Action.

The Chairman called the meeting to order. He explained that he would give everybody a chance to be heard, but for the sake of maintaining order he would not entertain questions or comments from the audience until after the Council had the opportunity to speak on each issue that might arise.

A woman sitting in the jury box asked to be heard. The Chairman repeated his dictum concerning the order in which speakers would be heard.

"You mean you won't let me speak?" the woman asked.

"That's right."

"You won't let a Daycare mother speak. He won't let a Daycare mother speak!" she shouted toward the visitors' section, pointing her index finger at the Chairman. She neglected to say that, while she was a Daycare mother, she was also a CAP employee; in fact, the same woman who had voted illegally to retain the Executive Director at the March 30th Board meeting. The Chairman considered mentioning this,
but the moment had passed. Behind him, as he faced her, people were laughing and shouting. He laughed too. She had set him a clever trap.

A large Indian man sat at the far end of the table. The Chairman had seen photographs of him and recognized him as the most prestigious member of the Missoula Chapter of AIM. The Community Representative from AIM had been unable to attend the meeting. This man represented himself as his alternate.

"Community Representatives do not have alternates," the Chairman said.

The most prestigious member of Missoula AIM and the former Chairwoman of the Council argued that all Policy Council members had alternates.

"Only Parent Representatives have alternates," the Chairman said. "The by-laws make no provision for alternates for Community Representatives."

The man from AIM and the former Chairwoman continued to argue.

"Only Parent Representatives have alternates. Community Representatives do not have alternates. Your vote will not be counted at this meeting," the Chairman told the most prestigious member of Missoula AIM. To the former Chairwoman, he said, "You helped to write the by-laws. You know what's in them."

The most prestigious member of Missoula AIM left the table and took a seat in the jury box behind the Chairman.
The former Chairwoman said that the by-laws were unfair and should be thrown out.

The Chairwoman of the new Board was the same woman who, in April, had identified herself as the first Chairman of the Head Start Policy Council. She rose now from the visitors' section and shouted that the current by-laws were illegal and that she had a copy of the original by-laws with her.

The Policy Council Chairman noted aloud that when, the previous spring, the Policy Council had inquired as to what had become of copies of previous by-laws, it was told by CAP staff and the former Policy Council Chairwoman that all copies had been lost. It was peculiar that only now had a copy of the old by-laws been discovered. In any event, the Chairman said, the old by-laws were superceded by the new ones.

The Parent Representative from Daycare (this was the Indian man whom the Chairman had studied earlier in the evening) announced that, since it had been he who called the meeting, he had prepared the agenda. He passed out copies of his agenda to the Policy Council. It provided for short speeches by the Community Representatives from Qua Qui and AIM. Neither person was in attendance at the meeting. The Daycare Representative's agenda also promised to speak to the issue of separation.

The Chairman said that the agenda that he had prepared himself would speak to the same issue; that, in fact,
the only difference between the two agendas was that the Chairman, in his, had allotted himself time to speak before the separation issue would be discussed whereas the Daycare Representative had allotted speaking time to the delegates from Qua Qui and AIM. The Chairman said that he was quite willing to allow anyone to speak in due course, but since the delegates from the two Indian organizations had not seen fit to attend the meeting, it seemed to him that his own agenda was the more comprehensive one and should be followed. He suggested that the Council vote on which agenda to accept.

The Daycare Representative insisted that his own was the only legitimate one, as it had been he who requested this meeting.

The Chairman insisted, as did the delegate from Central Trades and Labor, that the Council decide which agenda they would accept.

The Daycare Representative acquiesced.

The Council voted ten to two to accept the Chairman's agenda. The two dissenting votes were those of the Daycare Representative and the former Policy Council Chairwoman.

The Chairman said that there was one more issue to be decided before the Council could proceed to the events scheduled on the agenda. This was the matter concerning the East Missoula Parent Representative.

The issue concerning East Missoula's Parent Representa-
tive was this: in March, the East Missoula Center had elected him as its "temporary" Parent Representative to replace its regular Parent Representative who was having difficulties which precluded her accepting Policy Council responsibilities. Since that time the "temporary" Parent Representative had represented East Missoula at all Policy Council meetings. However, to the Policy Council's knowledge, he had never been elected regular Parent Representative.

When the Executive Committee convened earlier in the week, the "regular" Parent Representative had attended as a voting member. The "temporary" Parent Representative took this as a personal slight, insisting that he had been elected "regular" Parent Representative in May. The "regular" Parent Representative knew nothing about a May election.

The Policy Council Secretary decided to inspect the Head Start Secretary's files. There she found a letter from the East Missoula Parent Center, dated in May and addressed to the Policy Council, stating that East Missoula had held an election and that its "temporary" Parent Representative was now its "permanent" Parent Representative.

While the new "regular" Parent Representative recognized that the Policy Council Secretary had made an honest mistake in calling the wrong party to attend the Executive Committee meeting, he felt that he had suffered a
personal humiliation. He respected the Head Start Director and distrusted the Executive Director and was aware of Head Start's travails under the domination of Community Action but he felt that the only way he could redeem himself in front of the other parents from his center would be to vote against separation.

Policy Council by-laws stipulated that a parent center could recall its representative or a representative could resign. Neither action had occurred; East Missoula had simply voted itself another representative.

The Policy Council Chairman eventually had resolved the problem by obtaining a letter of resignation from the former "regular" Parent Representative. He had her date it June 12th. Had she dated it prior to June 6th, she would have invalidated the Executive Committee's vote for separation.

The question now was whether the new East Missoula Parent Representative would accept his "regular" place on the Council as of June or would he argue that the letter should have been dated in May to conform with the East Missoula election. If he chose the latter action, he would at least cast doubt on the Executive Committee's move six days earlier.

Now, the Chairman explained to the Council the confusion and error that had surrounded the exchange of the
East Missoula seat. He and the Policy Council Secretary took full responsibility for the error although, as the Policy Council Secretary pointed out, it was only owing to her going through the files of the Head Start Secretary that they were able to discover that the source of the error was, in fact, the Head Start Secretary's negligence in forwarding mail to the Policy Council. (The Head Start Secretary, who was seated in the jury box, objected strenuously that the Policy Council Secretary had no right to go through her files.)

The Chairman produced the letter of resignation signed by the former East Missoula Parent Representative. He asked the Council to accept her resignation so that the new East Missoula Representative could be formally seated. He passed the letter around. He watched as the former Council Chairwoman received the letter from the person sitting next to her and read it. She was about to pass it on when she drew her hand back. She had caught the date. She objected. The Chairman asked her to wait until everyone had read the letter.

When the letter was returned to him, the Chairman asked the former Chairwoman to voice her complaint. She objected to the date on the letter, stating that it should have been dated in May. The Chairman stated that he had been informed, through the Policy Council Secretary's efforts, of the legitimacy of the new East Missoula Parent
Representative's claim to the Council seat only after the June 6th Executive Committee meeting. Neither the East Missoula parent group nor the Policy Council was at fault. The fact was, the Chairman said, that if the letter of resignation was not accepted, this would mean that the new Parent Representative from East Missoula would not be able to vote this evening. The Chairman said that he doubted that anybody on the Council wanted to deprive him of his vote.

The former Chairwoman, the Chairman knew, was in a precarious position. It had been the East Missoula parent group which, the previous February, had petitioned to have her removed as Chairwoman and which, in March, along with the Northside, had threatened to pull out of Head Start unless she were removed immediately. It also had been the East Missoula group which originally had elected her to the Council as their "Community Representative" but which later objected that she and the Executive Director had deceived them into electing her. It was necessary, even now in June, to at least make a pretence of affiliation with the East Missoula group if she did not want to re-open all of the old wounds.

She now suggested that the East Missoula Parent Representative could still vote as a temporary representative. This was unacceptable to the East Missoula Parent Representative. He had been legally elected as a bona
fide Parent Representative and he was not about to assume a lesser status.

The Council voted to accept the letter of resignation and to recognize the Parent Representative-elect as the bona fide Parent Representative as of June 12th. The former Chairwoman and the Daycare Representative abstained from voting. The Chairman inwardly exhaled relief. He smiled at the former Chairwoman.

The Acting Deputy Director now spoke from the judge's bench. He had noted when perusing the Head Start by-laws that a quorum of the Policy Council Executive Committee required one person more than fifty per cent of the entire Executive Committee. As the Chairman was only an ex officio member of the Committee, his presence at the June 6th meeting could not be included in the constitution of a quorum. As the Executive Committee was composed of seven members, there was not a quorum at that meeting, for only four members, not including the Chairman, were present. A quorum required four and one-half members.

The Chairman replied that the spirit of the by-laws was such to ensure that a simple majority of the Executive Committee be required to constitute a quorum.

"But the by-laws don't say that," said the Acting Deputy Director.

"Nevertheless, that is their spirit. Everyone who worked on the by-laws last March is here tonight. I
don't think anyone will disagree with my interpretation."

No one did.27

For forty-five minutes following the opening of the meeting, the Chairman had been besieged by a variety of diversions and attempts by Community Action and its allies to manipulate the proceedings to serve its own ends. The Policy Council Chairman had had to adopt a defensive strategy. Now, however, Community Action's arguments had been disposed of and it was the Chairman's turn to attack. He had prepared a six and one-half page "history of the past year of the Missoula-Mineral Counties Head Start program . . ., centered around the major issues of conflict. . . ."

The Chairman's statement began by discussing the formation of the Head Start Evaluation Committee in the late summer of 1972, (as distinguished from the MMHR Evaluation Committee formed in February, 1973) which some teachers had likened to a kangaroo court or a court of the Inquisition. The Chairman enumerated some of the questions that the Committee asked the teachers: 1) Would you be willing to document the activities of your family? 2) Would you be willing to demonstrate for a cause you did not believe in? 3) Would you be willing to undergo psychiatric treatment?

At this point in the meeting, the previous director of Head Start rose and objected that the questions were being represented out of context. For instance, he could
see nothing wrong with documenting the activities of Head Start families. A lot of Head Start families, he said, required such services as psychological counselling and medical care. How was the agency to know which family required which services unless the family was documented?

A teacher rose to challenge him. She was nervous and her voice quavered. She described the context of her interview with the Evaluation Committee as one in which she was frightened by the prospect of losing her job should she fail to answer the questions correctly. She said that she was asked to document her family, but that it was left to her own interpretation of the question whether CAP meant her own family or Head Start families generally and to guess for what purposes CAP intended to use this information. She told the previous Head Start director that he himself had posed the question to her during the interview.

The previous Head Start director appeared thoughtful. "I don't know," he said. "I'll have to check. I have the files at home. I'll have to check on it." (The Policy Council Secretary, upon hearing this, turned and whispered feverishly in my ear, "What's he doing with Head Start files in his house? Those files are supposed to be confidential, they're not supposed to be taken out of the office. He's not even a Head Start employee any more.")

The Chairman continued. He reported that, as a result of "this kind of pressure and intimidation" three teacher aides quit their jobs and a fourth was put on
"Special Probation for three months, to run concurrently with a six-month regular probationary period. The purpose of this Special Probation was to determine her loyalty to MMHR 'goals.'"

A low-income member of the Board shouted that one of the three teacher aides who left the program had been pregnant and had intended to resign anyway. And as for the other two, "good riddance. We're better off without them, anyway." She said also that "we should have got rid of" the fourth as well.

The Chairman said that only two Board members had objected, during a Board meeting, to the procedures of the Evaluation Committee, but that the Executive Director, the Deputy Director, and the then Head Start Director had shouted them down and told them that they did not know what they were talking about.

A number of CAP supporters now demanded to know who those two Board members were. The Chairman replied that both were present this evening and that if they wished to identify themselves, it was their decision, but that he would not name them. They did not identify themselves. Several people shouted that the Chairman was lying, that he was making up everything that he was saying. (After the meeting, one of the two Board members in question approached me and intimated that he had been too intimidated to identify himself.)
The Chairman brought out that Head Start was paying $400.00 interest on the $40,000 loan taken out to meet the payrolls and expenses for the months of December and January. The Chairman implied that it was owing to incompetence on the parts of the Planning Director, the man who was Head Start Director during academic year 1971-1972, and the then Policy Council Chairwoman that Head Start was paying interest on a loan that the agency should not have had to take out in the first place (Cf. Chapter IV).

The Chairman pointed out the differences in policy between the Executive Director and the Head Start Director, citing the controversy over "intake" criteria as an example. The Head Start Director, the Chairman said, "wanted to establish broader contact with the 'working poor' as well as the 'welfare poor' . . . Community Action has been working with a couple of hundred low-income people, many of whom have been economically dependent on CAP for as long as six and seven years."

The Chairman noted that the "mini-assessment" done by OEO's Regional Office in November "confirmed that thousands of people who needed help were not being reached."

The Executive Director challenged him. How did the Chairman know what the mini-assessment said?

"I read it," replied the Chairman.

"That's very interesting," the Executive Director said, "because the mini-assessment hasn't been released yet."
The Executive Director was correct; OEO had never released the mini-assessment. It had released only a summary of the mini-assessment and, in fact, this is what the Chairman had read. The Chairman had confused the two and he had been caught out. He could not, however, backtrack now. He had launched his attack and to hesitate even for a moment might prove disastrous.

"Perhaps I have better relations in Denver than you do," he said.

The Executive Director blanched. Suddenly he started what I can describe only as a sort of nervous dance in which he hopped or skipped about the room, the while slapping his right knee with his hand, shouting, "I knew we had a plant, I knew we had a plant! But I didn't know who it was! Until now!"

The Chairman's mouth dropped open. The Policy Council Secretary, having turned around to say something to him, suddenly grinned broadly and said instead, "Close your mouth. You're catching flies." The Chairman closed his mouth.

The Executive Director wound down. He stood at the near end of the aisle separating the two halves of the visitors' area, his face flushed, smiling knowingly at the Chairman.

The delegate from Central Trades and Labor suggested that the Council take a ten minute break. It was apparent,
he said, that many people were in need of a drink of water.

During the break, while the other members of the Council relieved and refreshed themselves, the Chairman stood by his chair at the head of the table. He had several "documents", personal statements sent him by informants, portions of which he had read interspersed with his own statement, scattered around his seat. He was afraid that, should he leave even for a moment, they might be stolen.

The Planning Director approached and stared at him wordlessly, an enigmatic smile fixed on his lips. The Chairman returned his gaze. The Planning Director circled the Chairman, their eyes never breaking contact, the smile frozen on his face. At last he turned and walked out into the corridor.

After twenty minutes, the Council members began to return to their seats. The Daycare Representative was about to sit down when he was approached by the most prestigious member of Missoula AIM. The latter whispered at length into his ear. Then he returned to his seat in the jury box and the Daycare Representative sat down.

The Chairman called the meeting to order and the room quieted. The Daycare Representative rose and, addressing the Council, stated that he did not really understand what had been going on for the past several hours. All he could see was that the Executive Director was being attacked unjustly. What he did know, he said, his voice suddenly
rising, was that everybody seated around the Council tables was a racist and that everybody's mind was already made up to vote for separation before he ever sat down. He said that he was leaving, that he no longer wanted to be a member of what he could now see to be a racist organization. He left the room.

There was minimal protest from the Council. The Chairman thought that everyone was simply too tired to speak up. (I later asked several Council members why they had not spoken in their own defense at this point. Their attitudes may be summed up in the words of one woman: "We already heard it all before.")

The Chairman continued reading his statement. He told how the Satellite Daycare had been lost, attributing the loss to CAP mismanagement.

He told how the Head Start Director had discovered that the Mineral County portion of the Head Start program was 75 to 80 per cent over-income. He laid the blame at the feet of the previous Head Start Director, the Parent Involvement Director, and the Executive Director.

He described previous attempts by CAP to remove the Head Start Director from his position, including the then Policy Council Chairwoman's implicit offer to himself of a job should he declare himself in opposition to the Head Start Director.

He reminded East Missoula how angry they had been over
the allegedly fraudulent baby-sitting claims submitted by the then Policy Council Chairwoman. He said that while in February, there had been no proof that she had submitted such claims, at the end of March proof became available. He tossed photocopies of these claims on the table.

The Chairman told of the Executive Director's successful entrapment of the Policy Council Secretary and her husband, and the unsuccessful attempt at entrapping the delegate from Central Trades and Labor and his wife.

The Chairman said that, on Sunday, April 14th, the Head Start Secretary had told the Policy Council Secretary how the Executive Director "had planned this public humiliation well in advance", that the Executive Director had told her "that because the Policy Council had attacked him personally, he felt he had to retaliate. It is unclear to me," the Chairman said, "how, up to this time [April 14th], the Policy Council had attacked him."

The Head Start Secretary vehemently denied having told the Policy Council Secretary anything of the kind.

The Chairman recalled the roll-call vote of "no-confidence" in the Executive Director which the Council had taken to retaliate for the humiliation of two of its members and their spouses.

He recounted the suspension with pay of the Head Start Director by the Acting Deputy Director with the concurrence of the Executive Director and the Executive
Committee of the new Board, consisting of the officers alone. He recalled that a Policy Council member had attempted to acquire a copy of the minutes of the Board meeting of June 1st, "in order to determine whether an Executive Committee had been appointed" but that the Council member had been rebuffed by the Board's new Secretary who said that she had been told not to release the minutes but refused to say who had given her these instructions.

The Secretary of the new Board denied that she had said what the Council Chairman alleged. The Executive Director said that at the time the Council had requested a copy of the minutes (June 6th), they had not yet been prepared for distribution.

The Council Chairman ended his statement by recounting that "on June 6th the Head Start Policy Council Executive Committee convened in public meeting and voted unanimously to refuse to recognize the firing of [the Head Start Director] and to request HEW Denver to separate Head Start from MMHR."

The Chairman had intended, at this point, to threaten to resign from the Council unless the Council ratified the actions of the Executive Committee. His intended threat was designed not to intimidate the Council, for he was reasonably certain that their sentiments were aligned with his own, but, rather, to impress upon the parents who observed from the visitors' section the weight of his own indignation and convictions.
Before he could speak, however, the delegate from Central Trades and Labor asked for the floor. The Chairman recognized him. The delegate from Central Trades and Labor moved that the Policy Council "accept the actions of June 6 concerning the Emergency Executive Committee meeting and further inform OCD and the appropriate persons involved what we have done" (quoted from a partial transcript of a tape of the Policy Council meeting of June 12th).

The motion was seconded.

The former Policy Council Chairwoman suggested that, since one of the issues at hand was the firing of the Head Start Director, those people who were responsible for hiring him, the Policy Council of the previous summer, should reconvene as the legitimate Policy Council and themselves consider whether the Head Start Director should retain his job.

"Is that like calling the old Board and the new Board [together] to decide new and old questions?" asked the delegate from Central Trades and Labor.

The former Chairwoman next suggested that the hiring of the Head Start Director might be considered "kind of illegal anyway" since the Executive Director had exerted such influence over the Policy Council, "so maybe he [the Head Start Director] wasn't really hired."

"I think we should be bringing up the point... [that] you had no by-laws, so nothing was illegal. You had OEO guidelines, but you didn't have guidelines of your
own," the Council Secretary said.

"Yes, we did have by-laws."

"You stated that you didn't, . . . ."

"We did, but we lost them."

"You stated . . . that you had no by-laws . . . ."

"That's right, O.K. . . . but what I'm saying, what I am questioning is the things that the old Council did, maybe it wasn't legal when he was hired."

The Chairman declared that, in any event, the current by-laws "stipulate who are voting members, not by name but by position." Only members of the current Policy Council could vote.

The delegate from Central Trades and Labor called for the question.

The Chairwoman of the new Board asked for the floor. The Chairman told her that she was out of order.

"Maybe so," said the Chairwoman of the new Board, "but that whole meeting [apparently referring to the Executive Committee meeting of June 6th] was out of order by your own _______ by-laws and the sooner you learn what's in your by-laws and abide by them maybe you will have a decent, operative, going program instead of a clique of middle-class idiots, who is too afraid to listen to the people you are supposed to be representing."

The vote was taken. Eight voted to refuse to recognize the suspension with pay of the Head Start Director and to request HEW to separate Missoula Mineral
Head Start from NIMHE. Three voted against taking these actions. There were no abstentions.

The Chairwoman of the new Board was recognized by the Council Chairman.

"I think in the future perhaps all of you on the Executive Council should go by your by-laws and as far as by-laws they were made up in 1965. That's just a point of order. First of all, according to the meeting held the other night the Chairman is the Ex-officio member of all standing committees without the right to vote and according to the letters you sent out you voted . . . According to your own by-laws the top listing on the Standing Committees is the Executive Committee. And as far as your quorum, one more than one-half of the total sub committee membership shall constitute a quorum and a quorum is required before a sub committee can conduct any business. And that also relates back to Robert's rules of order. And you may have ratified it tonight and I hope you are very happy with yourselves. I was the first Chairman of Head Start of the Policy Council that the parents were involved [in] and I have never seen such railroading, such . . . people that are so called . . ."

"You're out of order," the delegate from Central Trades and Labor broke in.

"Just a minute, I have the floor. You're out of order."
"You're right."

"All right--shut up! You want a so-called Head Start. You don't want a Head Start you want your own little committee. You want to run it, the _____ with the people, you don't give a ____ who you stomp on. Start listening to the people that you are supposedly representing, your own Southside. I can cite a few names that dropped out because of your attitudes and this was people that were in the Southside center, this was people that were so-called on the Board. And they do not want any part of it and I don't blame them. I have never been so ashamed of a Head Start program since it started, I have always been very proud to say that I was an ex-Head Start parent and I have always considered Head Start as a very very special program because it met the needs of the kids and their families and you are just nothing but a bunch of people who don't give a _____."

"I hope that when we work on this in the future," the delegate from Central Trades and Labor said, "--we have taken our action and I suspect that Denver will go along with us--it is my own personal feeling that Head Start doesn't belong [to] the Board [MMHR], it should belong to the parents."

"Why don't you practice what you preach?" said the Chairwoman of the new Board.

"All right," the Chairman said, speaking to the Council, "before anything more happens; if anyone is harassed at all, threatening phone calls, fire-bombings,
whatever—most of it has been threatening phone calls, and automobiles driving back and forth on your street yelling names, put down a record of the time it happens, and that's what we'll give the police. On phone calls it's awfully hard, we can't prove who it was, but we might be able to establish a pattern by which the police will be able to take care of it." (All quotes since the last citation are taken from a partial transcript of a tape of the Policy Council meeting of June 12, 1973.)

As the Chairman collected his papers, he was approached by one of the dissidents from the old Board, who congratulated him on how well he had conducted himself.

"Then why do I feel so bad?" asked the Chairman.

"Because you've just taken a hell of a beating," the other replied.

The Acting Deputy Director of Community Action had just stepped down from the judge's bench. He stopped in front of the Council Chairman.

"Who did you learn your tactics from, Richard Nixon?" he said angrily. He called the Chairman "a master of innuendo."

The Chairman replied that he thought he had been fairly explicit.

The Acting Deputy Director was about to say something more when CAP's Executive Director pulled at his sleeve. They walked out the door together.
An officer from the old Board was delighted to see the Executive Director get "what he's been giving the Board all these years."
The husband of one of the Council members, while sympathizing with Head Start, called the Chairman's performance "the biggest railroad job he had ever seen."

An East Missoula parent had been angered all through the meeting by what she considered the cruelty which the Chairman had directed toward the Executive Director and the former Chairwoman. It was only the violent outburst of the new Board Chairwoman at the end of the meeting which re-established her loyalties to Head Start.

The Missoulian reporter said that the meeting had been "the worst experience of my life."

"You haven't seen anything yet," the Chairman told her. He was referring to the harassment and "terrorism", as he would come to call it, of Head Start parents, in which he assumed the reporter would be interested.

The reporter wanted him to comment on the accusations of racism that had been leveled against the Council.

"Nobody would believe what I have to say, anyway," the Chairman said.

The Chairman rode back to Missoula with the Head Start Director. In Missoula, they stopped at a cocktail lounge for a drink. Several other members of the Head Start staff arrived shortly after and they pushed two
tables together so that they could talk about the evening's events.

The Chairman had a terrific headache and did not want to talk or listen to the others. He turned away from them and surveyed the drinkers at the bar.

The drinkers were "middle class" people. They wore slacks rather than jeans, shoes rather than boots, short sleeve shirts rather than the more functional long sleeve ones. Some wore ties and sport jackets. The women laughed and looked charming. They wore earrings and gold bracelets and had rings on their fingers.\(^{32}\)

The Chairman was filled with resentment. He would have liked, not to have been one of them, but to have lowered them to his own level. He wanted them to endure what he had just gone through and what he had put others through. He wanted them to suffer.

The Chairman had begun to doubt that he had done the right thing, that his attack against the Executive Director and his cohorts had been justified. Yet, he knew with all certainty, that had he not struck so hard, and so stunned the CAP leadership, the Council itself would have received the stunning blows this evening and would likely have fragmented.

Suddenly the Chairman was seized with such loathing, such hatred, for the drinkers at the bar that he had to turn away; he was afraid that he might walk over and physically assault one of them.
He forced himself to engage in conversation with the others from Head Start.

Prior to the meeting of June 12th, the reporter from the Missoulian had requested persons from both Head Start and Community Action to meet with her at the Missoulian offices so that she might gain some perspective on the conflict. Each faction agreed to send four people to the Missoulian on the morning of the 13th.

The Head Start people arrived first. They were the Head Start Director, the Policy Council Chairman, a former (dissident) member of the public sector of the Board, and a former (dissident) member of the low-income sector of the Board. They were shown into a conference room and waited there for the Community Action people to arrive.

Five people from Community Action arrived. The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were not surprised. As a rule, whenever Community Action met, whether for purposes of negotiation, or interviews, or confrontation, they tried to produce greater numbers than any other group present might provide. The show of the previous evening had proven an exception. Those representing Community Action were the Executive Director, the Acting Deputy Director, the Chairwoman of the new Board, the Vice-Chairwoman of the new Board (the former Chairwoman of the Policy Council), and the most prestigious member of Missoula AIM.
The reporter asked the Policy Council Chairman if he had any objection to CAP providing five people. The Chairman had none. The Executive Director apologized for the discrepancy in numbers and said that he must have misunderstood the provisions of the meeting.

Before the new Board Chairwoman entered the room, the Executive Director sat down next to the Policy Council Chairman and told him that the new Board Chairwoman was extremely tired this morning because she had been kept awake all night by harassing phone calls. The implication was that either Head Start was also using rather disgusting tactics or that an unidentified "third force" might be responsible for harassing both factions. The Chairman suggested that the new Board Chairwoman inform the police.

"They can't do anything," the Executive Director said.

When the new Board Chairwoman entered the room, it was discovered that there were not enough chairs. The Executive Director went out to get another chair and the new Board Chairwoman took his place beside the Policy Council Chairman.

"You look tired," the Policy Council Chairman told her.

"I am," she said. She said that she had had to work all night following the meeting in Superior and hadn't been able to get any sleep.

They discussed the kind of work she did and how she liked her work. It didn't pay much but it was better than nothing and it kept her active.
The Executive Director returned with another chair and sat down. The reporter asked if anyone minded if she taped the meeting. Everyone was agreeable. She had difficulty setting the tapes on the old-fashioned machine and people chatted amiably or kept silent until she was able to work out the problem.

As soon as she began to tape, the Acting Deputy Director stood up and, pointing his finger at the Chairman of the Policy Council, cried angrily that the Chairman was a "master of innuendo" and then declared that everybody in the room who was identified with the Head Start faction was a racist. The former member of the public sector of the Board rose and declared that he was tired of being called a racist and that, if the Acting Deputy Director called him a racist one more time, he was going to punch him in the nose. The Acting Deputy Director threatened to have the other up on an assault charge if he struck him.

Each faction managed to calm its own member. The reporter observed, wide-eyed.

Then the most prestigious member of AIM said, "You're all racists; you and you and you and you," pointing his finger in turn at each of the four members of the Head Start faction.

The former low-income member of the Board objected with some heat, saying that he had never discriminated against anyone, white, red, black, or yellow, and that
anyone who knew him, including Indians, would vouch for his fairness.

The most prestigious member of AIM leaned against the back of his chair and folded his arms across his chest. "If the shoe fits . . .," he said.

The Head Start Director asked the most prestigious member of AIM to furnish one fact which would support the accusation as it pertained to him. The most prestigious member of AIM did not respond.

The reporter asked the Executive Director and the Head Start Director to respond to the economic issues. The Head Start Director said that, in order to manage an effective program, he had to know approximately how much money Head Start had at any time. The CAP agency was much too flexible with its use of Head Start monies and Head Start, as a program, was showing signs that it was quickly running out of money. While he could not be certain, because he did not have access to the account books at the present time, the Head Start Director estimated that, at the rate of expenditures of the past several months, Head Start would be entirely without money by September, two months before the end of its program year. Head Start, he said, was not spending all of its money, but it was being spent all the same.

The Executive Director said that the Head Start Director was overly concerned with the details of Head Start's daily operation, that he failed to view the program
with broad enough vision. The Executive Director admitted that CAP had taken $8,000 from Head Start just recently, in order to pay CAP staff's salaries. However, that money would be replaced, now that OEO's Regional Office was going to lift the freeze on MMHR's grant. (This was the first time that either the Head Start Director or the Policy Council Chairman heard of this withdrawal.)

The reporter asked the most prestigious member of AIM how he viewed the conflict between CAP and Head Start.

"I've been an Indian for forty-one years," said the most prestigious member of Missoula AIM. The others of the CAP faction laughed politely.

He told of how America had been before the White man came; there had been no wars, no disease; Indian people had lived as brothers and sisters with each other; a perfect harmony between nature, God, and the Indian people had endured until the coming of the White man. The White man had brought war and disease and hunger to the Indian people.

Even so, the most prestigious member of Missoula AIM said, and even though he was already forty-one years old, he intended to finish college. He had three years down and one to go, although it would take him longer than one year to finish because he had to work part of the year in order to go to school the remainder of the year. But he was determined to complete school.
"I'm not one of these Indians you see drinking at Al's Bar," he said. Then he hesitated.

The Council Chairman cast him a cynical smile. The most prestigious member of Missoula AIM had got his audiences confused. In speaking to a white reporter, he, as a representative of Indian people, would be expected, by other Indians at least, to present the Indian people in a noble and forbearing light. Indeed, he had begun his statement in this manner. He had deviated, however, by focusing on his own ambitions and had caught himself presenting Indians in conformity with the White stereotype of them, implying that the stereotype did not apply to himself. He made a clumsy attempt to backtrack.

"You know," he said, "some Indians drink like some White people drink. Every people has its problems."

The Chairman broke in and asked him what he expected from Head Start.

The most prestigious member of Missoula AIM replied that Indian people wanted their own Head Start center where Indian children could be taught their own culture by Indian teachers.

"In effect, that's de facto segregation. As a confirmed integrationist, I would have to be against it," said the Chairman.

"That's your own pre-conception. Why don't you listen to what he wants?" the Executive Director shouted at the Chairman.
The Head Start Director said that, in any event, Head Start did not have the facilities to transport Indian children from all over Missoula County to a single classroom. This was true. In fact, the possibility had been discussed by the Policy Council several months earlier and the idea had been discarded for that very reason.

Even had buses been available, the Head Start Director would have opposed a segregated Indian class, he has told me. He recalls that, as a non-White child reared by an Indian foster mother, he and "other" Indian children used to watch from their classroom windows as the White children with whom they went to school played at recess. Indian children had to wait until the White children had finished playing before they were permitted onto the school playground. One of the ramifications of this system was that the balls and other toys that White children brought to school to play with at recess were unavailable to Indian children. For the Head Start Director, as for the Policy Council Chairman, there was no such thing as "separate but equal."

During the last part of the interview, the internal affairs of the agency were discussed. The Executive Director attempted to discredit the Board Evaluation Committee by saying that the Committee had been constituted illegally in that the Chairwoman did not have the authority to appoint committees. He also said that the Evaluation Committee solicited negative responses to their questions.
by the manner in which Committee members asked them.

The former member of the public sector of the Board, who had served on the Evaluation Committee, responded that the Board Chairwoman had appointed other committees in the past and her authority to do so had gone unchallenged until now (Cf. Appendix A). He said that the purpose of the Evaluation Committee was to discover what needed to be done in order to revitalize CAP, and criticism was solicited for that purpose.

The interview ended. The reporter thanked everybody for coming. To the people from Head Start, going over "historical" issues—the Evaluation Committee, "race", activism versus service, fiscal accountability—seemed rather anticlimactic.

The following day, Thursday, the Executive Director "demoted" the Head Start Director to nutrition aide, the demotion to be effective beginning July 1st. The Executive Director described this action as a disciplinary measure.

On Friday, June 18th, the new Board met. It "dissolved" the Head Start Policy Council and replaced it with an "ad hoc committee." The Chairwoman of the Westside Parent Center, who, in April, had resigned in protest against the Policy Council's vote of no confidence in the Executive Director, reappointed herself center Chairwoman and, presenting her personal views, said that she did not feel the Policy Council represented the sentiments of
Head Start. The Northside Parent Center, as a group, agreed with her. (In July, the Northside would meet to replace their Parent Representative to the Policy Council. The meeting would occur without the knowledge of the seated Parent Representative.)

The Board also decided to investigate the possibility of relaxing current nepotism rules and called for disciplinary action against staff members whose disloyalty to MMHR had been proven "through action or hearsay."

In his response to the Missoulian reporter's query, the Policy Council Chairman said that he did not "consider the council dissolved because an official of the Office of Economic Opportunity has declared that MMHR's board of directors was improperly elected" (Bloom: June 16, 1973).

On June 19th, a majority of the Head Start teachers signed and distributed to Head Start parents a statement to the effect that "if Missoula-Mineral Human Resources is continued as the prime sponsor of Head Start, we, the undersigned, will tender our resignations."³³

The statement provided a concise analysis of the roots of the conflict as perceived from the classroom.

The Missoula-Mineral Human Resources action philosophy conflicts with the comprehensive child development goals of Head Start. Due to this conflict we feel that our effectiveness with children and parents would greatly diminish if our association with Missoula-Mineral Human Resources continues. Knowing what needs Head Start could fulfill, we would feel our goals and rights as teachers of young children would be compromised.
As teachers we see ourselves concerned primarily with young children and their immediate environment—classroom, family, and neighborhood problems that effect their ability to achieve optimum development. This is in direct conflict with Missoula-Mineral Human Resources' confrontation and issue-oriented action. As a result of this disparity, the parents and children who we serve are deprived of a truly effective child development program . . . .

The effect of this letter upon the parents was described by one as "the biggest kick in the guts" the parents had yet received. In her opinion, it was this letter which prevented a mass defection of parents from Head Start to Community Action.

Also on June 19th, an investigator sent by the Chief Counsel for HEW's Regional Office arrived in Missoula to take possession of the Head Start intake records still held by CAP. CAP's Planning Director, instructed by the Executive Director via telephone, refused to surrender the records, although he later claimed to have offered to allow the investigator to look at them (the investigator stated that the Planning Director refused to allow him to see the records).

The investigator told the Head Start leadership that it was more important that he had been denied possession of the records than if he had been permitted to take them, for in refusing him, CAP had violated OEO regulations which required CAP to surrender its records to a duly authorized agent of HEW upon request. The refusal
constituted "non-cooperation", which was fine from Head Start's standpoint.

On Wednesday, the 20th, the investigator drove to Mineral County to collect the intakes pertinent to the Alberton and Superior Head Start centers and a tape of the January 31st meeting at Alberton during which the Executive Director and the Head Start Director had given their interpretations of Head Start regulations as they pertained to recruitment. (The meeting had been taped without the knowledge of either man. Head Start only learned of the existence of the tape in June.)

The investigator returned to Denver that same evening.

Also on Wednesday, the Head Start Director, the Policy Council Chairman, the Chairwoman of the old Board, the Education Director, and the Supportive Services Director converged on the bank wherein Head Start's account lay. They wanted to know, first, how much money was left in the account and, second, what was the procedure by which they could obtain access to it (none but the Board Chairwoman were signatories to the account).

The bank vice-president with whom they spoke was agreeable to fulfilling the first request: Head Start had approximately $1,450 in its account. The Head Start Director had expected to find between $15,000 and $17,000. (As Sakaye's later investigation showed, approximately $15,500 of Head Start monies was expended by CAP during
the spring of 1973. Approximately $12,000 was ultimately replaced, leaving about $3,500 for the bookkeeper.)

As to the second request, to gain access to the money, that was impossible. The bank could not be certain who the current Board Chairman was, given the various claims by the several parties involved in the conflict, and, unless the Chairwoman of the old Board could produce the corporate seal, the bank could not allow her access to agency monies. The corporate seal was in the possession of the Executive Director.

That same day, HEW turned down a request from the new Board to lift the suspension of grants pertaining to the operation of Head Start.

The requests were denied because they need concurrence from the old board of directors of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., and the Head Start Policy Council, according to a telegram from [the] Regional HEW Director. . . which arrived Friday [June 22nd]. MMHR is the sponsor for Head Start.

The requests were sent by the new MMHR board which is not recognized by the Office of Economic Opportunity due to allegedly faulty nominating procedures.

[The Chairwoman of the old Board] said [that the Deputy Regional Program Director] for the Office of Child Development made it quite clear that the request for funds during suspension must come from the old board. OCD is the division of HEW which oversees Head Start (Bloom: June 23, 1973).

On the 22nd, the Missoulian reporter telephoned the Policy Council Chairman to ask him if his faction intended to request funds. He responded affirmatively and told her that his group would be meeting the following day with part
of the Executive Committee of the old Board. The reporter wanted to know when and where they were meeting. The Chairman did not want to tell her. Since the Policy Council meeting of June 12th, Head Start parents were shy of open meetings. The Chairman did not want the meeting scheduled for the 23rd publicized.

The reporter was persistent. "Just for my personal information," she said. The Chairman gave her the information on time and place.

In the same article in which the reporter wrote of HEW's refusal to grant the requests of the new Board, she also announced that the Policy Council Chairman "said his group will meet at 1:30 p.m. Saturday in the Gold Oak Room of the University of Montana Center to decide whether to support the requests for funds during suspension."

At the last minute, the Chairman had to make other arrangements for a meeting place in order to avoid a possible confrontation with CAP or its supporters. (I learned the following week that members of Missoula AIM and employees of CAP indeed had arrived at the Gold Oak Room to participate in the meeting. The nature of the intended participation, of course, remains open to speculation.)

Head Start staff and parents had regarded the reporter with some distaste since her first articles dealing with the conflict had appeared. It was apparent that the reporter accepted with little question the explanations as to the causes of the conflict that were provided her by CAP.
In her articles, she emphasized CAP's court battles with OEO and HEW and apparently accepted a conspiracy theory which allowed that President Nixon and the current ruling factions of OEO, HEW, and Missoula-Mineral Head Start were secretly allied to destroy OEO and Missoula-Mineral Human Resources particularly.

But Head Start parents were more concerned with the fact that many of themselves were being harassed by telephone both day and night. They were afraid for the well-being and, in some cases, the lives of their children. Their reputations were being maligned. Current and former Head Start staff members had suffered property damage at the hands of unidentified vandals.

The Head Start Director and Policy Council Chairman had supplied the reporter with copies of some of the personal statements written by Head Start staff and parents. But the reporter had not incorporated any of this material into her evaluations of the conflict.

A number of Head Start staff and parents were certain that the reporter had been seduced by one or another CAP staff member and speculated on which one had taken her to bed. The Chairman felt that the seduction was of a different kind. CAP was proficient in what the Chairman came to call "middleman's rhetoric." Those of the "liberal" community --some academicians particularly but also other "professionals" such as some lawyers and civil service workers generally unconnected with the daily operations of MMHR--had been the
recipients of lengthy monologues describing CAP as an "advocate" of the poor and the poor themselves in benevolent if patronizing terms. President Nixon's obvious dislike of OEO only served to reinforce "liberal" attitudes toward Missoula's CAP agency.

Able to perceive the liberal aversion to conservative or reactionary light, spicing the pot with charges of "racism".

What "liberal", unconnected with CAP, could be against its goals of social reform and social justice? As Alinsky pointed out, "To criticize an anti-poverty program would be like being against Mother" (Alinsky 1965:41). Yet, Alinsky perceived the distinction between "rhetoric" and "reality". Calling anti-poverty agencies "pimps of the poor . . . using the problems of the poor to secure anti-poverty grants for their own agencies," he described the "anti-poverty program . . . as history's greatest relief program for the benefit of the welfare industry. Graft wears many faces and one of the most sickening is the dedicated one. The use of poverty funds to absorb staff salaries and operating costs . . . is an old device" (Alinsky 1965:45).

The reporter, the Policy Council Chairman felt, had been seduced by CAP rhetoric, the acceptance of which enabled her to be content with writing only superficial accounts of the conflict. The Policy Council Chairman had refused to accept the premise of most of those in Head Start with whom
he was in daily contact that the reporter consciously had
taken sides against Head Start.

He felt now, however, that there could be no other
explanation for her betraying what he had given her as
privileged information. The general sentiment expressed by
Head Start parents was of an "I told you so" nature. Head
Start staff sympathized with the Chairman's anger at having
been deceived.

On June 25th, MMHR filed suit against the Regional
Directors of OEO, HEW, and OCD, HEW Secretary Casper
Weinberger, and OEO Acting Director Howard Phillips.
According to the newspaper article,

The suit ... seeks five objectives:
--To declare the suspension of Head Start
funds unlawful ... .
--To keep the defendants from taking fur­
ther action regarding the suspension or
ro rescind the suspension.
--To recognize the new board of MMHR, ... .
--To overturn the decision of ... ,
Regional Director of HEW, not to recognize
the new board based on [OEO's Regional
Director's] decisions.
--To declare the new board the only
official board of MMHR (Bloom: June 26,
1973).

On June 26th, in response to a telegram sent
Saturday, June 23rd, by the executive committees of the
old Board and the Head Start Policy Council requesting
operating funds for Head Start during the period of
suspension, HEW released $1,800 by which to operate
Daycare alone. The remainder of the $7,394 request by
which Head Start salaries, facilities, rentals, and
administrative claims would be met, was withheld. HEW's reasoning here was that it was willing to take a chance that the $1,800 would be used by MMHR to support Daycare, but it did not trust MMHR to use other monies for their intended purposes.

On June 28th, the Regional Director of HEW sent a TWX (a wireless message transmitted and received by tele-typewriter) to the Head Start Director, the Policy Council Chairman, the Chairwoman of the old Board, the Executive Director of CAP, the Head Start (State) Training Officer, and the Chairwoman of the new Board, informing all parties that it was HEW's intent to terminate all grants, "effective at 5:00 p.m. on July 31, 1973, for [Missoula Mineral Human Resources'] continued failure to comply with federal standards, guidelines, instructions and conditions, which failures have resulted in serious maladministration of the Head Start program."

The TWX cited the particulars of the allegations:
1. it noted the over-income status of both the Alberton and Superior Head Start centers and that the Executive Director and the Head Start Director of academic year 1971-1972 had sanctioned the "practice of disregarding or altering the gross income of families to bring about the alleged 'eligibility' of children to attend classes . . ."
2. it noted that "a proper representative" of HEW was denied access to intake records by the Planning Director,
"acting for and under instructions of" the Executive Director. 3. it noted a continual failure "to comply with federal audit instructions, . . . " 4. it noted that MMHR had "used funds derived from the state program for Aid to Dependent Children to pay interest on a commercial loan." 5. it noted that "On or about June 15, 1973, the management of the agency, allegedly acting through a newly-elected Board for the Missoula Mineral Human Resources, Inc., purportedly dissolved the Head Start Policy Council." It cited a transmittal notice of the Office of Child Development: ". . . a proposal can not be adopted or proposed action taken until agreement is reached between disagreeing groups (e.g., Policy Council and Board or individuals)." Therefore, the TWX stated, "The dissolution was in violation of this instruction." 6. it noted the removal of the Head Start Director and his replacement by the Parent Involvement Director and that neither action had Policy Council concurrence. 7. it noted three instances of "misuse of funds," or the attempt to misuse federal funds. 8. it noted that "During the months of February, March and April 1973, Head Start facilities . . . were made available to individuals . . . [who] spent the night in the center and consumed food which belonged to the Head Start program. Property has been damaged or lost, mail destroyed and the center left in unhealthy and unsanitary disorder. On several occasions the center had to be cleaned by the
teachers before classes could begin. The telephone was used for non-Head Start purposes and the Head Start program billed. These incidents were reported to . . . , Executive Director of MMHR several times. With one known exception, no direct and timely action was taken to remove unauthorized and disorderly individuals, or prevent other abuse of property." 9. it noted that Head Start staff and parents had "lost confidence in the ability of the MMHR to administer the program," which "resulted in the Policy Council request . . . that the Head Start grant no longer be administered by the MMHR" . . . and "12 of 23 teachers signing a petition declaring they would resign if MMHR were to be retained as the sponsor." The TWX blamed "the fiscal and personnel maladministration discussed hereinbefore" for "the existence of opposed community groups and divided community opinion . . . ."

The TWX informed the agency that it was entitled to a hearing "to show cause why the termination should not occur." (For the complete text of the TWX of June 28th, see Appendix B.)

For Head Start, the situation looked good. Everything was proceeding according to the timetable that OCD's Regional Community Representative had outlined the previous spring.

Reversals
On July 4th, the Missoulian reported the resignations of the Executive Director of Missoula's Community Action agency and the Regional Director of OEO. In various capacities, and over a variety of issues, the two men had fought each other intermittently for years. CAP, while obviously saddened to see the Executive Director leave, rejoiced at the resignation of the Regional Director and held a small beer party to celebrate his departure.

The Executive Director, in an interview with the Missoulian reporter said that he hoped that the Regional Director's resignation would help to quell the conflict in Missoula. "I hope [the Head Start Director] will resign . . ., too," [he] added.

"'We're all focal points for people to rally around,' he explained."

In more personal tones, he described what Community Action had meant to him as a social action program:

Before coming to MMHR, [the Executive Director] said, he had "a very traditional social work background."

Then he went to work as head of the social services department at the Montana State Prison at Deer Lodge, following a prison riot there in 1959.

He said he introduced psychiatric services, casework services, a Jaycees chapter, a Toastmaster chapter and such to deal with the problems which had caused the riot. He said prior to that time the prison had been strictly a custodial institution.

"The prison experience traumatized
me," he said. "We were working with the results of a bad system." [The Executive Director] said many of the prisoners would not have needed to be there, but racial prejudice and bad housing and employment situations had caused problems for them.

He said he was frustrated at [sic] the prison and judicial systems were all geared to self-perpetuation, he said.

The step from the prison to Community Action, whose official goal is to end the causes of poverty, as well as to deal with the effects, was a logical one for [him].

He said this was the very issue at stake in the current battle over Head Start. He said the difference between Head Start and the traditional preschool program is that a traditional preschool program accepts a child and helps him, but does not attempt to change the cases [sic] of his poverty.

Head Start, on the other hand, should be saying, "Why work with the child for one year and then turn him out into a bad school system?" [the Executive Director] said, adding that the program should be working with parents and with the school system.

[The Executive Director] said the most basic change effected by MMHR over the years was awareness of poverty in Missoula. "People didn't know there was poverty," he said. "We've made it visible."

He said the low-income people had organized to fight the health department, employment services and the welfare department and had won those battles. But they were disappointed in efforts to have the city build low-income housing units.

In the over-all war against the Nixon administration's efforts to close down the OEO, he said, "We're winning some battles. I don't know if we'll win the war. But it's a waste of time and energy."

He said Nixon has tried to limit the effectiveness of low-income organizations
since 1970 and anti-poverty agencies nationally have been able to do little but respond.

At present the basic question in CAP work is "advocacy versus survival," he said.

Some people say "survive at any cost"; some say "survive only on your own terms," he said. Those who advocate the first attitude are afraid of losing the programs they have, he explained.

"Programs you can get anytime. Advocacy is hard to get because advocacy involves risk. It's hard to take a stand," he said.

"I've taken a lot of stands. Now it's caught up with me," he added, referring to the disputes MMHR has been involved in during recent months.

"But I've lasted longer than the average CAP director," he said. Nationally, CAP directors last about two years on the job. [The Executive Director] finished almost eight (Bloom: July 4, 1973). 34

The Head Start teachers were angry that the article was so sympathetic to the Executive Director. Also, they were afraid that he had "got away." (He had taken a job in Colorado.) They wanted to see him put into prison. I asked them what proof of illegal activity on the part of the Executive Director did they have that would send him to prison. They had none. But they felt certain that he must have done something illegal. They admitted that they wanted revenge for all of the personal humiliations they had suffered from Community Action over the years.
The Head Start Director assured them that if the Executive Director had done anything illegal while a CAP director, the government would find him and bring him to trial.

As far as the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were concerned, little had changed pertinent to seeking separation from MMHR. If the Executive Director had gone, his minions, of similar mind, had remained.

One man in the agency neither the Head Start Director nor the Policy Council Chairman knew. This was the former Deputy Director, who had returned to the agency as a consultant at the Executive Director's request in June, after a year's absence. While the teachers hated the Executive Director, and returned the contempt of the Acting Deputy Director and the Planning Director, they feared the former Deputy Director. The Executive Director had considered him his "right hand man", the teachers said. They said that in past years, the most offensive of the tactics the agency had employed had originated from the mind of this man. They agreed on the term, "dangerous", to describe him.

Even so, I have little specific information on this individual's activities during the summer of 1973. During a Board meeting in early June, he announced that "Head Start will die with CAP." On another occasion he said, in reference to the Head Start Director, "There's only one thing to do with a turkey: shoot it." And on another
occasion, "The only thing to do with a turkey is shoot it," again referring to the Head Start Director. Apart from issuing this kind of statement from time to time, the former Deputy Director appears to have done nothing during the summer of 1973. The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman interpreted his rhetoric as an attempt to incite someone to take it upon himself to try to kill the Head Start Director.

According to the scenario for separation that the Regional Community Representative had outlined, and which the OEO investigator had confirmed as accurate, the next step in the process was that representatives from Head Start would meet in an "informal hearing" in Denver with representatives of HEW. CAP was also entitled to an informal hearing but theirs would come later. During the first week in July, the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman made arrangements with HEW functionaries to have the hearing on Monday, July 9th. On Friday, the 6th, the Regional Community Representative telephoned the Policy Council Chairman at his home. She wanted to know why he and the Head Start Director had requested the hearing.

The Policy Council Chairman was surprised. He had thought that this "informal hearing" was a formality that Head Start was expected to endure. However, he and the Head Start Director wanted to use the occasion to request
immediate refunding for Daycare. But all of this was only a rehash of what Head Start and HEW had planned weeks earlier. He asked the Regional Community Representative why she had bothered to call to ask this question. She replied that she was only curious, and that she would see him on Monday afternoon.

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman arrived in Denver Sunday evening. Monday morning they went to the Federal Building hoping to find somebody they knew who could give them some idea about what to expect from the hearing in the afternoon. They were told that everybody was attending a meeting and would be occupied all morning. They spent the lunch hour drinking coffee in the building's cafeteria. The Chairman, looking out of the sealed window, watched a diesel van chugging its way along an interstate highway. Cars were passing it. "You know," he said to the Head Start Director, "Denver is a long way from Missoula." The Head Start Director nodded in agreement.

They met the Regional Community Representative and the Deputy Program Director of OCD at one o'clock in their offices on the tenth floor of the Federal Building. Then they were introduced to the Regional Program Director of OCD who in turn introduced them by name to the Chief Legal Counsel of HEW. The Chief Legal Counsel seemed uncertain as to who the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were. He appeared to believe that they were from Missoula's CAP agency.
"We're from the other side," the Policy Council Chairman said.

"They're from Head Start," said the Regional Program Director of OCD.

"Oh, you've come here to get your hands slapped," the Chief Counsel said.

"To get our hands slapped!"

"They're from Head Start," the OCD Program Director said again.

The Chief Counsel seemed confused again. He ushered everybody into a small conference room. He said something about his doing some work for the OCD Program Director occasionally and then rephrased it so that it came out that they worked together on certain projects sometimes. The point seemed to be that he did not work for anybody but helped out other people on the HEW staff.

He apologized for not being prepared for this meeting, but a personal problem had arisen the previous Friday and it had occupied his attention all weekend.

The Head Start Director filled him in on the problems in Missoula as Head Start saw it: the false intakes, the suspected misuse of Head Start monies, his "suspension", the lack of fiscal and managerial accountability, the parents' dissatisfaction.

The Chief Counsel sympathized.

The Head Start Director stated that only $1,450 remained in the Head Start account and that Head Start could not touch
even that because the now former Executive Director held the corporate seal. (According to an informant, the Executive Director retained it in his possession for an unspecified time following his resignation.)

The Chief Counsel asked what the Executive Director was doing now.

The Policy Council Chairman named a foundation in Denver for whom the Executive Director was working.

The Chief Counsel asked the other HEW employees whether the foundation solicited HEW grants. If it did, he suggested, HEW could refuse a grant unless the former Executive Director gave up the seal.

The other HEW people did not know where the foundation got its money.

The Chief Counsel suggested that the most expedient thing to do would be to drag the conflict out until November, the end of Head Start's program year. By that time, most of Head Start's staff would be forced to have found other jobs and, the staff gone, there would be no conflict.

The Head Start Director, under the impression that the purpose of this "informal hearing" was to allow Head Start to present its case, asked that HEW auditors be sent to Missoula to audit the agency's books.

The Deputy Program Director of OCD said that HEW had sent auditors to Missoula a number of times during the
past year and they had not been able to find any significant abuses.

The Head Start Director said that he would be able to show the auditors what to look for if they would contact him when they arrived in Missoula.

The Chief Counsel called in two HEW auditors. They said that they would be able to fly to Missoula within a week and that they would contact the Head Start Director when they arrived.

The Head Start Director next said that Head Start was considering taking its case before a federal grand jury.

The room immediately became silent, except for a scuffing sound in a corner. The sound was made by the OCD Program Director sliding his chair against the wall so that the Policy Council Chairman's view of him was hidden by the Regional Community Representative.

The Regional Community Representative looked at the Chief Legal Counsel. The Chief Legal Counsel looked at the ceiling. The Deputy Program Director of OCD stared into the wall to his left. The auditors looked at their feet.

For perhaps a minute nobody said a word. Finally the Deputy Program Director of OCD said, "I don't think that would be a good idea."

"Why not?" the Policy Council Chairman said.

"Only a government agency can request a federal grand jury."
The meeting ended. The Head Start Director could expect a call from the auditors upon their arrival in Missoula within a week or ten days. (They arrived in the middle of September.)

The Deputy Program Director of OCD wanted the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman to meet somebody from OEO. The Regional Community Representative accompanied them. Instead of taking the elevator, they walked up the flight of stairs at the end of the corridor to the eleventh floor, OEO's demesne. The stairs were littered with trash. The janitors were on strike, the Regional Community Representative explained. "You see, we have our problems in Denver, too."

The Deputy Program Director of OCD introduced the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman to an OEO staff member whom he described as the man in charge of the Missoula case. (He was introduced by name rather than position. Later, he held the position of Chief of Operations for OEO's Regional Office. Whether he occupied this position in July, 1973, I do not know. However, for purposes of this paper, I shall refer to him as the Chief of Operations.)

The Policy Council Chairman asked the Chief of Operations if he had read the documentation Head Start had forwarded (copies had been sent to HEW, OEO, and Montana's Congressional delegation.)
The Chief of Operations hesitated, began to speak, changed his mind, then said that he had not read it.

The Policy Council Chairman was dumbfounded. He literally could not find his voice. How could any public servant involved in so violent a controversy fail to familiarize himself with all of its aspects? How could the Chief of Operations make an intelligent judgement of the affair without reviewing all the information? And why did he admit his ignorance? Why did he not lie to cover it? (According to the report in August of a well placed informant, immediately following the resignation of OEO's Regional Director on July 3rd, his staff members burned the Missoula file. I have not been able to confirm this report. However, if it is true, it would help to explain the behavior of the Chief of Operations on July 9th.)

The Chief of Operations said that he had read only the brief that the Acting Deputy Director had filed.

"Do you think that's enough to gain an overview?" the Head Start Director asked.

The Chief of Operations replied that he thought it was. He mentioned the problems that OEO was having nationally, and said that the controversy in Missoula cast an unfavorable light on OEO. He hoped that now that the Regional Director of OEO and the Executive Director of Missoula's Community Action agency had resigned, the causes for dissension between CAP and Head Start had been removed and the problems between
them could be resolved.

The Policy Council Chairman said that the remainder of Missoula's CAP staff was of a kind with the Executive Director.

The Chief of Operations concluded the short meeting by saying that simply because a few seats on the MMHR Board were fraudulently obtained, this was no reason to throw out the entire Board. OEO was going to recognize the new Board. The Chief of Operations said that he would insist that new elections be held for the contested seats. (The elections were never held.)

The Deputy Program Director of OCD returned to his office after inviting the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman to wait around until 4:30, when he would take them out for a drink.

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman followed the Regional Community Representative back to the office she shared with a number of other lesser OCD staff personnel. She introduced them around, not failing to mention that they were from Missoula. The other employees shook their hands and politely excused themselves.

The Regional Community Representative said that CAP agency personnel were constantly calling her. "Do you know what they say about you?" she asked the Chairman.

"I know. I'm a naive student and I do only what [the Head Start Director] tells me to do."
They laughed.

She complained about CAP's Planning Director. He had been calling the various Head Start projects throughout Montana, attempting to foment dissatisfaction with the Regional Community Representative's job performance. She said that she had forty-three Head Start projects to manage. Missoula was only one.

"It's the only one I care about," said the Chairman.

"I can see that." She said that Ogden was also presenting problems.

The Chairman asked what she knew about the Spokane and Seattle controversies.

She did not know anything about them. They were in Region X. This was Region VIII.

The Chairman began to talk about Daycare. He assumed it would be refunded.

The Regional Community Representative interrupted him. "Did you notice, Andy, [the Regional Program Director of OCD] didn't say anything about Daycare during the meeting?"

"But I assumed that that simply meant we would be refunded. That's one of the reasons we came here."

"No," she said. Her face had reddened.

"Well, at least we didn't lose the entire program. For a while I thought we were going to," he said bitterly. She did not say anything. She looked at the floor.

"We're a long way from Missoula, Andy."
"I know. I was thinking about that earlier."

At 4:30 the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman met the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD and the three of them took the elevator down to the ground floor. In the elevator several people were talking and laughing about--the pig farm.

For several months rumors concerning the Executive Director's investment in a pig farm in Colorado had circulated through Missoula's CAP agency. The rumors vaguely referred to some sort of legal difficulty concerning the farm. Now, in the elevator, these men were talking about the same farm. Apparently there were others, HEW and OEO employees, who were co-investors, and the legal difficulty, according to these men, arose from the (alleged) fact that this pig farm, owned by welfare bureaucrats, had been stealing pigs from a neighboring "poor people's co-op."

When the elevator stopped at the bottom the Chairman turned to one of the men he had met that day who was among those joking about the predicament in which certain of his colleagues found themselves.

The Chairman asked who were the investors in the pig farm.

The informant named the Deputy Regional Director of HEW.

"Who else?"

The informant named the Regional Program Director of OCD.
"Who else?"

The informant made a sweeping motion with his hands.

"Everybody."

"Is [the Regional Director of HEW]?"

"No. Not him."

"Are you?"

"No. Not me."

He refused to say any more. Several men who had left the elevator with them were standing around listening to the conversation.

The Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD, the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman proceeded across the street from the Federal Building to a bar called Eddie's Tavern.

The Chairman said how much he had been looking forward to drinking a Coors', which is not sold in Montana.

"We don't drink Coors' here," the Deputy Program Director of OCD said. He explained that people in Denver were not drinking Coors' in an effort to pressure the Adolph Coors' Company into hiring more Mexicans.

The Chairman agreed not to order a Coors' "if you honor Chavez' boycotts." It was a gentleman's agreement.

They were joined shortly by another HEW employee. He ordered a Coors'. The Deputy Program Director of OCD did not say anything.

Soon the Regional Program Director of OCD and the
Chief Legal Counsel of HEW pulled chairs up to the booth. The Regional Program Director of OCD ordered a brand of beer other than Coors' and the Chief Counsel ordered scotch. The HEW employees made shop talk. The pig farm was mentioned again. Apparently neither Head Start's Regional Community Representative nor the Deputy Program Director of OCD was an investor. The Chief Legal Counsel complained about a member of his staff who he said was not competent and whom, apparently, he had tried to have fired. The staff member, a Black, had accused him of racism. The Chief Counsel snorted and said that he had told the man that if he were not Black he would not have lasted as long in the job as he had.

Talk turned to Missoula. The Chief Legal Counsel had read the newspaper clippings that had been forwarded by the Head Start Director and the STO. He asked how well they represented the situation. The Head Start Director said that the reporter was biased in favor of CAP. The Chief Counsel said that he thought the newspaper accounts were quite fair. The Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD said that the reporter was biased. The Chief Counsel insisted that she was not.

"Who is she sleeping with?" the Chief Counsel asked. He wanted to know what she looked like.

The Chief Counsel told how MMHR's Acting Deputy Director had been calling him recently, insisting that
President Nixon was "out to get me", and that "you [the Chief Counsel] can tell me" if it's true, promising not to tell anyone where he obtained the information. The Chief Counsel laughed about the Acting Deputy Director's sense of self-importance, "as if Nixon had ever heard of him."

"He [the Acting Deputy Director] wants to be a martyr," someone suggested.

The Head Start Director mentioned the falsified intakes. "I've known about them for a year," said the man who had ordered Coors', as though to dismiss their significance.

"I've known about them for a year and a half," said the Regional Program Director of OCD. The Policy Council Chairman looked at him, unbelieving. The Regional Program Director nodded his head as though to confirm what he had just said. "A year and a half," he repeated. He shook his head sadly, as though to emphasize the shame of it all.

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman had to hurry to catch their plane. As they entered their hotel to pick up their baggage, the Head Start Director said, "I'm beginning to think that the whole world is corrupt."

"Yeah," the Council Chairman agreed.

They did not talk on the plane ride back to Missoula. Each tried alone to make some sense out of what he had seen and heard that day.

The Regional Director of HEW was on vacation. Was his
staff carrying out his instructions, or were the mice playing in his absence. What was the significance of the pig farm? Did it act as the whore with whom everybody was forced to copulate so that no one could snitch to the others' wives? If the Regional Program Director of OCD had known, a year and a half ago, that Head Start intakes had been falsified, why had he not taken remedial action? And how much did the Regional Director of HEW know of all this? The Chief Legal Counsel had wanted to slap Head Start's hands. He had suggested also that HEW should drag out the conflict until November, saying explicitly that by then the Head Start staff, of economic necessity, would be forced to have found other work, thus ending the conflict without HEW having to get mixed up in it. Whose side was he on? The Chief Counsel appeared to be inordinately conscious of his bureaucratic rank. Several times during the afternoon meeting and again at Eddie's Tavern he had made an issue of his not working for anybody but, instead, working with particular people. When the Policy Council Chairman had tried to bait him by saying, "You just do it out of the goodness of your heart," the Chief Legal Counsel had agreed that that was the case. How did these apparent aspirations of "bureaucratic ascendency" affect Head Start? According to Missoula rumor, the Executive Director "had something" on the Regional Program Director of OCD. What was it? Did it relate to the current fight? The Deputy Regional
Program Director of OCD had said that the now former Executive Director, now living in Denver, was "haunting the halls" of OEO and HEW. What effect did his constant presence have in Denver? A month earlier, the Regional Community Representative had told the Chairman, "You have the entire federal government behind you." Should he now assume that the entire federal government was against him? Against Head Start? The phrase, "Something terrible is going to happen," resounded through the Chairman's head throughout the flight. What more could Head Start do that it had not done? The Chairman was willing to take on the entire federal government if he had to, but what more could Head Start do? The refrain, "Something terrible is going to happen," continued to sound in his mind.

Dog Days

The following day, the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman met at the STO's office. Several Head Start staff members were already there. The STO informed them that the Regional Program Director of OCD had telephoned her and instructed her to refuse the use of her office to Head Start. She said she was sorry. The Head Start staff and policy group transferred their meeting place to one of the university coffee shops.

The same day, OEO recognized the new Board as the legitimate policy making body for MMHR. OEO had violated
its agreement with HEW to withhold recognition until after Head Start had separated. MMHR now had a bargaining position.

The attitude of the STO cooled considerably toward Missoula's Head Start. Although she had promised continued use of the copying machine available to her, each time access was requested she made a greater show of reluctance in relinquishing the key to unlock it. Toward the end of the week, the Chairman waited until the STO was out of her office, then removed the originals of the personal documents which had been forwarded to him and which he had secreted in the STO's filing cabinet. He retained half and gave the remainder to the Head Start Director.

On Thursday, four representatives from CAP met in an "informal hearing" in Denver with the same people with whom the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman had met. The Regional Community Representative had promised to telephone Missoula as soon as the hearing had ended to let Head Start know what were the results.

On Friday, she responded to a call from the Head Start Director. There was "no change," she said. HEW would continue with plans for the separation of Head Start from Community Action.

But that same evening, MMHR hosted a party to celebrate the event that HEW had conceded on all of MMHR's demands. Head Start did not know what demands MMHR had put forth.

On Monday, the Head Start Director told the STO that HEW had sold out Head Start. The STO refused to believe it.
She and the Regional Community Representative were close personal friends. She could not accept that the Regional Community Representative had lied to the Head Start Director the previous Friday when she had cited "no change" or that she would have failed to warn her, the STO, that a change of position was imminent. She called Denver and spoke with the Regional Community Representative. The latter told her that "there were a few changes but nothing that could be considered major." She did not specify what the changes were.

The STO was shaken. She kept repeating that the Regional Community Representative never had deceived her before, that she, the STO, would continue to trust her. It was apparent to the Head Start Director, the Policy Council Chairman, and to the Head Start director of another program in Montana who happened to be present that the STO was only deceiving herself. The other Head Start director said, "My God, if they can do this to Missoula, what's going to happen to the rest of us?"

Copies of the agreement between MMHR and HEW were received in Missoula on Wednesday the 18th. It rescinded the suspension of Head Start grants, provided that:

[MMHR relinquish all claims over Head Start grants after November 30, 1973, if another] prime grantee is designated and a smooth transition from [MMHR] to the new prime grantee can be guaranteed . . . . MMHR will solicit a new grantee for the Head Start program in Missoula and Mineral Counties . . . . No less than 90 percent of the
children in each Head Start class will be from low-income families. . . . [MMHR will attempt to] operate efficiently and without dissension. . . . Disagreements will be eliminated or minimized. . . . The proposal to terminate MMHR as a Head Start grantee is withdrawn by HEW upon ratification of this agreement [by the MMHR Board of Directors]. . . . [The current Policy Council] is recognized . . . as the legally constituted Head Start Policy Council for MMHR . . . . Previous personnel actions taken without requisite Policy Council concurrence are to be rectified. . . . A full audit will be made. . . . No funds coming to MMHR for the Head Start program will be used for any other purposes. . . . [HEW recognize the new Board] . . . .

(For the complete text of the agreement, see Appendix B.)

For Head Start, the key to understanding the agreement could be found in HEW's acquiescence to MMHR's apparent demand that it retain Head Start until November 30th, the end of Head Start's funding year, that MMHR solicit for a new grantee for Head Start, and that Head Start separate only if a "smooth transition" to a new sponsor could be guaranteed. (The agreement did not specify who was to provide the guarantee.) In short, there would be no separation. In short, there would be no Head Start in the fall, for, if the Head Start Director were correct in his estimate of the rate at which Head Start monies were disappearing, Head Start would be entirely without operating funds by September. In short, the physical and emotional suffering that Head Start supporters had endured had been for nothing.
What was the Chairman to say to the woman who traced her incapacitating migraines, her lower back and stomach pains, to the continued telephone calls threatening her pre-adolescent daughter that were made by a Head Start outreach worker loyal to Community Action? To the woman whose daughters were threatened with kidnap and rape? To the woman who was afraid to sleep in her own house at night because an anonymous caller threatened to "do it to you." To the woman who had sacrificed her marriage in order to participate in the fight for Head Start?35

Two weeks earlier, the Head Start Director had called the Senator's office in Washington. He had told an assistant to the Senator that he was afraid that "some sort of unfavorable agreement might be ginned up between HEW and MMHR. [The assistant to the Senator] apparently spoke to [the Regional Director of HEW] about these concerns and he was assured by [the latter] no agreement would occur without his concurrence and [the Senator's] office would be kept advised" (quoted from a statement by the Head Start Director).

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman now agreed, following the policy reversals by HEW/OCD, that Head Start's only hope lay in directing Congressional pressure against HEW. The Head Start Director again telephoned the Senator's assistant and stated that, in his opinion, the agreement between HEW and MMHR "was a white wash of some serious situations which would have no
doubt reflected back on HEW/OCD administration."

The Senator's assistant telephoned OCD's Regional Program Director. The Regional Program Director told him that the agreement had HEW's Regional Director's concurrence.

The Senator's assistant then telephoned HEW's Regional Director, who had returned early from his vacation. The latter stated that he knew nothing of the agreement. He said that he would alter the agreement in such a way as to make it unacceptable to MMHR, who would, therefore, refuse to ratify it.

On July 20th, the Board convened to ratify the agreement. OEO had sent two investigators to Missoula. They were present at the meeting. One of them described how, following the resignation of the previous Regional Director of OEO, he, the investigator, had strolled through the corridors of OEO, whistling Auld Lang Syne. He described how jubilant the OEO staff had been at the time. He said that, in sounding out public opinion in Missoula, he had found that CAP had an excellent reputation for serving the poor, and was highly regarded by low-income people. He said that the OEO investigator who had been in Missoula the first week in June, and who had reached conclusions about CAP which were diametrically opposed to those he was now presenting, had been a "hatchet man" for the previous Regional Director of OEO.
He stressed how important it was that the conflict between Head Start and Community Action in Missoula be resolved, that it reflected disadvantageously on other Community Action agencies.

He was going on in this vein when the telephone rang. The call was for the Chairwoman of MMHR. Her young son had accidentally shot himself while playing with a flare gun. He would be going into surgery this afternoon. The Board Chairwoman was shaken. Several people, including some hostile to MMHR, offered to drive her to the hospital. She refused. She continued to conduct the Board meeting.

The telephone rang again. A TWX from the Regional Director of HEW was read over the line. The reinstatement of Head Start grants would end on August 1st. Head Start would be finding a new grantee.

MMHR refused to accept this new "proposal". The Board ratified the agreement that had been made between MMHR and OCD a week earlier.

Word of the tragedy befalling the son of MMHR's Chairwoman spread fast. One Head Start parent said that he was glad there were witnesses to it so that no one could blame Head Start for the shooting.

On the evening of July 21st, the Policy Council Chairman received a telephone call from a Policy Council representative. The man said that he was "jacked out of shape. As a matter of fact, I'm extremely jacked out of
shape." The former Policy Council Chairwoman had accused him of attempting to rape her. She had told Sheriff's officers that she was certain he was the man. Within a couple of days she retracted her statement, apologized to the man she had accused, and, instead, delivered to the Sheriff's office a list of names of men she regarded as likely suspects. The list included the names of almost every man connected with Head Start. The Sheriff's office apparently felt that something more than a simple case of assault or attempted rape was involved, and investigated no further. The woman did not pursue the issue.²⁶

The Council representative who had first been accused told me that he hoped he did not run into the former Council Chairwoman on the street or even at a meeting; he was afraid of what his reaction might be.²⁷

During the period immediately following the July 20th MMHR Board meeting, someone fired a rifle into the house of a teacher aide. The bullet missed both the woman and her son by inches. A Head Start teacher recalled that, three years before, the same style of assault had been employed against another teacher aide by a man who was then a part-time consultant for MMHR and who was now allied with CAP against Head Start. In the earlier instance the case had been dropped when the victim withdrew her complaint. In the present circumstance, as both the
Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman pointed out, there was no sure evidence that the same man had fired the shot. Generally, however, Head Start was convinced that the shooting was related to the conflict and that someone allied with or employed by Community Action had progressed from threats of violence to carrying them out.

Head Start became more conscious of the more obvious tools of force. A man who, months earlier, had told me that he was afraid of guns, bought a heavy caliber handgun and kept it in his closet. Another informed me that he would shoot anyone from MMHR who "sets foot on my property." The Policy Council Chairman kept a loaded revolver in his bedroom. The Head Start Director kept one on the mantle of his fireplace.

The effects of stress were becoming apparent. The Policy Council Chairman was plagued by the symptoms of dysentery, from which he had suffered in Vietnam. The Head Start Director, who had received a shoulder injury while bailing out over Laos, now was in constant pain from the recurrence of the injury's symptoms. Both men referred to the present conflict as their "second war." Complaints of stomach and lower back pains were made by women. Marriage bonds were strained. (To my knowledge, four marriages of which at least one partner would attribute the other partner's commitment to the conflict to be a primary cause of dissension within the home ended in divorce.)
Under these circumstances, I expected that "racial" sentiments would become more obvious, that "anti-Indian" remarks would become more prevalent among the Head Start membership. I had accepted as valid the allegations of racism that CAP levelled against Head Start, thinking that these racist views were only thinly camouflaged so that observers would not be able to detect them. But while Indians as a distinct social category were mentioned frequently in conversation, there appeared to be little or no hostility attached to the comments. Rather, the general sentiment was that the majority of the CAP Indians were being misled by CAP. The Parent Involvement Director was regarded as a "professional Indian", that is, one who presented herself as an Indian only in order to further her personal ambitions. Indians not associated with CAP were regarded with curiosity. The teachers especially wished that they were better versed in Indian cultures.

However, fear of Indians was widespread. Women, especially, feared being attacked by Indians whose inhibitions may have been broken down by alcohol.

What did surface was an extreme anti-Communist sentiment, of which I had no idea existed. Several parents with whom I talked felt that MMHR was dominated by Communists. The expression of this opinion seemed to arise spontaneously, at about the same time (late July) in several parent centers. Those who voiced anti-Communist
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sentiments were unaware that people from other centers shared their feelings.

When one woman told me that she felt that a certain member of the CAP staff was a communist, I assumed that she regarded the term "communism" to be synonymous to totalitarianism. I agreed that there seemed to be a kind of totalitarian aspect to CAP's thinking processes, but I said that I seriously doubted that any of the CAP staff were members of the Communist Party. "No," she insisted, "I really think he is" a communist.

She told me that twenty years earlier, when a university student, she had demonstrated against the firing of "communist" professors. The issues at that time had been the defense of academic freedom and resistance to McCarthyism. She saw no inconsistency in her sympathies past and present.

I pointed out that Head Start was using essentially the same political tactics as Community Action. The foremost difference between the methods of the two groups was that CAP employed terror while Head Start did not.

"Well," she said, "I guess it all depends on what cause you believe in."

Except for a single telephone communication between the Head Start Director and the Regional Director of HEW, HEW/OCD had refused all contact with Head Start since
July 18th. Repeated attempts on the part of Head Start to telephone the Regional Director of HEW, the Regional Program Director of OCD, the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD, and the Regional Community Representative were thwarted by HEW and OCD secretaries who insisted that all parties were "out of the office", "in conference", or "out of town".

Head Start, therefore, relied on two other channels of information: the communication between the Head Start Director and the Senator's office and the communication between MMHR and the Daycare parents, whose loyalty to MMHR was now contested.

According to the Senator's assistant, the Regional Director of HEW told him on July 23rd, three days after MMHR had refused to ratify the amended agreement but had ratified the agreement made by OCD and MMHR, that MMHR had agreed to accept his amendments. Thus, as far as the Regional Director of HEW was concerned, on August 1st Head Start would be separated from MMHR. (Yet, when August 1st rolled by, there was no separation. To my knowledge, the Regional Director of HEW did not comment on this twist. On August 1st, he was "out of the office" to one telephone call from Head Start and "out of town" to another.)

On July 24th, the Policy Council Chairman attended a Daycare parents' meeting. This meeting was also
attended by MMHR's Acting Deputy Director, the Planning Director, and Daycare's representative to the MMHR Board, who did not usually attend Daycare parent meetings. As well, a small number of parents whose children were newly recruited into Daycare attended.

Some of the parents were discussing the recent assault against the former Policy Council Chairwoman when the Chairman arrived. He had the feeling that they suspected that he had either committed the offense or had ordered it done. One woman said that the former Chairwoman had suffered three sprained fingers and sore ribs as a result of her struggle with the assailant. The Chairman noted how convenient it was that all of her injuries were invisible. (At this time, the Chairman was convinced that the episode had been manufactured by the former Chairwoman.)

As soon as the Daycare Chairwoman called the meeting to order, the Acting Deputy Director proposed to the Policy Council Chairman that MMHR was prepared to welcome Head Start back into the agency, provided that Head Start agreed to the firing of the Head Start Director.

"There will be no reconciliation," the Policy Council Chairman said.

The Acting Deputy Director said that the Head Start Director had to go before Head Start would be permitted to return to MMHR.

"There will be absolutely no reconciliation," the Policy Council Chairman reiterated (emphasis his).
The Acting Deputy Director said that the Chief Legal Counsel of HEW (Regional) had called him and had told him that HEW's Regional Director's amending the original agreement between OCD and MMHR provided MMHR with grounds for a legal case against HEW.

The Policy Council Chairman did not respond.

The Acting Deputy Director rose and began to pace the room silently. Except for comments or expletives which he issued against some of the Chairman's later statements, he had nothing more to say to the Policy Council Chairman.

Daycare's representative to the Board (one of the CAP Indians) said that if Head Start succeeded in separating from MMHR, then "we" (CAP Indians) would ensure that no Indian children were recruited into the program. This would force closure of the program as federal regulations required that a Head Start program had to recruit a representative number of minority group children.

The Policy Council Chairman said that he did not believe that the Daycare representative to the Board represented all Indians in Missoula and Mineral Counties.

"We do," she said.

"I don't think so."

"We need this program!" she screamed.

"Nobody is keeping it from you."

"You are! You and (the Head Start Director)!"

"That's not true."
"Hah!" the Acting Deputy Director said.

One of the "new" parents asked the Policy Council Chairman what the conflict was about. The Chairman said that, essentially, CAP wanted to take over Head Start and turn it into a vehicle for militant action. He asked the Planning Director if he did not agree that this was the primary issue.

The Planning Director agreed. "What's wrong with that?" he said.

The Policy Council Chairman then said that Head Start objected to CAP's plan and moved to separate from MMHR.

"Quite right," the new parent said.

Later in the meeting, the Planning Director asked the Council Chairman for some pipe tobacco. Preferring his tobacco pouch, the Council Chairman asked the Planning Director what leverage CAP had used against OCD in order to get the agreement of July 13th. The Planning Director said that, while he had not gone to Denver himself, the CAP negotiators had told him that as soon as they mentioned the intakes, "OCD folded."

After the Acting Deputy Director, the Planning Director, and Daycare's representative to the Board left the meeting, the Daycare parents expressed their concern over their representative's threat to close the program. The Chairman cited the Head Start Manual (pp. 6-9)
to the effect that Head Start was obligated to make the attempt to recruit Indian children, not to shanghai Indians into the program.

In any event, he said, he was convinced from talking to Indian informants that AIM represented a very small number of Indians in Missoula.

Returning home, the Policy Council Chairman telephoned the majority of the Policy Council and several other Head Start parents. He told them of the Acting Deputy Director's offer and of his own response, and asked for their opinions. The unanimous sentiment can be expressed in the words of one parent: "If you had [accepted the offer], you'd be out of a job." The Chairman also learned that the Acting Deputy Director had approached another member of the Policy Council and a former MMHR consultant about Head Start making peace and reuniting with MMHR. He was rebuffed by both men.

On Sunday, July 29th, a Daycare parent telephoned the Chairman. She had learned that MMHR had spoken with OCD's Regional Program Director the previous Friday. He had said that, upon termination of the program from MMHR, the Policy Council would be dissolved. This was counter to what the Regional Community Representative and the OEO investigator had described as part of the separation process, and what the Policy Council Chairman had passed on to Head Start parents.

The Daycare parent was afraid that, the Policy
Council gone, MMHR would "invade" Daycare and recapture it.

The Chairman told her that he would ask the Head Start Director to contact the Senator's office and to ask the Senator's assistant to find out what was going on in OCD.

On the last day of the month, the Senator's assistant reported that neither HEW's Regional Director nor OCD's Regional Program Director had responded to his telephone calls.

The National Director of Head Start, who was observing the conflict through an intermediary allied with Head Start, similarly was unable to reach HEW by telephone. However, according to the intermediary, he said that, should MMHR decide to press its legal suit against HEW/OCD, Head Start could be placed under an interim sponsor. He said, also, that the Policy Council, as an elected parent body, could not be dissolved by HEW.

On August 1st, the Senator's assistant telephoned the Head Start Director. Within the middle and upper echelons of government, the battle lines had been drawn. Montana's Congressional delegation, the National Director of Head Start, the Regional Director of HEW, the Deputy Program Director of OCD, and Head Start's Regional Community Representative were allied with Missoula Head Start against OEO, the Chief Legal Counsel for HEW (Regional), and the Regional Program Director for OCD,
who were allied with MMHR.

The Chief Legal Counsel appeared to be the tactician of his faction. If he was successful, it would mean that Head Start would remain suspended until the end of its funding year, the end of November.

If the pro-Head Start faction won, HEW would solicit an interim sponsor for Head Start until the end of November, when a new prime sponsor would be found.

The Chief Legal Counsel claimed that the suspension was in order. The Senator intended to contest its legality. If it did prove legal, then the Senator would demand a waiver of suspension while formal hearings between HEW and MMHR were in progress. The Senator would threaten HEW (Regional) with a General Accounting Office investigation unless HEW acceded.

There was to be a meeting between MMHR and HEW on Friday, August 3rd. This meeting was to determine which agreement was legal, the Regional Director of HEW's or OCD's Regional Program Director's.

On August 2nd, the meeting between MMHR and HEW, scheduled for the following day, was cancelled. It is unclear why or at whose request this was done.

The Guns of August

By training, experience, and values, the Head Start
Director and the Policy Council Chairman easily complemented one another. One woman said that Head Start succeeded in separating from MMHR owing only to "the expertise" of the Head Start Director and "the moral indignation" of the Policy Council Chairman. While an exaggeration, her statement does distinguish between the roles that each man performed both prior to and during the conflict. The Head Start Director specialized in the realm of law and regulation, while the Policy Council Chairman immersed himself in popular custom and sentiment.

The Head Start Director had only recently retired from the Air Force after twenty-four years service, eighteen of which he had spent as an officer. He was knowledgeable and accomplished in the ways of large, comparatively efficient bureaucracies. He expected each member of the Head Start staff to be accountable for his or her individual actions, while he himself assumed responsibility for the staff as a whole.

Except for the majority of the Parent Involvement staff and a few of the Daycare staff, who preferred the laxness of Community Action to the accountability insisted upon by the Head Start Director, Head Start responded positively to his expectations.

Where the Head Start Director was proficient in matters of administrative organization, the Policy Council Chairman was competent at mass organization. Throughout his Army service, he had specialized in guerrilla and
counterguerrilla warfare, including recruiting, training, advising, and leading indigenous troops. He saw little distinction between war, as he had engaged in it in Viet Nam, and the present conflict. Only the weapons were different, and by late July it appeared that this difference would be erased.

The Chairman regarded the Policy Council Executive Committee, during the conflict, as his personal staff. At the same time, he recognized that, in order to lead effectively, he needed consensus not only from the Executive Committee but from the parents at large. From a purely tactical standpoint, he saw that the best way to maintain commitment to the "cause" was through a continuous flow of information. Not only did he call key parent figures such as the parent center chairmen and Policy Council parent representatives to keep them up to date on the latest happenings both locally and in Denver and Washington, but he also invited them to sit in on Policy Council Executive Committee meetings, otherwise closed to the public.

Secondly, he personally requested individual parents to perform particular tasks, such as carrying petitions and performing secretarial and clerical chores under the supervision of the Policy Council Secretary. Time and energy given in this manner helped to ensure that, even should the ideological commitment lapse, the sense of social and moral obligation would be maintained and even enhanced.
Between the parents and the staff there were structural and organizational areas of overlap which helped to ensure continued solidarity between the two. The Policy Council Secretary was called upon by both the Policy Council Chairman and the Head Start Director to perform secretarial duties. Ultimately, she formed a pool composed of both staff and parents to deal with an increasingly heavy burden. She it was, also, who arranged for low-cost copying after Head Start could no longer use the copying machines originally proffered by the STO.

Other areas of overlap were economic in nature. Through a personal connection, the Chairman was able to arrange for interest-free loans for the staff, should money become critically scarce. (Interestingly, the only person to inquire about a loan was the Parent Involvement Director, and this at the beginning of the summer before anyone had become concerned about having money enough to eat. But the Parent Involvement Director was buying a new station wagon. The inquiry was rebuffed.) Long distance calls to Denver and Washington, occasional drinks and meals for staff and parents, small loans, and some travel expenses came out of the Head Start Director's own pocket. (He was partially reimbursed by HEW when the conflict ended.)

In almost daily contact, the Head Start staff and Policy Council Executive Committee, as well as a number of other parents, developed intensified personal relations.
There is no evidence of sexual activity between other than marriage partners but sexual joking intensified immeasurably. One joke which was retold for weeks, and always enjoyed by the same people who heard it so many times, referred by gesture to a woman squeezing a man's "lemons". On one occasion, in response to a joke in the form of a question, the Policy Council Chairman, rather than answering, belched loudly. For several days, those other jokesters who had been present begged the Chairman to repeat his performance. "Outsiders" could not appreciate either the humor or the significance of either story.

By way of contrast, we may view an instance of joking behavior on the part of CAP. On one very hot day, the Acting Deputy Director sneaked up behind a low-income woman who was temporarily employed by the agency. She was wearing a brassiere halter. The Acting Deputy Director untied the halter and whisked it away, revealing the woman's breasts. According to informants, the CAP staff found the incident amusing, but other low-income people who were present were "disgusted". Head Start teachers, upon hearing of the incident, said that as much as they hated the former Executive Director, they had to admit that he would never have behaved in that way. The Acting Deputy Director also posted an announcement on the agency's bulletin boards that he was "horny" and was available to service any woman upon request. Neither was this appreciated by the low-income people with whom I spoke.
Insofar as intra-group personalized relations are concerned, Head Start had come to resemble Community Action as it had existed before the departure of the Executive Director. The charismatic "hands on" approach to information gathering and problem solving was employed by both the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman. It seemed inevitable that this should happen. None but these two men had the prestige by which to influence others' decisions or to restore communication between individuals who, under stress, had severed contact. In such cases as the latter, the Policy Council Chairman, for instance, mediated the dispute until each party had agreed to tolerate the other's differences. However, more often than not, the two parties expressed amicable relations only in the presence of the Chairman, thereby making of him the cornerstone of their relationship.

Both the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman noted that women, married and unmarried, sought their advice on matters unconnected with Head Start as well as those pertinent to the conflict. Both observed that, often, married women would solicit their advice even after having received their husband's counsel, or in place of it. At times, a woman (less often, a man) would telephone the Head Start Director or the Policy Council Chairman to request his support against the other spouse in a family squabble. At these times, the Head Start Director or the
Policy Council Chairman was assumed to possess superior or greater knowledge on seemingly all matters under the sun than did either spouse.

The Policy Council Secretary, who, the previous winter, had expressed fear that the adoration invested in the Executive Director by a number of low-income people might be "used in a damaging and dangerous manner" now told the Policy Council Chairman of a dream ("almost a nightmare") she had had about him. In the dream, he had just returned from Denver. He was pale, gaunt, unshaven, and obviously exhausted.

"You're making me into a Christ figure," the Chairman complained.

"Well, you asked for it."

By the end of July, Head Start had established its own identity, at least to its own satisfaction. Its leadership was undisputed and the division of labor was satisfactory. An appendage had been attached to "Head Start" as the name of the organization. The Head Start Director, in correspondence, had begun to refer to the Head Start "upstarts". The teachers liked the label and so began to refer to themselves.

As well, Head Start had a symbol.

The Westside classroom was located at the agency proper. It had not been used, at least as a classroom,
since the last week in May, when the academic year ended. At the beginning of the summer, one of the teachers had occasion to go to the agency. There, in the street, she found a child's doll belonging to the Westside center. Someone had mutilated it and thrown it into the street. Its symbolic mutilation was regarded as prophetic, should Head Start not succeed in separating from Community Action.

One day in early August, the delegate to the Policy Council from Central Trades and Labor approached the Chairman and said that he felt that there needed to be new checks on the Chairman's power placed in the by-laws when the conflict was over.

"I agree," the Chairman said. He said that he had been considering ways of doing just that, such as assigning some of the Chairman's powers and responsibilities to standing committees. "But for now," he said, "I need all the power I can get."

The delegate from Central Trades and Labor agreed and reiterated that the time for organizational change would be immediately following the end of the conflict. They parted for the day, still friends.

In fact, the Chairman already had informed the Head Start Director that he intended to resign following the termination of the conflict. The Head Start Director assured him that he intended to continue in his position
for at least another year. "Somebody has to put the program back together," he said. Both men were agreed that at least one of them had to remain with the program in order to ensure continuity, although the Head Start Director would have preferred that they both remain.

The Policy Council Chairman also had called the Vice-Chairwoman to inform her of his intention to resign. He promised to see the conflict through to its end, even if he had to drop out of school for a quarter in order to do so. He told her that he had become so conflict-oriented that he did not believe himself able any longer to perform purely administrative tasks.

The Vice-Chairwoman, having received assurances a second time that the Chairman would see the conflict through, said that she would be agreeable to assuming the leadership of the Policy Council when the Chairman left.

By the end of July, the Policy Council Chairman had come to the conclusion that, given sustained conflict, the position he occupied in Head Start was a structural trap. He thought that he could detect similarities not only in the relationships he had built among the Policy Council and some of the parents at large and those the former Executive Director had maintained, but, also, between the political behavior of the Executive Director and his own. Indeed, the same woman who, admittedly, had begun to regard him as a "Christ figure", only a week
previous to telling him of her dream had said to him, "You're getting to be as cunning as [the former Executive Director]."

The Chairman felt that he was "trapped" in the sense that he was permitted only two alternative courses of action: to continue to fight or to quit. Should he follow the former course, it seemed likely that the parents' reliance upon him as their leader would ultimately result in their relinquishing entirely their decision-making powers to him. This was not what he had wanted for Head Start. He had envisioned near-autonomous parent centers at whose service would be the Policy Council. But the parent center organization, for all practical purposes, was nearly dead, politically. Instead, parents were drawn directly to him, as their primary source of information and knowledge.

At the same time, he could not simply quit while the conflict continued. To deprive the parents of their accustomed leader at this point would be to throw the parent organization, as it now stood, into a shambles. Here, too, the Chairman used the analogy of Community Action to try to understand the organizational evolution of Head Start. The resignation of CAP's Executive Director was followed by a number of CAP "loyalists" falling away from the agency. Two women had left the state. Two others simply dropped out of sight. Yet another fell away from the agency, while remaining in
Missoula. All had been clientele of the agency for several years.

The Acting Deputy Director, who had replaced the Executive Director in the role of "leader" of the agency, did not have the personality required to maintain a stable network of economic and personal relationships. Where the Executive Director had used patronage to reciprocate for political support, the Acting Deputy Director appeared interested primarily in self-glorification. He had been hired to occupy a newly created position entitled "Acting Deputy Director". Once the Executive Director resigned, and as the summer progressed, he began to refer to himself first as "Deputy Director", then as "Executive Director", and at summer's end, alternated between referring to himself as "Executive Director" and "Director". Yet, he had not been promoted. Informants told of having heard his end of a telephone conversation with a senator's secretary. The senator either was not in his office or would not speak to him. After several minutes, the Acting Deputy Director shouted into the phone: "I am a lawyer. Tell him I'm a lawyer." According to informants, the conversation with the secretary endured for half an hour, throughout which the Acting Deputy Director insisted that the senator speak with him by virtue of the former's being a lawyer.

At the same time, Board members openly challenged him on policy decisions and the uses to which money was
put, questioning his authority as they had not the Executive Director's.

The Policy Council Chairman, in a sense, occupied a more precarious position than had the Executive Director or the Head Start Director did now. As the only elected leader, he was also the only one responsible only to his constituency. The Executive Director and the Head Start Director, hired onto federal payrolls with popular concurrence, could have hidden behind their bureaucratic statuses if they so chose. With dual responsibilities, to their clienteles and to OEO or HEW, they were in positions to protect themselves against excessive demands by their clienteles by pleading that bureaucratic demands conflicted with those of the former. In fact, neither man might have had to lie on this account, as the aspirations of the bureaucracies and their clienteles often conflicted.

The Policy Council Chairman, on the other hand, had no bureaucratic position to shield him from the increasing social and moral demands of his Head Start constituency. At the same time, his willingness to respond to the demands, not only of Head Start but of the conflict itself, served to deprive the parents of their own decision-making powers.

The moral conflict was irresolvable. It would cease only when the conflict between Community Action and Head Start ended.

On Saturday, August 4th, the Senator's assistant...
telephoned the Head Start Director. He said that on either the coming Thursday or Friday the Regional Director of HEW would be coming to Missoula. MMHR, he said, had agreed to separate Head Start on condition that the negotiations take place in Missoula.

That same afternoon, a Daycare parent telephoned the Chairman. She said that she had enough votes lined up to recall Daycare's representative to the Board. Her faction was angry, she said, because the representative had not attended the last four Daycare meetings. Second, the representative had told a Daycare parent and a teacher that she owed her loyalty to the (CAP) Indians, not to Daycare parents, even though the latter had elected her to represent them. Third, the representative had told "Denver" that the Daycare parents were "all for the suspension" of Daycare by OCD in that it allowed Indians to set up their own daycare. 40

The Chairman advised against recalling the Daycare representative. The conflict would soon be over, he said. There were enough hard feelings without creating more. The issue was laid to rest.

On Tuesday the 7th, the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD telephoned the Policy Council Chairman. It had been nearly three weeks since the last communication with Denver. The Deputy Regional Program Director wanted information. The Regional Director of HEW, his deputy, and
the Regional Community Representative would be arriving on Thursday the 9th. Should they expect a confrontation from MMHR?

The Policy Council Chairman did not think that CAP would confront. He felt that CAP was bluffing HEW by its legal suit against the government, that CAP had more to lose in the event of a thorough investigation than did HEW, and that CAP, therefore, truly wanted a settlement.

The Deputy Regional Program Director saw things similarly. But he had talked to the Head Start Director prior to calling the Chairman and the Head Start Director had said that HEW should expect a confrontation. (The Head Start Director's reasoning was that CAP, recognizing HEW's fear of having its corruption exposed, was not afraid of having its bluff called and that CAP would use confrontation tactics as a negotiating device.) Even so, the Deputy Regional Program Director thought that the Chairman was more likely right.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that CAP's Acting Deputy Director and the Regional Director of HEW had recently had several long telephone conversations, the most recent lasting over an hour. The Regional Director was willing to make concessions to MMHR if CAP would withdraw its legal suit and its request for a formal hearing. If MMHR and HEW could agree on separating Head Start from the agency, then the Policy Council, upon separation, would
be terminated. The new sponsor, whoever it might be, and HEW would decide, when the program was operational again, whether the Policy Council and its by-laws should be retained. Staff would "remain in place" for ninety days, at the end of which time the new sponsor could replace any or all. CAP wanted an ad hoc committee made up of new parents which CAP already had recruited to select the new sponsor. This committee would not have policy-making powers. Following the selection of the new sponsor, the committee would be dissolved.

The Policy Council Chairman said that he was afraid that the new parents would be powerless once the Policy Council and the by-laws were dissolved. He was certain that CAP would attempt to recapture Head Start.

The Deputy Regional Program Director had met the same response from the Head Start Director in their previous conversation. He said now that there was "no way" that MMHR would ever get Head Start back. In the past, MMHR could have "mended its ways" to OEO's satisfaction and recaptured Head Start, but OEO was now taking a different attitude toward MMHR, although MMHR probably did not know it yet. The Deputy Regional Program Director said that, while he also had reservations about the ad hoc committee, he was assuming that CAP did not have the control over Head Start parents that it thought it had.

The Chairman assured him that CAP no longer controlled Head Start or the parents. The much-touted ad hoc committee
that CAP had created on June 15th to replace the Policy Council which it had "dissolved" had never been able to attract more than five or six Head Start parents to its meetings. These meetings were attended, however, by quite a large number of CAP staff and Board members, from whose attendance the uninitiated could gather the impression that the ad hoc committee was a workable body.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that he had thought as much. He asked if the Chairman thought that Head Start could "live with" the kind of agreement that he had outlined.

The Chairman said that it was "livable", that the Council had decided at the beginning of the conflict that if it took their own destruction as a decision-making body to separate Head Start from Community Action, then it was worth the price. He said that as long as Head Start could make the transfer to a new sponsor with its staff intact, the program could survive.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that the ninety day staff evaluation was "programmatic", that neither the ad hoc committee nor the Policy Council could restructure the staff.

The Chairman recalled that, in the days when Head Start and OCD had friendly and open communication, the Deputy Regional Program Director had told him several times that no one, not MHHR, not OCD, not HEW, nor anyone...
could dissolve the Policy Council, because it was a legally elected body. He had said that only by the process of new elections could the Policy Council be changed. The Chairman asked now what had become of that regulation.

The Deputy Regional Program Director sighed and said that that had been HEW's policy before MMHR had gained bargaining power by OEO's recognition of the new Board.

On the 4th, upon learning of the impending meeting between HEW and MMHR, the Policy Council Chairman made plans for a meeting of all Head Start staff and parents to take place on the evening of the 8th in one of the banquet rooms of the Edgewater Inn, a restaurant which offered a congenial atmosphere and overlooked the Clark Fork of the Columbia River.

The Chairman was afraid that the existence of CAP's ad hoc parent committee might lend the impression to the visitors from Denver, two of whom had not recently, if ever, been to Missoula, that CAP rather than Head Start represented parent sentiment in Missoula and Mineral. The primary purpose of this meeting, then, was to demonstrate, by promoting a massive turnout of Head Start parents, exactly who were their spokesmen. Toward this end, teachers, Policy Council members, and parent center chairmen worked hard to ensure the presence of a large number of parents. The Policy Council Chairman planned for eighty people.
The occasion by which to attract the parents themselves would be the presence of three speakers, each representing a different community organization which had stated to either the Head Start Director or the Policy Council Chairman a readiness to accept the sponsorship of Head Start once it was separated from Community Action. (Since June, the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman, at the behest of the pro-Head Start faction within HEW's regional office, had been soliciting prospective sponsors, recognizing that the final decision as to the selection of a sponsor lay with HEW.)

A third consideration for holding the meeting was that the Chairman wanted to provide the parents an opportunity to mix business with pleasure. The parents would listen to and then vote for a new prime sponsor. They would also have the opportunity to dress up and the women especially would be able to display themselves at their best.41

The occasion was advertised in the Missoulian as "an informal meeting for Head Start parents and staff only."

The evening at the Edgewater began well enough. The Chairman posted himself and a couple of Policy Council members in the lobby to direct traffic upstairs to the banquet room. People he had not seen in two months arrived, as well as others he did not recognize. (These latter turned out to be Head Start parents whose children had been recruited the previous spring by Head Start or during
the summer by CAP to participate in the 1973-74 program.)
Several parents brought friends with them. The Chairman began to wonder if he had not underestimated the turnout.
Two of the speakers arrived and he directed them upstairs.
(The Head Start Director was going to speak on behalf of a third organization, which did not send a speaker. He was present in the lobby.)

The Chairman noticed the Parent Involvement Director walking though the lobby, then the Daycare representative to the Board and her husband, who had unofficially resigned his position as Daycare Parent Representative to the Policy Council. The latter approached the Chairman and said that he wanted speaking time during the meeting. The Chairman agreed to allot him time. Others associated with CAP showed up: the Acting Deputy Director with his wife and small children, the Board Vice-Chairwoman, the outreach worker who specialized in intimidation. The entire CAP staff, the Parent Involvement staff, most of the CAP Indians, and a number of Board members had turned out.

As the Chairman walked up the stairs, he was met by a woman he knew. The Board Vice-Chairwoman had been boasting earlier in the day about carrying a gun in her handbag, she said. She knew that the Board Vice-Chairwoman had applied a couple of weeks earlier for a permit to carry a concealed weapon and that the Sheriff's Department had refused to give her one, but she was carrying a gun anyway. Another woman came out of the banquet room. She also had heard the Board Vice-
Chairwoman boasting about carrying a gun in her handbag.

The Chairman went into the banquet room. He asked the Acting Deputy Director what he was doing here.

The Acting Deputy Director said that he was distributing copies of a paper which specified the position MMHR was going to take in the negotiations with HEW tomorrow.

The Chairman asked him to leave.

The Acting Deputy Director refused.

The Chairman told him to leave or he would call the police.

The Acting Deputy Director told him that he could call the police.

A third woman was waiting in the corridor for the Chairman. All three women had apparently been discussing the attempted shooting of the teacher aide three weeks earlier. (The Chairman had wondered how widespread news of the incident had become. Apparently, it was much more widespread than he had imagined.)

The Chairman called the police, told them that a private meeting had been intruded upon by CAP staff members, and asked the police to send a car to the Edgewater. He returned to the banquet room.

At the head of the stairs he was met by one of the speakers. She said that she would not speak as long as the people from Community Action were present. Another woman came out into the corridor. She told the Chairman that
after he had left, the Acting Deputy Director had told his children to link arms when the police came for them and that they would all be spending a night in jail. The woman was afraid of a demonstration.

The Chairman asked the speaker if she would mind if he cancelled the meeting. She said that she thought that would be the best thing to do. The Chairman called the other speaker into the hall. He explained that the first speaker had refused to speak in the presence of CAP people and that a number of parents were afraid of a disruption. Would she mind if he cancelled the meeting? She said that she did not care.

The Chairman stepped into the banquet room and announced that he was cancelling the meeting. He apologized for the necessity to do it but did not specify why he felt it necessary.

The husband of the Daycare representative to the Board stood up and said that the Chairman had promised him time to speak.

"That's right," the Chairman said. As the man made his way to the speakers' portion of the room, the Chairman introduced him to the audience. Then the Chairman walked out.

As he passed through the door, he heard somebody say something which he could not make out. The husband of the Daycare representative to the Board responded with:
"Shut up! I'm talking now." According to a number of Head Start staff who had not yet left the meeting, he then proceeded to accuse everybody present of being a racist.

The Chairman walked outside and waited for the police to arrive. He told them that he had cancelled the meeting. The older officer said that they could not evict the intruders if the meeting had been cancelled. The Chairman said that that was all right and apologized for having called them. The officer said that they would have a look around, anyway.

The Chairman watched them go upstairs. He waited until they came down and then he walked home and telephoned the Missoulian. The Acting Deputy Director had already telephoned his side of the story. The Chairman gave his, omitting any discussion of a gun or the possibility of a confrontation between CAP and the police (Cf. Hood: August 9, 1973).

Neither the Policy Council Chairman nor the Head Start Director intended to attend the meeting between the Board and HEW on August 9th. They had speculated that the meeting was only a formality, that both parties knew in advance the role each expected the other to play, and that Head Start would finally be sold out for good and all. Neither wanted to witness the ritual process by which this was to happen.
The meeting was scheduled for early afternoon, following a closed session between HEW and the Board Executive Committee.

In late morning, a parent telephoned the Policy Council Chairman. He asked if the Chairman was going to the meeting. The Chairman said that he was not. The parent said that he had been talking to a number of other parents, that they had anticipated that the Chairman might not want to attend, and that they had decided that the Chairman should attend regardless how he felt. The Chairman, after all, knew more about what was going on than any of them.

The Chairman agreed to attend the meeting.

The parent then asked whether the Head Start Director intended to go. The Chairman replied that, to his knowledge, the Head Start Director did not. The parent said that he thought the Head Start Director should also attend the meeting. The Chairman said that he would call him.

The Head Start Director agreed to attend the meeting, also.

The meeting at the agency was packed. Every chair was filled and people stood lining the walls. The Head Start faction and the CAP faction, including the Board, had shown up in about equal numbers. As well, several Daycare mothers whose primary interest lay in keeping Daycare open through its periods of suspension were present. The Policy Council Chairman sat beside the Regional Community Representative.
She said that the Acting Deputy Director had said during the closed session with the Board Executive Committee prior to this meeting that he had carried a gun to the Head Start meeting last night because he was afraid for his life.

"We're the ones being shot at," the Chairman said.

"I know," said the Regional Community Representative.

The Chairman told her that he had been reviewing MMHR's and HEW's agreement proposals (CAP had distributed copies. Cf. Appendix B.) It seemed apparent to him that CAP still intended to try to gain control of Head Start. For instance, Point Five of HEW's proposal specified that "The new sponsor will continue the employment of current staff who are performing satisfactorily," but MMHR's sixth point provided for staff rehiring.

The Regional Community Representative said that HEW was aware of this and that the Chairman should not worry about it.

The Chairman was also concerned about the makeup of the "ad hoc parent advisory group" which would screen prospective sponsors. HEW's proposal (Point One) stipulated that the ad hoc committee would be "composed of representatives of parents of children recruited for the class originally scheduled to begin by October, 1973." MMHR's proposal (Point One) provided that the ad hoc committee would be "composed of center parent committees. . . ." and that "Parents of children recruited for the class scheduled to
begin in October, 1973 will be included in the membership of the Parent Center Committees" (emphasis mine).

The Chairman had recently finished reading a book by William Divale in which the author described how in October, 1967, the Progressive Labor Party had attempted to capture the UCLA chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society. The tactic the PLP had used was to segment the SDS into ever smaller organizational units until the Maoists were able to gain control over them. As the Maoists attended the university for political rather than educational purposes, they did not carry heavy class loads, but spent the greater part of their time engaging in political activity. Thus, they nearly succeeded in their attempt to wrestle control of the SDS chapter from the more academically-minded students (In 1968, they did succeed. Cf. Divale and Joseph 1970:107).

The Chairman saw the possibility of an analogous situation developing in Missoula in regard to the Head Start parent committees. Unless it was spelled out in the agreement in no uncertain terms that the parents should have absolute control of the parent committees, Community Action would attempt to inject agency employees into key positions on the committees. As the agency employees, paid to do CAP's will, would be competing against new and naive parents for whom Head Start could not even be called an avocation, it could be assumed that CAP would stand a better than even
chance of gaining control of the committees and of itself selecting the new sponsor: perhaps LIGHT or Qua Qui, which were affiliated with CAP organizationally and economically and had expressed interest in becoming Head Start's new prime sponsor. The Chairman outlined these thoughts on a slip of paper and passed it to the Regional Community Representative. She looked at it and passed it to the Deputy Regional Director of HEW who, with the Regional Director of HEW, was conducting the negotiations on HEW's behalf. She told him where the note had come from. He nodded his head as he read it.

Apparently, a number of proposed points had been agreed upon, at least in principle, by HEW and the Board Executive Committee during the closed session prior to the open meeting. Almost immediately as the meeting was called to order, however, the assistant professor who sat on the Board purportedly representing agency staff, insisted that "We need to know the allegations [made against MMHR by Head Start] to clear our name. Who made the allegations? . . . I want the purpose of this meeting changed from reaching agreement to informal hearing."

He was joined by Daycare's representative to the Board: "If we sign the agreement, it looks like we're admitting our guilt."

And the assistant professor again: "... You [HEW] are trying to gloss over differences by rushing into an agreement."
In fact, the assistant professor and the Daycare representative were correct: nowhere in either MMHR's or HEW's proposal was there a response to the allegations made by Head Start or were the allegations even mentioned. The Regional Director of HEW and his deputy attempted to avoid discussion of the allegations while at the same time muttering so that only a few people could hear that it was to MMHR's benefit that the allegations were not being openly discussed. "I came here to reach an agreement," said HEW's Regional Director. "If I went over the allegations now it would just further split this community and increase the hatred."

MMHR's Acting Deputy Director stood up and walked to the other side of the conference table around which the Board members and the visitors from Denver were gathered. He whispered into the assistant professor's ear and then returned to his own seat. For a while, the assistant professor held his silence.

However, the Parent Involvement Director now took up the cry: "We know who made the allegations: [the Head Start Director], a few teachers, Policy Council members, [the Policy Council Chairman], ex-Head Start staff, [a former Head Start nutritionist]."

A Board member stood up: "I'm sick and tired of all these people making so much money. We never had trouble until all the new people came in." (Following the meeting, the Head Start Director approached her and asked her
"Do you know what you're talking about?" "Well, that's what everyone says," she replied. She apparently did not know that the expression "new people" referred primarily to the Head Start Director, of whom she was personally fond.

The Parent Involvement Director spoke again: "Parent involvement has been poor this year [Implicitly associating the Head Start Director's tenure with decreased parent participation]. This has been the worst parent involvement since I've been in the program [about five years]. The middle class do not understand Indian culture. The Indians have been neglected this year. It's been a White, middle class oriented program."

The Regional Director said that she had stated in the Executive Committee meeting a little earlier that parent participation had declined over the past two years, which corresponded with her own tenure of two years as Parent Involvement Director. She denied that she had said "two years" and insisted that she had said "one year." The Regional Director insisted that she had said "two years." The Parent Involvement Director again denied this.

A low-income Board member ended this discussion by saying: "It has always been really bad."

A Northside parent spoke: "Parents have no say. A few people are running the Council. They are not representative. Other years I've been on the Council; I know how it should be. It had been good—but this year has been bad."
The parents have no say. I've been made to feel that what I have to say is not worthwhile. I won't have children in next year. I want to be on the ad hoc committee. Can parents be on that? If the majority of parents wanted to stay with MMHR, could Head Start stay with MMHR? Parents should have the say. I have never been informed of Policy Council meetings. I never received minutes. I am so angry I can't speak any more."

A Northside Head Start teacher responded: "When you say you did not receive notices, you are saying [another teacher] and I were not pinning notices on the backs of children. We did pin them on. If once in a while we didn't get them on, if there wasn't time to get them on, we hand delivered notices. Maybe our system doesn't work. We cannot go to homes and read them to you."

HEW's Regional Director said, in response to the Northside parent: "Certainly you should be involved. That's why we have arranged for the formation of a new ad hoc Policy Council. Certainly you should be a part of it. But the majority should be the new parents; the program is for their children. The Council should be fifty-one percent new parents." (Apparently, the make-up of the ad hoc committee had been discussed at some length during the previous meeting with the Executive Committee. But, apparently, no firm agreement had been reached.)

Daycare's representative to the Board spoke: "CAP
is the only agency that cares about Indians; other sponsors would not be responsive. What would you [HEW] do if the Indians refused to participate. If there are Indians in the community, don't the guidelines say there have to be Indians in the program? Isn't Head Start required to have minorities represented?"

The Regional Director replied: "How many Indians are there? Twenty-six per cent. Then if the majority of parents [on the ad hoc committee] wanted a sponsor that was not responsive to Indians we could not approve of that. There are certain conditions that must be met. That would depend on what decision the majority of parents made. Certainly their opinion would be considered." Replying to the threat of Indian refusal to participate in the program, the Regional Director said that, as American citizens, Indians are free to participate or not, as they wish.

"I want to be included [on the ad hoc committee]," said Daycare's representative to the Board. "I'm a last year's parent; I still want to be included."

Head Start's Supportive Services Director asked Daycare's representative to the Board: "Who is on the ad hoc council [now]?"

"Two parents, two private, two public, and all parents that want to attend are invited," answered the latter.

"How many attended meetings?"

"Fifteen."
"How many are in Head Start? One hundred and sixty-five."

"Those are insinuating and accusing questions," said MMHR's Vice-Chairwoman.

"Those are not insinuations, and they are not accusations."

(Following the meeting, I came into brief possession of the minutes of an ad hoc committee meeting. Listed in attendance were fourteen persons, of which nine were agency employees. Informants stated that this particular ad hoc committee meeting drew a larger turnout than any other.)

It had become apparent by now that nothing was going to be settled in Missoula on this day. It was obvious that neither the Board Chairwoman nor the Acting Deputy Director was capable of controlling the direction of the meeting. To the Policy Council Chairman, it was obvious that the assistant professor and Daycare's representative to the Board had subverted, unintentionally, any peace agreement that might have been signed today. The CAP staff, and the Board Executive Committee had taken too much into their own hands and had failed to inform even the assistant professor, one of their more credible public spokesmen, of their latest maneuvers. To demand that allegations be proven or retracted was reasonable, provided MMHR was completely guiltless. But who knew of MMHR's guilt, outside of Head Start? Apparently, the majority of the
Board did not. Certainly, they had refused to accept responsibility for their own social and political policies and fiscal management. Now they refused to accept the blame that went with responsibility.

The focus of the meeting shifted to Daycare's problems. A Daycare mother described the difficulties in feeding the children at Daycare. "We've been sending sack lunches. What will happen Monday? What will we do? Will HEW continue Daycare during negotiations?"

The Head Start nutritionist, who had remained with the agency throughout the summer attempting to do her work, confirmed that Daycare was having not a little difficulty purchasing food on credit from local businessmen.

The Regional Director, responding to the Daycare mother said: "I can say yes with a condition. You have WIN funds [that] were paid for Daycare and should be spent for Daycare. When MMHR uses those for Daycare we can supply whatever else is needed. We can negotiate that. We're not sending you a blank check. HEW will not provide funds if MMHR uses the money for programs other than Daycare."

The Acting Deputy Director said: "We asked for definitions of use. You told us these funds were for improvements of services. There are other commitments; we are conducting other programs. There is the Indian Cultural Center. . . ." He noted that MMHR had received
$3,600 in WIN funds in the past few months, of which $600 had been used for the Indian Cultural Center.

The Head Start Director disputed that MMHR owed Daycare no more than $3,600: "There was the SRS $2,200 used to pay an OEO debt, and another $600 borrowed and not repaid. $3,600 plus $600 is $4,200; add $2,200, that equals $6,400. That could keep Daycare going for several months."

"In other words," said the Daycare mother to the Regional Director, "we've been fighting this summer to keep it open and you're going to close it down?" She was crying.

Daycare's representative to the Board said: "We want a yes or no answer. We don't want a conditional answer. Yes or no?"

The Southside Parent Center Chairman now put in: "With the suspension lifted, will there be money to pay creditors? How come Daycare rent was paid, but the Southside rent was not paid?" (In fact, Daycare's rent had not been paid, although MMHR's bookkeeper had told the Daycare parents that he had paid it.)

The Acting Deputy Director said: "Because Daycare is an operating program, Southside center is not [during the summer]."

The assistant professor now referred to the agreement that the Regional Program Director of OCD had signed.
HEW's Regional Director said: "That was a tentative agreement, pending my approval. There was a condition that it be returned by certified mail. I have not received a copy of the signed agreement by certified mail."

A member of the public sector of the Board asked: "Could you disclose the specific allegations and who made them . . . if the Board so voted?"

A young man, unknown to anyone from Head Start, said: "MMHR's credibility is in question if the allegations are not settled."

The Regional Director of HEW said that he had come to Missoula to reach an agreement. He had thought, he said, that MMHR had invited him here with the same idea in mind.

The assistant professor reiterated his demand that this meeting be considered an informal hearing and said that he was under the impression that the Regional Director had come to Missoula to answer questions that parents and other low-income people might want to ask.

"I came prepared to reach agreement," the Regional Director said. "We need to start afresh."

"I thought it had been called to discuss differences between MMHR, HEW, and Head Start, and that signing an agreement was secondary," said the Acting Deputy Director.

The Board Chairwoman now said: "I want to know the allegations. We have refuted every allegation."
The Regional Director said: "I sent them to Perry. Didn't you receive them? Perry, did you send them to the Board members?"

The Acting Deputy Director said that he had distributed them to Board members. Several Board members denied having received them.

The Acting Deputy Director, seemingly reluctant, said: "This is the original." He gave a paper to the Regional Director, who offered to read it aloud. Someone demurred. The Acting Deputy Director pulled the paper out of the Regional Director's hands. The Regional Director again offered to read aloud the allegations.

"No, I won't give it to you," said the Acting Deputy Director.

"CAP has done a lot of good things. None of us is perfect," said a member of the public sector of the Board, who was also a member of the Board Executive Committee.

Again, there were demands that the meeting be regarded as an informal hearing, coming now from the Board Chairwoman as well as the assistant professor.

The Regional Director said to the Board Chairwoman: "This was to be an informal hearing, and you called and asked me to come to Missoula to negotiate an agreement."

"I did not call you, . . . I have never called you," said the Board Chairwoman.

Someone suggested that it may have been the Board
Secretary with whom the Regional Director had talked. The Board Chairwoman and the Board Secretary had the same given names.

"It wasn't me because I never talk, I just listen. I waited for the phone call and went home," said the Board Secretary.

"I waited too. I had to go home. I never talked to you before. I didn't know what you looked like until you walked in here. I work from nine until five. If I talked to you it would have had to have been at my office," said the Board Chairwoman.

"I talked to someone who identified herself [by the Board Chairwoman's first and last names]. You said . . . " the Regional Director said.

"That's a Goddamned lie," said the Board Chairwoman. "Goddamn . . . no one's going to call me a liar."

Said the Board Executive Committee member who had earlier said that "None of us is perfect": "I am on the Executive Board, and I was not on that conference call . . . . There are five Executive Board members here, and none say they were on that phone call."

"I know [the Planning Director] and I were there," said the Acting Deputy Director. He would not say who else was present.

"Let Head Start go," muttered the Planning Director, apparently speaking to himself. "They're too destructive."
"We're getting nowhere. Let's adjourn," said the low-income Board member who earlier had said that parent participation "has always been really bad."

The motion was seconded by several people at once. The meeting was adjourned. 42

Following adjournment, I approached a member of the Board Executive Committee. "What do you think is going on?" I asked.

He did not refer either to the conflict or to the fiasco that had just ended. Instead, he talked about how tenaciously the Japanese had fought on Okinawa and how the American invaders had suffered so many casualties in the fight for the island. (The reader will recall that the Head Start Director was Anglo-Japanese.) I walked outside to listen to what others were saying.

At the door stood the woman whose son apparently had been kidnapped. The Acting Deputy Director was standing beside her. Three women were asking her questions about the presumed incident. "They say it's not in their jurisdiction," the mother said. Two of the women looked toward the Acting Deputy Director, whose attention had been caught. He turned away.

The Policy Council Chairman came outside, followed by the Board Chairwoman who walked past him without speaking. She was followed by the Regional Director. The Policy Council Chairman went up to him and shook his hand. "I thought you did very well, all things considered," said
the Policy Council Chairman. The Regional Director seemed confused.

The Board Chairwoman walked back toward the Regional Director. They shook hands.

"When I negotiate, I don't feel anything," the Regional Director said.

"You should," said the Board Chairwoman, smiling up at him.

"When I negotiate, I don't allow myself to feel anything," the Regional Director said. He was obviously attempting to give her a crash course in bargaining.

"You should," said the Board Chairwoman, continuing to smile. The Regional Director seemed as perplexed as he had earlier.

The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were agreed that, apparently, a confrontation had not been planned by CAP, that it had occurred because CAP's leadership and the Board's Executive Committee had failed to inform the Board of the necessity to put an end to the fight, even if it meant losing Head Start. The Board had simply behaved as it had been accustomed to do, and had pulled the rug from under its leaders. The Executive Committee's apparent turnabout, toward the end of the meeting, when they denied having had previous communication with HEW, was an attempt to reaffirm their solidarity, through the expression of ignorance, with the Board. This
also left the higher-ranking CAP staff holding the bag.

The Head Start Director told the Regional Community Representative that CAP would again ask to negotiate an agreement.

The Denver people had to hurry to the airport to catch their plane. The Head Start Director offered to drive them. The Regional Director refused. He did not want to be seen in association with anyone from Head Start. He said that he did not want to allow MMHR the opportunity to charge that he was biased in favor of Head Start.

The following day, the Regional Community Representative telephoned the Policy Council Chairman. MMHR's Acting Deputy Director and Planning Director had just called, she said. They wanted to negotiate. She said that the Regional Director of HEW would be taking a very hard line from now on. The Chairman believed the first statement but did not believe the second.

He asked her to keep him informed as to what was going on in Denver. She said that she would.

On August 14th, the Missoulian carried news of the Central Trades and Labor Council's decision to request a "congressional investigation of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., regarding treatment of employees and use of federal funds."

The statement issued by the Council, quoted in
part in the Missoulian, said: "The MMHR-Head Start conflict has shown MMHR's attitude toward working people is most unfair and even oppressive."

In the article, MMHR's Acting Deputy Director was cited as saying that

... the only effect of the statement is to add pressure which may delay the opening of the Head Start program until January 1.

[The Acting Deputy Director] said he would like to see the program begin, with the teachers who were employed last year, early this fall.

"No one seems to believe us that we want to get it underway," [the Acting Deputy Director] added.

[The Acting Deputy Director] added that he is a strong supporter of labor and terribly disappointed. He said he suspected the council had heard a lot of "bullshit" from [its delegate to the Head Start Policy Council] and was going off "half-cocked" (Missoulian: August 4, 1973).

The same day, the Acting Deputy Director told the Daycare staff to close down Daycare. There were no WIN funds to support it, he said. When a Daycare staff member complained to the reporter, the reporter replied: "Would you do anything for them if they were against you?"

"We're not against them," the teacher complained to me. "We're just trying to stay open."

OCD, at the same time, refused to instruct MMHR to use WIN funds to keep Daycare alive, OCD's Deputy Regional Program Director saying that since HEW sent federal funds to SRS, which converted them to state-issued WIN funds
which it sent to MMHR, HEW could not tell MMHR how to use these monies. It was an MMHR decision, he said.

"It's like we're the ones being punished for doing the right thing," said the Head Start Director upon hearing this.

The Daycare teachers refused to close Daycare, but began making plans to take the children into their own homes, should they be evicted from the center.

On August 17th, representatives from MMHR and HEW met in Denver.

On Monday, August 20th, the Deputy Regional Program Director for OCD and the Head Start Director spoke by telephone. The Deputy Regional Program Director said that no agreement had been reached, that the Acting Deputy Director was still in Denver, and that a formal hearing was set for September 4th.

Also on Monday, the Head Start Director was visited by two investigators sent by Montana's delegation to the U.S. Senate. They asked the Head Start Director if Head Start felt that HEW (Regional) was incompetent. The Head Start Director said no, but that the regional office was considered unresponsive and concerned primarily with serving its own interests.

What would be Head Start's opinion of a General Accounting Office (GAO) investigation and the formal hearing were run concurrently?
Head Start would be for it. 43

What about having the hearing in Missoula?
Head Start would be for it.
What did Head Start think of the possibility of
two people from MMHR and two people from Head Start
negotiating whether to retain the Head Start Director?
No way.

The investigators expressed surprise that Head
Start had not been consulted during negotiations, that
Head Start had been kept only minimally informed, and
that for three weeks Head Start had gone completely
uninformed.

They were "ticked" that the Senator's office had
been given conflicting and contradictory information by
the HEW and OCD regional offices.

They felt that the grounds for separating Head
Start from MMHR might well be grounds for closing MMHR also.

On August 22nd, the Head Start Director spoke with
the Senator's assistant. Both were convinced that MMHR
and HEW were in collusion to "starve out" Head Start.

An informant told the Policy Council Chairman
that the Missoula County Sheriff's Office was afraid of
an "all-out shooting war" between Head Start and Community
Action.

The same day, the Board met to ratify a new agreement
between HEW and MMHR. Not enough Board members turned
out to constitute a quorum and no business was conducted.

On August 23rd, the Head Start Director spoke again with the Senator's assistant. The latter had spoken with OCD's national office. The national office had told him that the regional office had threatened to close down Missoula Mineral Head Start for six to nine months if they, regional officers, had to go through a formal hearing. The regional office said that it was not sure it could win in a formal hearing.

The Senator's assistant told OCD that he thought it was being vindictive toward Head Start, and the Head Start Director particularly, because he "turned out not to be one of their patsies."

The same day, the Head Start Director spoke with the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD. He said that owing to the way he was presented in the local press, many local people regarded him with suspicion, he had been accused of getting rich from Head Start.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that HEW/OCD would "take care of that" once Head Start was separated from MMHR.

Later that day, the Policy Council Chairman spoke with the Deputy Regional Program Director. He told him that the Sheriff was afraid of a "shooting war" in Missoula.

"I'm not surprised," said the Deputy Regional Program Director.
On August 24th, the Board convened again to ratify the agreement made between its representatives and HEW. The low-income sector of the Board was not present and it is possible that the Board acted without a quorum. I have described part of the meeting in chapter 3.

The agreement stipulated that:

The suspension of the aforementioned grants. . . is hereby rescinded as of 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973. MMHR will pay all legitimate claims for program operations, as described in the aforementioned grants, from 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973, through August 31, 1973, . . . .

[MMHR] dismiss with prejudice the civil action filed by it against the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and others on June 25, 1973. . . .

HEW will promptly form an ad hoc parent committee composed of two representatives from each target area, . . . . One of the representatives from each of the aforementioned target areas must have had a child enrolled in the Head Start program in school year 1972-73, and the other representative from each of the aforementioned target areas shall be scheduled to have a child enrolled in the Head Start program for the school year 1973-74. The Regional Office, HEW, Region VIII, will provide technical assistance to the parents in the establishment of the ad hoc parent committee.

HEW and MMHR will endeavor to provide means by which the full Day Care component of the abovenumbered grants will operate continuously through at least November 30, 1973.

HEW will endeavor to ensure that the new grantee(s) will advertise the Head Start Director(s') position(s) and hire a director(s) from among those who apply.
(For the full text of the agreement, see Appendix B.)

On August 25th, the Head Start Director telephoned the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD. The latter confirmed the intent of the agreement to dispose of the Policy Council and the Head Start Director. There was nothing personal about it, the Deputy Regional Program Director said.

The Head Start Director said that owing to the way the newspaper had presented the conflict, and the denial of a formal hearing, he was "left holding the bag."

The Deputy Regional Program Director agreed. He said that HEW/OCD would exonerate his reputation.

The Head Start Director said that he was considering going to court to clear himself.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that HEW/OCD might be able to make some arrangement with the new grantee.

The Head Start Director said that CAP would try to influence any new grantee against hiring him, that since the allegations made against CAP were never proved in court and were not even mentioned in the agreement, CAP could maintain that his suspension and demotion were proper actions.

The Deputy Regional Program Director said that HEW/OCD would "go on record" to redeem the reputations of those connected with Head Start during the conflict.

On August 27th, MMHR's Acting Deputy Director told
a Daycare teacher that after August 31st, Daycare would be on its own, MMHR would have no more to do with it.

The Deputy Regional Program Director, upon learning of this from the Policy Council Chairman, expressed anger and said that he would make a statement to the press regarding MMHR's responsibility to keep Daycare open.

August 31st passed without incident. The conflict was officially over.

Summary


There were several reasons presented in this chapter for schism between the two programs. There was the misuse of Head Start monies by CAP, although this was not proven until after the conflict had ended. Prior to and during the conflict, only the Head Start Director felt absolute certainty that Head Start monies were being misused. The Policy Council, as a whole, recognized that Head Start monies were disappearing but was unable to comprehend the rate and extent of withdrawals, or the manner in which these monies were "washed" and then embezzled or transferred to other accounts. Indeed, neither did the Head Start Director realize the complexity of CAP's method, until Arthur R. Sakaye's later investigation revealed it.
More important to an analysis of the conflict itself were the perceptions by Head Start staff and parents that they were being treated as second-rate members of the agency. At issue, with the suspension of the Head Start Director, was whether or not Head Start parents had the right to make and carry out policy pertinent to Head Start. This, at least, was the Policy Council Chairman's perception, and the Policy Council agreed with it. The Head Start Director's popularity with staff and parents, at the beginning of the conflict, was of secondary importance.

By the beginning of the summer, the Policy Council was no longer willing to acknowledge allegations of racism made by the CAP Indians, but regarded these accusations as a political ploy directed by CAP's Executive Director and his minion, the Parent Involvement Director. When the Executive Director resigned his position, this ploy was continued by his successor, the Acting Deputy Director.

To the CAP Indians, however, it seems apparent that they fully believed their own allegations, even though, when challenged to produce evidence of racism within the Head Start, they were unable to do so. The CAP Indians were convinced that, should Head Start succeed in separating from Community Action, Indians would be excluded from the program. A contradiction in their attitude is indicated by their recognition that, in order to ensure that Indians would be excluded from program participation, they, the
CAP Indians, would themselves have to work toward this end.

Nor did Head Start accept the idea of a class difference between the clientele of Community Action and its own, although it did recognize differences in family structure. Differences in the personality make-ups of CAP's and Head Start's staffs were seen by both groups as ideological and political. CAP was "action-oriented" while Head Start was "service-oriented". Under the guise of activism, CAP employed tactics of confrontation, harassment, and "terror" against Head Start. Head Start eschewed methods of harassment and terror, but adopted the tactics of confrontation.

To the analyst, there existed a dialectical opposition between CAP's symbolic and behavioral norms when viewed from both their public and private aspects.

Within the walls of the agency, the CAP staff consistently denigrated all programs regarded as service-oriented. Their behavior throughout was consistent with their own conceptions of activism. However, to the public, and the reporter, CAP presented its mission as that of alleviating the conditions of poverty (service) while attempting to destroy its causes (activism). Only within the agency were its causes defined as the entire social structure of the country. For the public's benefit, and the benefit of most of the agency's clientele, the causes were less generally defined as racism, political oppression, and the middle class' hoarding of wealth.
The reporter, I believe, was seduced by the noble principles of OEO's mission, service and activism together, which harkened back to the mythical days of John F. Kennedy's presidency. At the same time, she refused to investigate the behavioral aspects of the agency's staff, for fear (I believe) that she would not be able to reconcile the contradictions. (When I suggested to her that she believed in a myth, she replied, "I hope you know you've insulted me."

One of the ironies of the conflict was that CAP ended up fighting against those very people, the poor, under whose banner it fought. CAP fought to save itself and its mission from extinction. Only by reclassifying the largest segment of the poor in Missoula and Mineral Counties as "middle class" was CAP able to wage war against it, and to use as weapons those very traits which it ascribed to the middle class: racism, political oppression, and the manipulation of economic wealth to serve its own interests.

CAP was centrally organized. Its structural relationships were economic and affective with a vague militant ideology superimposed over these. The focus of these relationships was CAP's Executive Director, who, by virtue of his organizational status, controlled the distribution of monies, favors, and information. The role of personality cannot be forgone, as witness the inability of the Acting Deputy Director to maintain those affective relationships which had been built up by the Executive Director.
Through conflict, the organization of Head Start came to resemble that of Community Action as it had existed prior to the resignation of the Executive Director. Nor can personality be ignored here. The Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman were no less intransigent than any of the Community Action staff and were no less self-assured of the moral rightness of their shared position, although they did not consciously espouse any political ideology.

Together, they had the ability to control almost all information that arrived from Washington or Denver. That they conscientiously distributed information to Head Start supporters does not alter the fact that they comprised the primary channel through which information flowed. Their commitment to Head Start and to separating it from CAP, and their accessibility to Head Start supporters placed them almost unwillingly in positions of patrons analogous to that which the Executive Director had occupied.

Structurally similar, although CAP went into decline shortly after the resignation of the Executive Director, the two programs distinguished themselves from each other by their respective values and behaviors.

CAP appears to have regarded itself as a kind of messianic social movement rather than simply another federal bureaucracy. Its methods of "operational expediency" were rationalized as the only means by which to achieve a
benevolent, if undefined, end. But make no mistake, if
the means were regrettable, they were no less enjoyable.
The CAP staff seemed to derive a true pleasure at recalling
how they had confronted one or another individual or organ-
ization and had so befuddled or intimidated their victim
that they won the day. I have no doubt that CAP ultimately
became committed, not to the winning of the war on
poverty, but to the conduct of the war itself. Head Start,
I believe, was regarded as racist and reactionary because
its Director and others cast doubt on the overall effective-
ness of CAP's tactics and questioned CAP's moral right to
use these same tactics.

Head Start regarded itself as continuing the Great
American Tradition of resistance to political oppression.
It regarded Community Action as totalitarian or "communist"
and its practice of "terror" and individual harassment as
evidence that CAP felt only contempt for human rights and
dignity.

The core of the resistance was Head Start's Southside
parent center. From this center came three of Head Start's
most active Councilmen: the Chairman, the Secretary, and
the delegate from the Central Trades and Labor Council.

The Southside was unique from other centers in
Missoula in one way: the Executive Director of Community
Action did not attend its meetings, nor did his minions.
In this regard, the Southside shared a common trait with
the Mineral County centers, which earlier in the year than the other centers had expressed distrust of and discontent with CAP. Perhaps owing to the Southside's closer geographical proximity to the agency, while at the same time maintaining its sense of independence, it took the lead in the fight against CAP.

I do not know why the Executive Director or other CAP staff did not attend Southside meetings as they consistently did those in other parent centers. But by December it was, at any rate, too late for CAP to make inroads. The Southside had already become suspicious and resentful of the glib generalities with which the Executive Director answered questions at Policy Council meetings and of the arrogance projected by the Planning Director in his dealings with parents. By way of contrast, the Head Start Director's candid but assured manner and his encouragement of parents to become more actively involved in planning and implementing policy earned him an open invitation to attend all Southside meetings.

Throughout the spring of 1973, OCD's Regional Community Representative for Head Start several times described the process by which Head Start could separate from Community Action, if it desired. The process was this:

1. Head Start should request HEW to separate the programs.
2. Head Start should provide documentation to show cause why it should be separated.

3. Approximately six weeks would be needed to separate the fiscal accounts and to find a new prime sponsor for Head Start.

4. During this six week period, both Head Start and CAP were entitled to informal hearings.

5. If a new prime sponsor could not be found immediately, OCD itself could act as interim sponsor.

6. All staff and program members would go intact to the new sponsor.

While the decision to resist the suspension of the Head Start Director by CAP was the Policy Council Executive Committee's, the form it took—to seek separation of the two programs—was suggested to the Executive Committee by an OEO investigator. The investigator outlined the same process of separation as had the Regional Community Representative.

The day following the Executive Committee's decision to seek separation, the Regional Director of HEW telephoned the Head Start Director at his home and informed him that HEW would support Head Start's bid and intimated that Head Start should have documentation ready for review within a few days. Only following this telephone call did Head Start issue a letter requesting documentation in the form of personal statements.
Until July, Head Start was unaware that MMHR could request a formal hearing. But, even so, the Regional Community Representative said, an interim sponsor could be found or OCD itself could act as interim sponsor should the formal hearing be a lengthy one.

Apparently, OEO and HEW (Regional) were in collusion to separate the programs. But when the Regional Director of OEO resigned and his successor recognized the legitimacy of MMHR's new Board of Directors, which had been previously contested, HEW was left holding the bag.

Although Head Start did not know this until the middle of July, CAP's misuse of WIN/ADC monies had been approved by OEO and OCD had permitted CAP to establish and maintain an over-income Head Start program.

Head Start presented a moral argument built around recruitment records ("intakes") which had been falsified by CAP for "political reasons". Head Start's argument stated simply that Head Start was meant to serve the poor but, owing to CAP interference, it could not to the extent for which it was designed. In this regard, the problem for Head Start was that OCD was aware of CAP's corruption of Head Start and, by omission or commission, had permitted it.

Other links between CAP and HEW/OCD are not so obvious. We have seen economic association in the form of co-investment in a pig farm. I do not know whether or how this association overlapped onto political linkages, but as similar systems of co-investment and gift-giving (I do
not mean bribery: Cf. Mauss 1967; Malinowski 1922) operated in Missoula to CAP's political advantage, we may speculate that the same applied in the former case.

As well, CAP shared aspirations of institutional ascendancy with certain OCD functionaries.

CAP's links to OEO, of course, were economic, political, and ideological.

Against these sets of interwoven structures, Head Start could bring only a kind of populist moral fervor and intransigence which were copacetic with the views of Montana's Congressional delegation (petitions also helped). It was this same fervor, abetted by CAP terror, which welded Head Start together and sustained it as a cohesive organization.

It was only through Congressional pressure on HEW and, apparently, on OEO that Head Start was separated from CAP in time to begin classes in the fall. Nevertheless, the separation agreement between CAP and HEW required both the dissolution of the Head Start Policy Council and the firing of the Head Start Director. Although the Policy Council had received advanced, if unofficial, warning that OCD intended to liquidate it, the Head Start Director learned only following the ratification of the agreement that he, too, had been terminated. Both actions by OCD were counter to what previously had been described as part of the separation process. There is more than a little indication that HEW did not weep to see the Head Start Director go, and that
they had come to blame him, however irrationally, for having disrupted their offices.
Footnotes


22. Telephone harassment commenced the following morning. Executive Committee members and Head Start parents known to be close friends of members of the Executive Committee began to receive obscene and intimidating telephone calls. These calls would continue through the summer and, in some cases, into early autumn.

In only one case was the caller identified. Rather, he identified himself to a Head Start couple who had known him for years and who confirmed that the voice on the telephone was his. He was the Head Start outreach worker who, the previous winter, had threatened one MMHR Evaluation Committee member with a beating and another with a house-burning.

As we shall see later in this chapter, violence, employed against Head Start, would not remain restricted to verbal forms.

23. The State Training Officer had a variety of miscellaneous responsibilities concerning Head Start projects in Montana. As her office was not officially concerned with the flow of money and information between HEW/OCD and Head Start, I have not included it on the organizational chart.

24. Within four days, sixty individuals' statements, as well as some of the Head Start recruitment records ("intakes") from past years, were in the hands of the Policy Council Chairman and the Head Start Director. By mid-August, the collection had grown to ninety-one statements. I have received explicit permission from the authors of those statements which I have cited in Chapter IV and V to include them in this paper.

25. LIGHT was the brainchild of a Head Start mother and employee who, in the late '60s, helped to found the organization and became its first chairwoman. During her tenure, meetings of upward of one hundred people were not uncommon. LIGHT espoused tactics of confrontation and cooperation with local agencies, modifying their tactics in accordance with situational demands. Eventually,
the chairwoman was forced out of the organization by CAP, who replaced her with a Head Start outreach worker. This move corresponded with LIGHT's refusing to endorse any tactic other than confrontation. In the summer of 1973, LIGHT was able to attract only six persons, other than agency staff, to its meetings.

26. I do not know why the letter was dated three days in the future.

27. This last exchange between the Acting Deputy Director and the Policy Council Chairman points out a bit of role-playing which the Chairman saw but which the Acting Deputy Director apparently did not. The Acting Deputy Director had been a practicing defense attorney for a number of years. The role of defense attorney was the only professional role he had ever played and it was the role he was playing this evening. In order to play this role, he had to assign the opposite role of prosecutor to the Chairman, who was only too willing to accept the assignment. Throughout the evening, the Acting Deputy Director objected to certain legalistic interpretations of the by-laws, the Head Start Manual, and MMHR's Personnel Manual made by the Chairman. What the Acting Deputy Director failed to appreciate was this: not only did the Chairman play the role of prosecutor but he had also assumed the role of judge. Thus, whenever the Acting Deputy Director objected to a "constitutional" interpretation made by the Chairman as prosecutor, the Chairman as judge would rule in his own favor. By the middle of the meeting, the Acting Deputy Director had given up and sat silently hunched forward, observing the proceedings.

28. I do not know to what meeting she is referring. Head Start had held no night meetings. I have no information on a night meeting that CAP may have held.

29. I was a member of the Southside Center. I am aware of no Southside parent who withdrew his or her child owing to disillusionment with Head Start. I know of one couple who withdrew their child from the program owing, in part, to discontent as a result of CAP's refusal to account for the spending of Head Start monies. I am aware of only one Board member who resigned owing to dissatisfaction with Head Start. This was the man who resigned in January of 1973 over the issue of the Alberton Center's being so grossly over-income. The only
Council representative who resigned out of discontent with Head Start, in program year 1972-73, was Daycare's representative.

30. The husband of the Policy Council Secretary recorded the meeting for the Council. The Executive Director set up his own recorder.

31. Two years later, a Head Start staff member would recall: "I'll never forget that night. Andy wouldn't let them [CAP] get away with anything."

32. Those from Head Start, including the Chairman, were similarly dressed in casual "sport" clothes.

33. Twelve of twenty-three teachers signed letters of conditional resignation. Four others signed similar statements but did not want their names made public. Several teachers were out of town on vacation and out of contact with Missoula. Teachers with whom I talked felt that all but one or two of their number would have signed conditional resignations if all could have been contacted.

34. The Head Start Director states that at no time did the Missoulian reporter solicit his opinion on any matter. Both he and the Policy Council Chairman attempted on several occasions to interpret the summer's events for the reporter in the light of Head Start's position. By late June, however, it was apparent that the reporter was relying on elements of the CAP staff to interpret the activities of the various organizations involved in the conflict.

Almost two years after the conflict I asked the reporter if she felt she had been biased in her coverage of the conflict. She replied that she did not think there was a reporter in the world whose feelings did not enter into his reportage. I asked her if she thought her feelings would have been influenced if, during the conflict, she were convinced that President Nixon and Head Start were in direct or indirect collusion to destroy OEO and CAP particularly (this is precisely how CAP presented the issues at the core of the conflict). She said she thought that her feelings would have been influenced but that she would have been able to remove her personal views from her stories.

The most far-reaching consequence of her stories is the suspicion with which the now former Head Start Director is regarded in Missoula. His "suspension" and "demotion" were reported without comment from him. The former
Executive Director chastised him through the reporter's stories, again without his accompanying comments. At one time a political hopeful, the former Head Start Director has forsaken any chance of again running for public office.

35. Informants within Community Action stated that no one associated with Community Action, except the former Policy Council Chairwoman, complained of any harassment or intimidation whatsoever. The former Policy Council Chairwoman's complaint will be discussed later in this chapter.

36. The following September, the former Policy Council Chairwoman lost her personal notebook or journal in a shop in town. An employee found it and recognized the name of the owner. It was then passed along to another employee who gave it to the by-then former Head Start Director. He lent it to me for an evening before turning it in to the Sherrif's Office. In the notebook was a letter written to a friend in another state. It discussed the attack and indicated that the victim had known all along who her attacker was. He was the same man who had been making obscene telephone calls to her for nearly nine months. Whoever her attacker was—the letter did not give his name—it was apparent that the assault had nothing to do with the conflict between Head Start and Community Action but had been used to serve CAP's interests.

37. He did see the former Policy Council Chairwoman again, at which meeting I was present. He displayed no physical or verbal reaction.

38. In July, the Chairman refused an offer from a friend of a friend who was affiliated with a CAP agency in an eastern city to supply "thirty of our Black brothers and sisters" who were accustomed to confrontation, and who would aid Head Start in its fight against CAP and HEW. The Chairman was afraid of increasing the level of violence and of introducing into the conflict "mercenaries" who would demand some sort of payment (jobs?) in return for their services. Interestingly, the offer was made by a white man.

39. Petitions requesting a "Congressional investigation" of the situation in Missoula and the relationship between OCD and MMHR were sent to the four members of Montana's Congressional delegation. The petitions were the idea of Head Start's Supportive Services Director and he had general supervision of petition carriers.
40. OCD's Regional Program Director had again suspended Daycare funding, apparently in response to HEW's Regional Director "amending" the agreement made between OCD and MMHR. An "Indian Cultural Center" had been established at the CAP agency using WIN/ADC funds. According to a statement made by CAP's Acting Deputy Director during the Board meeting of August 9th, $600 of $3,600 received from the state was appropriated. It is unclear what became of the other $3,000 that found its way into CAP's hands. Head Start's Daycare center, meanwhile, was unable to pay either rent or salaries or to buy food for the children. The teachers continued to work, the church in which the Daycare Center was located did not press for its rent, and an Episcopalian women's organization donated food.

41. The Chairman had taken a lesson from a special meeting he had conducted the previous spring. Taking the advice of a CAP staff member, he had arranged for the meeting to be held at a rather drab location. The CAP staff member had said that, were the meeting to be held at the Edgewater as the Chairman intended, the parents would be offended by the "middle class" atmosphere. Head Start parents, learning of the location for the meeting, demanded to know why it could not be held in more pleasant surroundings. When the Chairman suggested the Edgewater, the parents agreed that it would be an excellent place to hold the session.

42. Following this meeting, the Regional Director of HEW requested Head Start to reconstruct it, including seating arrangements and the names and locations in the room of persons present. Also included were the statements of each person who spoke.

I have represented the meeting in accordance with the recollections of the six persons who reconstructed it. All dialogue is taken from their report.

43. Head Start had requested the Senator's assistant to press for a "formal" court hearing before an administrative trial judge. Because the newspaper accounts of the conflict had been so superficial on the one hand and prejudiced on the other, Head Start felt that the only way it could redeem its reputation as an aggregation of responsible people was to carry its case into court.

44. In Missoula, there was, for instance, the incident of the chickens. In early autumn of 1972, according to informants, an agency employee collected cash from a number of agency personnel--employees and Board members--
to buy chickens with which to set up an agency cooperative. He bought 500 chickens. En route to Missoula, 250 smothered owing to faulty ventilation in the van transporting them. He sold the remaining 250 to certain influential persons in Missoula for apparently more than reasonable prices. Agency personnel who had invested their money were told that the money gained by selling the 250 chickens was needed to offset the loss of the other 250 chickens. Apparently no money was refunded and no co-op was established.

For purposes of this paper, our interest is directed toward the persons who bought the chickens. The question must be asked: why, of all the persons available who might have been interested in buying live chickens, were these influential persons solicited? I suggest that these persons were solicited precisely because they were influential. They were sold the merchandise at very reasonable rates as a personal favor on the part of the agency employee. Having received this favor, they might eventually be called upon to return a favor.

One public official who had bought chickens indicated the potential political embarrassment inherent in receiving this "gift" when he stated publicly that the money received for the sale of the chickens was used for the benefit of the poor, although he had been informed prior to making this statement that evidence to the contrary existed.
CHAPTER VI

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Following Mitchell's ordering of structural, categorical, and personal relationships (Cf. Chapter I), I intend now to redefine the categorical and structural orders which existed within Community Action and Head Start and to describe the effects of personal relationships on each.

The Categorical Order: Indians

In relation to one another, Indians emphasize their tribal identities while in relation to non-Indians, they emphasize their Indianness. In the urban environment, as well as the reservation environment, Indians take their social identities from their ethnicity.

The "CAP Indians" were a clique of urban Indians employed by or congregated at the Community Action agency in Missoula. Economically, the CAP Indians were dependent upon federal monies and services. Indians appear to regard federal patronage as their right, by way of treaties, as opposed to non-Indians who regard it as Indians' privilege.

In order to maintain their economic relationship with the federal government they must identify themselves
as Indians. In order to establish their identities as social beings, they must enter into an interpersonal network composed of other Indians.

The CAP Indians sought to maintain their Indian identities and their economic rights by provoking and maintaining ethnic antagonism.

CAP supporters, Indian and White, were organized into what, after Mayer, I shall call an "interactive quasi-group." Mayer (1966:97-98) defines quasi-groups in this way:

First they are ego-centered in the sense of depending for their very existence on a specific person as a central organizing focus; this is unlike a group, in which organization may be diffuse. Second, the actions of any member are relevant only in so far as they are interactions between him and ego or ego's intermediary. The membership criteria do not include interaction with other quasi-group members in general.

The charisma of CAP's Executive Director appears not to have been as effective with the majority of CAP Indians as with White supporters. It appears, rather, that to the larger number of CAP Indians, the Executive Director was simply the primary decision-maker and authority in the agency to which they had transferred their dependency and their aspirations from the BIA and which encouraged the Indian momentum toward a new ethnicity.

Those CAP Indians who were employed by Head Start but who owed their loyalties to Community Action acted as intermediaries between the two cultures which made up the agency's clientele. Their devotion to the Executive
Director appears to have been mitigated only by the necessity to maintain rapport with Indians outside of their clique, to which necessity they attached primary importance.

Behavioral norms among both Indian and White supporters were established by the Executive Director and his intermediaries and were enacted in accordance with the Executive Director's expectations.

The Categorical Order: Head Start and Community Action

The larger part of Head Start supporters, aside from employees, were employed in the private sector of the economy.

We may consider Head Start a coalition of parent centers, each of which was itself a semi-autonomous socio-political system, factionalizing around predominant issues, and dominant personalities, forming new factions as other issues arose and individuals realigned themselves. Each parent center's primary loyalty, however, was to itself as an aggregation of parents united to ensure the fair distribution of services and resources for its children, as against other parent center/classrooms, by way of Policy Council decision-making.

The Head Start Policy Council, then, was the legislative focus of Head Start parents but the power which derives from the exercise of moral authority was located in the parent centers. The Policy Council employed no means
by which to enforce its decisions other than verbal argument and moral persuasion. The Head Start administrative staff were regarded as executors of the Policy Council's will and responded in conformity to the Council's expectations.

By way of contrast, Community Action vested moral authority in its Executive Director. Political power derived from his relationship to OEO. The exercise of power within the agency took the forms of patronage, political nepotism, and economic entrapment.

The very method by which CAP "organized" the poor, or more accurately, attracted to itself a clientele, served also to corrupt the agency. Without doubt, CAP succeeded in instilling a sense of pride and self-respect which had been lacking in the minds of many of its supporters. In return for this and for jobs or the prospect of jobs, CAP expected and received loyalty to itself and its mission. It established social boundaries between itself and those it labeled "middle class."

A weave of reciprocal roles connecting all facets of the private and public lives of CAP supporters brought about the kind of social and emotional entropy of which Wallace speaks (Wallace 1971:9-7). All roles focused on the Executive Director. He or his intermediaries blocked or distorted the flow of information between "outsiders"
and his board of directors, between the Head Start Director and the Policy Council (at least between October 1972 and March 1973), and between the several parent centers. Incompetent employees could not be terminated for fear of altering extant loyalties. Records were manipulated to conceal past frauds.

Conceptual models by which to view the poor and which were the ideological impetus to the War on Poverty did not accurately portray the poor. The qualitative model of the "culture of poverty" suggests that, for whatever reason the poor are poor, they tend to perpetuate their own poverty. People who are participants in the culture of poverty can be distinguished behaviorally from other people. The quantitative model of poverty maintains that the poor are poor because, having lower incomes, less economic security, and lower educational levels, they have fewer vocational opportunities than other people.

Schneider and Smith's more recent pluralistic model in which the poor may be distinguished among themselves by a variety of "status groups based upon occupation, income, style of life, ethnicity, and race," often times inimical to one another, appears to approach empirical reality in Missoula more closely than either of the other two.

CAP's Executive Director apparently perceived something akin to this reality, as for several years he
was able successfully to manipulate one status group, or
category, against another to serve his own, or CAP's, ends.
Nevertheless, he presented the culture of poverty model to
his clientele, substituting the expression "hard-core poor"
for culture of poverty, and linked it to an ideology which
stressed the uniqueness of the poor as a sort of noble savagery
and which depicted the middle class as a straw man responsible
for the problems of the poor. At the same time, CAP dis­
couraged its clientele from seeking social mobility, accusing
those who had achieved a higher socio-economic status
after having left the agency of having become "middle class."

CAP ascribed to the middle-class traits of racism,
political oppression, and the hoarding and manipulation of
economic wealth. This "negative ideology" was consistent
with Indians' views of themselves as an oppressed minority
suffering from "cultural deprivation."

There is only minimal evidence that a "culture of
poverty" composed of individuals representing generations
of self-perpetuating urban poor existed within the boundaries
of Community Action, although, according to the Executive
Director and to OEO's original planners, these were the
people whom CAP was designed to mobilize. Informants and
I were able to isolate only two extended matrifocal families
which, for three generations each, have found themselves
living in conditions of poverty, regardless of aid offered
or given by welfare agencies and opportunities (presumed)
for achieving enhanced status. One of these families appears to be suffering from a physiological deficiency. The other, ethnic differences aside, bears an uncommon resemblance to Oscar Lewis' portrayal of the Rios family (Lewis 1966b). Rather, unemployment, alcoholism, old age concomitant with having been discarded by one's family, a personal history of imprisonment, and, in the cases of women, divorce, desertion, incapacitation, or death of the husband concomitant with entering the welfare rolls appear singly or in combination to account for the diminishment of wealth and status and the sense of social inferiority and guilt which characterized CAP's clientele.

If a sub-culture of self-perpetuating poor of any size exists in Missoula and Mineral Counties, it was beyond CAP's grasp. The method of organization through conflict—the Alinsky method—which CAP used worked almost exclusively with individuals who had already had some experience as members of corporate groups, work organizations, or associations. Those beyond the pale, if they exist, remain beyond the pale. Friendship or patron-client networks into which CAP's Executive Director inserted himself were composed of persons who, by and large, had known better days (either in actuality or in imagination) and who would have liked to know them again. To this clientele, CAP offered a semblance of economic security and social solidarity.

Provided a scapegoat in the middle class, the poor, Indian and White, were able to project their feelings of
inadequacy, insecurity, and guilt—the psychological responses to a "condition that arises out of the exigencies of being relatively without resources and of being negatively evaluated by the larger society" (Rossi and Blum 1968:40)—against the middle class in the form of "racial" and class hatred. The conflict between Head Start and Community Action was preceded by CAP's categorizing Head Start as "middle class," thereby signaling to CAP's clientele and lower-ranking employees that Head Start was to be attacked.

Whatever racism was manifest in Head Start was apparently grossly exaggerated by CAP. No one associated with Head Start was in such a position as to be able to execute political oppression or fiscal manipulation. Head Start did, however, adhere to the "middle class" ideals of achievement and social mobility.

Head Start revered rationality and the expression of ideas in contradistinction to CAP's emphasis on the expression of emotion. Head Start emphasized professionalism in work standards in contradistinction to CAP's emphasis on affect and personal loyalty. This accounts for Head Start's high regard for the Head Start Director as well as CAP's disdain for him as "insensitive." Similarly, it accounts for the reverence with which the teachers were regarded by Head Start parents and the contempt with which CAP regarded them.

If CAP regarded Head Start as increasingly dominated by reactionaries who were bent on destroying the CAP "family,"
as one CAP loyalist termed it, Head Start no less came to consider CAP a socially and politically oppressive, totalitarian (or "communist") regime under which no one could expect Head Start to live.

The Structural Order: Community Action and Head Start

Where we may regard Head Start as a segmentary system, each parent center comprising a minimal segment, Community Action was an administrative system, but one which had become a political party. In his prize-winning essay, "On Segmentary Lineage Systems," published twenty years ago, M. G. Smith speaks to the differences between the two types of systems:

Whereas the form of political systems is segmentary, and only displays hierarchic patterns to the extent that the political structures are directly involved in administration, the form of an administrative system only displays segmentary patterns to the extent that the administration itself constitutes a political system . . . . This important point . . . exposes the basic fallacy of the view that an all-dominating bureaucracy is a more rational or superior organ of government than a controlled bureaucracy insulated against the direct operation of political action. For, to the extent that the administrative structure decides policy, it becomes thereby a political system, and its hierarchic devolution of authority and functions is transformed into a segmentary contraposition of components, which, if it is not to lead to administrative breakdown, requires the elimination of the unsuccessful party in the conflict about policy from the single coextensive field of political and administrative action. In Russia this elimination may
involves liquidation; in segmentary societies, it proceeds by lineage redefinition, notably in the form of fission (Smith 1955:49).

From a structural standpoint, we may say that Community Action sought to establish for itself a broad constituency consistent with its mission as a revolutionary party but that, in attempting to do this, it created political enemies of the majority of those whom it sought to attract. The alternative courses of action for Head Start, then, were the elimination of Community Action as a political system or fission. CAP could attempt only to eliminate those it perceived to be its opponents.

Similarly, because the regional offices of HEW and OCD could not eliminate one another (an unsuccessful attempt to remove the Regional Program Director of OCD from his position had been made in early 1973), and because there were no provisions for institutional fission, the two offices could do no more than to attempt to neutralize the effects of each other's decisions throughout the conflict in Missoula. Ultimately, it required the intervention of Montana's Congressional delegation to settle the conflict (Cf. Wallace 1971:9-4,5).

Until 1973, there were no provisions for structural fission in Missoula either. But President Nixon's impounding of OEO funds and his apparent determination to destroy Community Action encouraged a sort of "categorical imperative" to manifest itself in Missoula's Head Start program.

Head Start demanded greater autonomy from CAP.
This move was matched, at least initially, by a "structural impetus" on the part of OEO. It saw in Missoula Mineral Head Start a new urgency which corresponded to their instructions (according to well-placed informants) to, if not destroy CAP, at least render it less capable of offense.

A linkage of unknown character between the offices of the Regional Director of OEO and the Regional Director of HEW, in late winter and spring, 1973, brought HEW into the action, acting on OEO's behalf. Although Head Start was, at that time, ignorant of the machinations at regional level, it greeted HEW as a benevolent patron and ally. Everything reversed itself in early July, as we have seen, with the resignation of OEO's Regional Director.

Slater and Bennis emphasize a point which Smith made earlier and put it into a less esoteric, but less dynamic, framework:

Organization and communication research at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology reveals quite dramatically what type of organization is best suited for which kind of environment. Specifically: for simple tasks under static conditions, an autocratic, centralized structure, such as has characterized most industrial organizations in the past, is quicker, neater, and more efficient. But for adaptability to changing conditions, for rapid acceptance of a new idea, for "flexibility in dealing with novel problems, generally high morale and loyalty . . . the more egalitarian or decentralized type seems to work better."

One of the reasons for this is that the centralized decision-maker is "apt to discard an idea on the grounds that he is too busy or the idea too impractical."
The failure of Nazi Germany to develop
the atom bomb is a telling example of this phenomenon (Bennis and Slater 1969: 5, quoting W. G. Bennis, "Toward a 'Truly' Scientific Management: The Concept of Organizational Health," General Systems Yearbook, 1962:273).

To return to the particular: although Community Action was intended to work with rather than on behalf of the poor, CAP was designed as a "central local authority" which would make policy decisions for local programs. But, as an "autocratic, centralized structure", it lacked the flexibility to deal with changing conditions and new problems.

As well, CAP discouraged local initiative, "independence and choice" while encouraging "dependency" on public assistance. CAP's centralism also encouraged a sense of elitism among CAP's staff and the low-income sector of its board of directors. The prestige inherent in acquiring a seat on the Board, as well as economic benefits and favors granted to low-income Board loyalists ensured that Board seats, once gained, would tend to be maintained. Members of the low-income sector became the principal recipients, after the agency's staff, of federal monies channeled through CAP. Although designed, in part, to distribute federal monies and services to the poor, CAP redirected large amounts of these monies to maintain its own "establishment".

Activism did not put power into the hands of the poor, but into the hands of the Community Action staff and those Head Start staff who declared fealty to Community Action. CAP's ideology, which accused the middle class of racism,
the political oppression of the poor, and the hoarding and manipulation of wealth, served to rationalize the existence of established and exclusive relationships (Cf. Cohen 1969: 104).

Organizations which compete against one another, or are in conflict with one another, come to resemble each other. This is true for persons as well.

I have already referred to CAP as a quasi-group and to Head Start as a coalition, as distinct from a quasi-group. The necessity to refer to these types of organization in both categorical and structural contexts emphasizes the role played by personal relationships in linking one context to the other. A quasi-group is, in fact, a structure which has as its cement personal relationships. This is not necessarily true for coalitions.

Boissevain's definition of a coalition is intended to compete with Mayer's definition of a quasi-group in describing the same organizational type. The features of a coalition can include:

1. a centrality of focus in the form of a single central ego or leader or even a clique; 2. a clearly defined common goal apart from mutual affection or interest; 3. an internal specialization apart from possession of a leader; 4. an exclusiveness of membership; 5. connectedness (shared social relations amongst members); 6. behavioural norms vis a vis other members; and 7. the presence of rival or competing units in the environment (Boissevain 1971:471).
On its surface Boissevain's description of a coalition appears to be little more than a clarification of Mayer's definition of a quasi-group. Boissevain's objection, however, relates to Mayer's use of time in describing the formation of a quasi-group through "successive contexts of activity:"

.. . the action-set is not a "permanent" entity like the group. Although the "outward" aspects are those of continuing role-relationships—e.g., those of caste, etc.—the "inward" aspect is that of a linkage based on a specific purposive impulse stemming from ego. This action-set exists only at ego's election. ... To the extent that the same linkages remain in use in successive contexts of activity, a quasi-group is formed. . . . (Mayer 1966:110).

The quasi-group, then, . . . exists through a series of contexts of activity without any formal basis for membership. The people who are more constantly involved in the successive action-sets need not be those closest to ego. . . . However, when the more constant members are at the same time those directly linked to ego, one can characterize them as the "core" of the quasi-group. This core may later crystallize into a formal group. . . . If it does not become a formal group, it can be seen to be a clique. This is a body of informally linked people, having a high rate of interaction and with that "even spread" of membership activities which I have said distinguishes the group from the quasi-group. Though possessing leaders, cliques are not ego-centered bodies. Where there is a clique at the centre of the quasi-group, it is possible for different egos, as members of the clique, to evoke the same pattern of linkages in different action-sets having similar contexts, and even in different contexts. Thus, where the core becomes a formal group or clique, it may be possible to take it, rather than an
individual, as the central ego. . . .
(Mayer 1966:115-116; emphasis Mayer's).

Boissevain's response is this:

By introducing time and sequence Mayer is introducing very slippery concepts that raise more questions than they answer. How many action-sets do you have to observe or reconstruct to be able to determine whether a particular set of social linkages constitutes a quasi-group? If a particular person X is mobilised on three out of four occasions, and person Y on two out of five occasions, does it mean that X is a member of ego's quasi-group, but Y is not? Why must the criterion of multiple mobilisations be built into the definition? Why must a person be what amounts to an old acquaintance to qualify for membership in ego's quasi-group (Boissevain 1971:468)?

Boissevain proposes, then, that we abandon the term "quasi-group" for "coalition" as used "in the ordinary, broader English sense. By coalition, therefore, I mean 'a temporary alliance of distinct parties for a limited purpose' (Shorter Oxford English Dictionary)."

This definition implies temporariness: the coalition is entered into explicitly in order to achieve a limited purpose. The duration of the coalition will obviously vary with the length of time it takes to realize that purpose. . . . Obviously a certain amount of coordination must take place and this gives the coalition a measure of organization. The parties in coalition remain distinct; that is, their individual identity within the coalition is not replaced by a group identity, nor is their individual commitment replaced by a uniform set of rights and obligations. This is not to say, however, that certain behavioural norms may not develop (Boissevain 1971:470; emphases Boissevain's).

It is my contention that the terms "coalition" and "quasi-
group" do not describe the same type of factional organization. The key to understanding the distinction between the two lies in the use to which time, as a vehicle by which social relationships are formed, may be put. Time as an index of the intensity or number of linkages established between ego and X provides us with the answer to the questions Boissevain raises.

Prior to June 1973, Head Start may have been likened to a coalition of parent centers, in that parents within each center and between them were allied for the primary specific purpose of ensuring the highest quality education for their children that Head Start could offer. Most parents knew at the beginning of the school year that their relationship with Head Start would be ended at the end of the academic year.

Throughout the late winter and spring a number of incidents occurred which required a cooperative response from Head Start. The writing of new by-laws resulted in the formation of a "Southside clique" composed of the new Policy Council Chairman, the Policy Council Secretary, and the delegate from Central Trades and Labor. While all three publicly and privately denied their existence and behavior as a clique, the sense of moral obligation they had developed toward one another, which I trace back to their effort expended in writing the by-laws reinforced by the fact of their derivation from the same parent center, has proved to transcend the conflict to the present time (autumn, 1975).
When, in April, the Executive Director attempted to entrap two of the three members of this clique, the occasion served to draw other members of the Council closer to them.

Throughout this period, personal and public attacks directed against the Head Start Director by Community Action's leadership served to make him into an identifiable and sympathetic figure for the Policy Council. Similar attacks against the Policy Council drew the Head Start Director's sympathy to it.

The events of June catapulted the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman into prominence. The resulting ego-centeredness and conditions of conflict transformed social and interpersonal relationships at all levels of Head Start. The parent center ceased to be the most important social unit, personal linkages between parents and the Policy Council Chairman or Head Start Director assuming preponderant importance. In some cases, marital relationships went by the way, supplanted by other relationships more relevant to the conflict. There is evidence that the Policy Council Chairman, by mid-summer, had been invested with some sacred significance to at least some people.

Prior to the events of June, Head Start parents by and large looked forward to the end of the academic year and their commitment to Head Start. But the attempted suspension of the Head Start Director and the actions that
followed inspired the idea that the conflict must be fought and won for the benefit of future generations of Head Start parents and children. I was told by one parent, for instance, that "It would almost be worth it for a guy to find himself a part-time job for a year or so, so he could keep on fighting." The man who told me this held down a full-time job and was desperately in need of money by which to meet upcoming medical expenses.

My point in rehashing portions of the conflict and the events leading up to it has been to establish that time and events serve to form and to transform social and interpersonal relationships so that, as Mayer says, "Although the 'outward' aspects are those of continuing role-relationships . . . the 'inward' aspect is that of a linkage based on a specific purposive impulse stemming from ego."

Head Start, I suggest, began academic year 1972-73 as a coalition. By August 1973, it had become a quasi-group. The transformation from coalition to quasi-group was accompanied by a change in purpose: from ensuring high quality education for the children currently enrolled in Head Start to ensuring high quality education for future generations of Head Start children and, perhaps more importantly, to ensuring that future generations of Head Start parents and staff would be able to operate their own program without unwanted interference from without.

I suggest that at the level of quasi-group, "purpose"
becomes ideological and that, as Cohen says (Cohen 1969: 104), "Except in a few truly revolutionary instances, . . . such ideologies merely serve as rationalizations, if not romanticizations, of the established relationships among networks." In this regard, CAP provides us with the more obvious example of purpose as a rationalization for maintaining established relationships, CAP's stated purpose being to obtain power for the poor.

Mayer regards a clique as a possible product of quasi-group evolution. The present data does not lead to dispute. I have, however, tried to show that a clique may also be the product of the evolution of a coalition to a quasi-group -- the vanguard, so to speak.

I have made much of the role played by the Policy Council Chairman in the formation of Head Start as a quasi-group. I could possibly have employed the "character" of the Head Start Director or, had more detailed information on Community Action been available, that of the Executive Director to illustrate the relationship between a faction leader or "network broker" (Whitten and Wolfe 1973:733) and his or her faction as it undergoes transformation. I have used the character of the Policy Council Chairman, however, because I best knew his thoughts and the processes by which he made decisions.

Through the development of the Policy Council Chairman's character and role I have tried to show how role conflict is
avoided or denied by commitment to one role to the exclusion of others. In the case of the Chairman, I have shown how academic roles which competed against those relating him to Head Start were gradually discarded.

Except in degree the Policy Council Chairman and the Head Start Director were not unique in their commitment. What set them apart from other Head Start supporters, however, were their structural statuses, the occupation of which allowed them primary access to information coming into Head Start from Washington and Denver. Whitten and Wolfe (1973:732) describe network brokers as wheeling and dealing through interpersonal linkages, forming, transforming, and using interpersonal relationships for some perceived advantage, and in the process affect the social relationships within the direct and indirect spheres of their maneuvers. . . . Such "strategically placed" persons, if fortunate or adept, may turn their skills as brokers in social capital into personal power; their ability to manipulate networks enables them to make social events turn out to their advantage.

Whitten and Wolfe describe only half a truth, for the ability of a network broker to make social events turn out to his or her advantage is limited by the expectations of his or her own network and by the necessity to adjust one's own behavior to meet that of rival networks and brokers. As Cohen states, "inter- and intragroup relations are in constant feedback; neither exists independently of the other, and a change in one immediately produces changes in the other" (Cohen 1969:103). The network broker, then, not only is
an agent for change but an instrument of it.

Throughout the conflict, CAP and Head Start each attempted to incorporate HEW/OCD functionaries into its network to the exclusion of the other. We have seen that certain officials allied with CAP while others allied with Head Start. Individuals who, prior to the conflict, shared established personal or economic linkages with the Executive Director apparently found these linkages transformed into political relationships at the will of the Executive Director.

Head Start concentrated on a moral argument, having no other weapons. This moral argument, which portrayed CAP as an oppressor, was not received without effect.

By August, I was able to detect a psychophysiological relationship to the larger conflict in the person of Head Start's Regional Community Representative. Whenever she was about to impart information to the Head Start Director or the Policy Council Chairman which she knew would not be well received her voice would change pitch, growing higher and squeaky.

OCD's Deputy Regional Program Director, under apparent pressure from his superiors, would attempt to deny the validity of interpretations of data made by the Head Start Director and the Policy Council Chairman, saying "I don't necessarily believe that" or "I don't think so." (The rate of accuracy of the Head Start Director's predictions was 100 percent. The Policy Council Chairman was accurate
approximately 70 to 80 percent of the time during periods of free communication between Head Start and HEW/OCD, dropping to 50 percent when no information was available). Under less strained circumstances, he accepted similar interpretations without qualification.

In this context, we may regard HEW's Regional Director's severing communication between his office and Head Start as an attempt to reinforce his office staff's commitment to their official roles, necessarily at the expense of their commitment to Head Start but not necessarily to Community Action's detriment, for OCD's Regional Program Director, linked personally, economically, and politically to CAP, had knowingly permitted one form of corruption of which CAP was accused to exist. Thus, adherence to professional loyalties and obligations included toleration of corruption within HEW's offices by those who were not directly involved.

A formal legal hearing would have brought out the existence of this corruption. Because the Head Start Director, particularly, requested such a hearing and, no less important, because he brought Head Start's case to the attention of the Senator, he especially presented the threat of exposure to HEW and therefore, I believe, was singled out to receive the harshest expression of HEW vindictiveness (Cf. Chapter VII).

Networks, Quasi-groups, and Administrative Organizations
In the past several hundred pages, I have attempted to illustrate the existence of a structural continuum between interpersonal networks by which lower-class persons, regardless of ethnic boundaries, are organized and administrative, particularly bureaucratic, forms of organization. At either end of the continuum we have the two forms just mentioned and they are inherently at odds with each other.

The system ideally requires that the personnel comprising the management organization proper carry out the institutionally assigned tasks according to abstract rules. Personal considerations which would divert information or contradict the chain of command may reduce the effectiveness of the management; thus only personal relationships that enhance these ties can be tolerated.

. . . strictures are often maintained against contradictions between administrative relationships and other relationships of kinship, economic obligation, love, friendship, and so forth which involve dominance and dependency.

Nepotism in our own culture (theoretically, at least) is proscribed because it places two members of the structure in a relationship in which obligations of kinship (whether acquired by descent or marriage) may defect judgement (Wallace 1971:9-5).

Personal relationships and administrative relationships, as I have described them, cannot tolerate one another. Interpersonal networks based on kinship, friendship, dominance and dependency, love and obligation, by which the poor manage the affairs of every day life, are inimical to the Weberian ideal of impersonal bureaucracy. Conversely, the depersonalization of these networks, demanded by incorporation into
an administrative system, would destroy them. Quite justifiably, the poor are reluctant to give up the security (however insecure, economically) of a system they are a part of and know well for one which threatens to transform beyond recognition their social and personal relationships and identities. Each system corrupts the other.

It was the job of Community Action to mediate between these systems, to incorporate the poor into the American mainstream via federal jobs while at the same time maintaining extant network relationships or creating new, similar ones. It is no accident that two of the three categories I have defined were the creations of Community Action. (I regard Head Start as a creation, by opposition, of Community Action. The CAP Indians were marginal to, but still a part of, two systems: Indianness and CAP.)

CAP was neither as efficient as administrative systems are expected to be nor as flexible as interpersonal network systems are. Neither fish nor fowl, CAP evolved into an administrative agency corrupted and dominated by personal considerations antithetical to administrative forms of organization.

In the present context, CAP suffered from yet another flaw: it was exclusive; it could not expand owing to the strictures placed on it by unyielding, stagnant personal relationships, and it refused until the last, to allow those who were excluded from these relationships to fission.
In Chapter V I quoted Alinsky to the effect:

The anti-poverty program may well be recorded as history's greatest relief program for the benefit of the welfare industry. Graft wears many faces and one of the most sickening is the dedicated one. The use of poverty funds to absorb staff salaries and operating costs by changing titles of programs and putting a new poverty here and there is an old device. They will be as effective in their new hats as they were in their old (Alinsky 1965:45).

I must admit to having deceived the reader, in that I presented a portion of Alinsky's essay out of context with the general theme. In this essay, Alinsky expressed the fear that City Hall would gain control of Community Action agencies and drive out those who truly had the interests of the poor at heart. He asked:

Who is going to select the [low-income sector of the board of directors]? The poor themselves? Or will they be poverty specimens hand picked by the prevailing political powers? The issue of selection is the all important one as otherwise one can have a committee of 100% "representatives of the poor" which could be nothing more than a puppet of City Hall (Alinsky 1965:44).

I felt justified, when I was writing Chapter V, in making this deception, for who could have guessed, in 1965 when only "bad guys" did not at least sympathize with the doings of Community Action, that federal agencies could become as corrupt as City Hall, and for similar reasons?
CHAPTER VII

EPILOGUE

On September 7th, six days after the agreement between HEW and MMHR went into effect, Daycare closed its doors. Neither MMHR nor HEW would provide funds with which to keep it open, an HEW official saying that since MMHR had violated the agreement by refusing to aid Daycare (Cf. Appendix B), HEW did not consider itself obligated to honor it either.

Daycare's teachers were willing to continue, even without pay, but the parents, having suffered through the worst of the summer, could not face a future of uncertainty. They no longer brought their children to the center.

The National Director of Head Start was reported to be "very upset" that the Head Start directorship was to be advertised and intended to intervene. The now former Head Start Director notified him through an intermediary not to intervene, that people in Missoula had suffered too much as it was and that they could not endure further conflict.

A former Policy Council representative said that she was becoming an anarchist, that she was losing all faith in government. Former Policy Council members generally believed that Head Start had made a mistake in not separating from HEW as well, that Head Start should have taken out
incorporation papers, using its by-laws as the skeleton of a charter.

Through the first week in September prospective sponsors for Head Start received copies of the former Head Start Director's "performance evaluation" made initially by MMHR's Executive Director (Cf. Chapter 3), then revised by other persons in CAP. The "performance evaluations" were delivered by mail in manila envelopes bearing no return address. They were unsigned. One prospective sponsor considered the evaluation libelous. Another found it "disgusting." A third was noncommittal. One prospective sponsor's representative withdrew the prospectus that she had submitted to HEW seeking Head Start sponsorship. She was afraid, she said, that her board of directors would not be able to withstand CAP harassment.

On one occasion the recently discharged Head Start Director discovered the Parent Involvement Director following him around town in her car.

On September 9th, the former Policy Council Chairman received, by telephone, a threat against his life.

On September 11th, the Head Start staff, under the direction of the former Head Start Director, threatened to bring suit against HEW for back salaries HEW had promised to pay but had not. One Daycare teacher was literally down to her last six cents.

On September 15th, MMHR named a new director.
On September 18th, HEW auditors arrived in Missoula to audit MMHR's records relating to Head Start. Provisions to pay Head Start staff's back salaries were made.

The same day, MMHR's Acting Deputy Director drew his last paycheck from the agency.

On September 19th, MMHR's back building burned to the ground in an arson-caused fire. The bookkeeper had been seen in the building less than fifteen minutes before the fire was noticed at 11:00 p.m. At eight o'clock the following morning, the former Acting Deputy Director appeared at the scene. He inspected the contents of the third and fourth drawers of a five-drawer file cabinet which stood among the ruins of the building. He then departed. The third and fourth drawers had been pulled out apparently prior to the fire's ignition. Their contents were completely destroyed. None of the other three drawers had been opened. Materials in them were only singed. The third drawer had contained the agency's fiscal records. The fourth drawer had contained Head Start recruitment ("intake") records.

On September 25th, the Regional Director of HEW and Head Start's Regional Community Representative met in Missoula with Head Start's ad hoc advisory committee to hear the latter's advice and to announce the selection of a new prime sponsor for Head Start.

The ad hoc committee was composed of seven parents representing the previous year's parent membership and
seven parents representing new participants. During the meeting the former Policy Council Chairman, who served now as a "last year's parent," asked how much of Head Start's budget the new sponsor would be getting.

"There will be no rake-off!" the Regional Director of HEW shouted, apparently angry. He asked the new sponsor's representative if he understood that Head Start's entire budget was intended to serve Head Start alone. The sponsor's representative said that he understood and that he agreed.

The former Policy Council Chairman asked what guarantee did Head Start have that both men's words would be honored.

The Regional Director of HEW said that he had never reneged on a commitment. To a person, all fourteen members of the ad hoc committee issued a single, abrupt, spontaneous horselaugh.

The Regional Community Representative said that as long as she had known the Regional Director he had never gone back on his word. Her comment was met with silence.

In October, the Regional Program Director of OCD was suspended for ninety days for having permitted "irregularities" to exist in a number of programs for which he had responsibility.

In early October, Sakaye discovered an MMHR "washing account."

The Missoulian, KGVO-TV and KGVO radio were approached
by Head Start, who asked for free advertising to aid in recruiting children into the program. The Missoulian refused free referral service. KGVO-TV and KGVO radio advertised for referrals twice per day for one month without charge to Head Start.

On October 12th, MMHR elected to place itself under the authority of a new state-administered funding program. MMHR would eventually become the District 11 Human Resources Council, funded through the Department of Human Resources, a state agency.

On October 16th, two General Accounting Office investigators arrived in Missoula from Denver. HEW officials in Denver had told them that they did not consider themselves to have been "footdragging" during the summer.

The investigators went to the new Community Action offices. There they were told that the former Head Start Director was a malcontent, that he was the only Head Start Director to have worked for MMHR who had ever challenged MMHR's fiscal and management policies. The Parent Involvement Director said that he was a racist. The Planning Director said that the conflict had been a simple philosophical dispute.

On October 18th, Sakaye took the investigators to inspect bank microfilm records of MMHR's accounts.

The GAO investigators called in the FBI.

On November 7th, a news commentator for KGVO-TV,
the local television station, drawing "primarily" from the
Missoulian reporter's accounts of the conflict, gave his
opinion of the causes and progress of the conflict:

. . . In Missoula, Head Start nearly met its
demise due to a number of factors, the
most apparent being internal conflict and
poor administration. That has done nothing
but hurt the children who could have gained
had the program functioned as it was
designed. . . . Head Start in this city
has been anything but productive. Too
much attention has been focused on personality
clashes and mudslinging. Too many involved
in the Missoula Head Start project in the
past have displayed an attitude of "What's
in it for me?" Not what's in it for the
children.

[Head Start's new sponsor] should be
applauded for displaying enough fortitude
to pick up the rather dirty pieces and try
to rebuild a rather shattered concept.
Let's hope this time around top priority
will be given to the children involved.]

On November 8th a new Head Start Director was named.
A few days later, two Head Start staff members were
told by an OCD functionary that if there were any indication
of further trouble in Missoula, the program would be closed
and removed to another city. "Missoula is a dirty word in
Denver," the functionary said.

At the end of November, Head Start reopened. A Head
Start class was not established in Alberton.

By spring of 1974, Head Start had become racially
segregated. All Indian children enrolled in Head Start
attended the Cultural Integrity class. No Indian child was
enrolled in any other class. White children were not
enrolled in the all-Indian class. Parents of those White children who had been enrolled in the Cultural Integrity class at the beginning of the school year complained that their children were harassed and withdrew them.

Indian participation in Head Start dropped from 20 per cent in academic year 1972-73 to 9.3 per cent in academic year 1973-74. Indian parents who were economically eligible to place their children in Head Start were given the impression by the Parent Involvement Director that Indian children were welcome only in the Cultural Integrity class.

In April, 1974, MMHR's former bookkeeper pleaded guilty to nineteen counts of embezzling state and federal money. He was sentenced to five years in Montana State Prison where he served eleven months.

In November, 1974, in response to a request from the former Head Start Director for a job reference, HEW furnished a letter dealing "specifically with [the former Head Start Director's] allegations."

The letter stated that the former Head Start Director was suspended from his position on June 17, 1973 and indicated that HEW regarded his suspension as proper. It implied that the former Head Start Director was responsible for program mismanagement and for the fire which consumed MMHR's fiscal records and Head Start intake records. The letter stated that no "deals" were made to exonerate his reputation.
in Missoula.

The letter was signed by Casper Weinberger who reported the findings of the Denver Regional Office.

Whatever Became Of . . . ?

The Regional Director of HEW, the Regional Program Director of OCD and the Deputy Regional Program Director of OCD retain their positions.

The Regional Community Representative for Head Start is employed by the Indian Migrant Program in Washington, D.C.

The Executive Director of MMHR is a CAP director in Colorado.

The Acting Deputy Director practices law in Montana.

The Planning Director is employed by the Department of Human Resources, Helena, Montana.

The Parent Involvement Director is the director of an all-Indian daycare center in Montana.

The assistant professor was terminated from the University of Montana for reasons not connected with the conflict between Head Start and Community Action. He is a member of the District 11 Human Resources Council.

The most prestigious member of Missoula AIM is a member of the District 11 Human Resources Council.

The Head Start Director is unemployed. He resides in Missoula, Montana.

The former Policy Council Chairwoman remarried and
lives in Washington.

The Policy Council Chairman is a graduate student at the University of Montana, Missoula, Montana.
Footnotes
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EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT
TO MMHR BOARD, 3/16/73

Members:

Following the announcement of the establishment of the board chairman's evaluation committee in a letter dated February 9, 1973, committee members have been interviewing staff, program participants, low income people and other interested persons regarding programs, philosophies, results, and staff members of the MMHR activities.

Some attempts were made to discredit the intentions of the committee, and, most of these were expressed in slanderous statements that were not specific in content. The committee does accept the criticism that the timing was unfortunate since it coincided with the threat of the loss of OEO funding. However since the complaints and criticisms made were of long standing and not resolved, the committee felt that it was imperative to continue with its evaluative work. The evaluation was done by interviewing individuals and attending meetings of all sorts during the past 45 days. Following is a summary of the committee's findings:

1. Positive areas of MMHR programs:

A. The first three years of the community action component from about 1967 thru 1969, are consistently reported as being the most useful. The reasons given are that the "action role" brought problems of low income people to the attention of the communities in Missoula and Mineral counties and that local low income persons learned how to organize, speak for themselves, and become appraised of their rights.

B. Selected low income individuals have grown considerably through such processes as being hired as CAP or Headstart employees, receiving PSC training, being involved in organizational responsibility, or some combination of these.

C. Outreach worker services to selected individuals for such benefits as welfare and food stamps, securing housing, and the like were highly valued.

D. The annual payroll for all OEO, NYC, nutrition grant, and Headstart employees has substantial impact on the
local economy. Several hundred people, many of them low in-
come persons, have been employed in the past few years in
Missoula and Mineral counties.

E. The "supportive services" of child development,
nutrition, health, expense monies to attend meetings, and
the provision of jobs in the programs have been well received
by program participants.

2. Negative areas of MMHR programs:

A. An important and long standing polarization exists
between supportive services (education, nutrition, counseling,
psychological testing, and health) and so-called action roles
(such as protests, strategy sessions) has existed for some
time. It is interesting that the activities of the action
roles are often with the goal of getting more of the support-
ive services for low income individuals.

B. Related to the polarization between supportive ser-
vices and action roles are many occasions reported to the com-
mittee of individuals being accused of having "middle class
values" and "not understanding the needs of low income people." In
some documented cases in which this accusation has been
made, the real issue has been that the person has disagreed
with an interpretation of an action role.

C. There was considerable comment about a negative
community image existing in Missoula and Mineral counties es-
pecially of CAP related activities. Comment was further made
that the agency must adopt a more positive image if it is to
receive support in the form of funding and other aid after
OEO funds are terminated. While the program cannot be respon-
sible for attitudes and beliefs of community persons, it can
actively seek the involvement of more community elements than
we have sought in the past.

D. There appears to be a lack of administrative and
supervisory direction among employees. A frequently cited
complaint by employees was that they do not receive the
written supervisory evaluations as called for under established
personnel guidelines. Staff also report confusion caused by
the administrative staff failing to delegate authority and
running things on a "make-it-up-as-you-go basis." All but two
of the employees interviewed stated that they were not always
certain what their job duties were or what was expected of
them. Even though job descriptions might exist, the position
itself might be changed around frequently.

Another complaint of staff was that technical personnel
feel harrassed by demands that they take part in "action roles
and issues" after working hours. There seems to be little room for disagreement or personal choice as to the form of expression for action roles in serving the needs of the poor. As one committee member observed "this is supposed to be a public program and not a religion."

Training plans carefully developed by the training officers are often disregarded in favor of arbitrary changes by administrative staff. Low income program participants, LIGHT members, and board members complained that they are used and manipulated or that their wishes are disregarded in some programs or issues.

3. Audit and budget questions: In evaluating expenditures with agency bookkeepers and interviewing various personnel, the committee found no proof of any individual using any funds illegally for his own personal gain. The problems were limited to the areas of management and allocation of finances and other resources.

A. Substantial long distance telephone charges, other than those made through the WATS line, have accrued during the past year by groups meeting in the Center. This is part of a larger problem that various groups are using buildings, telephone, supplies and perhaps other resources for which the agency is not budgeted and for whom the board has not established any definite policy.

B. The MMHR Corporation is presently paying approximately $400 in interest because of having to borrow funds from a local bank to make up deficiencies in fiscal-year 1972 budget in the Headstart program.

C. In reviewing expenditures, it was not possible for the evaluation committee to determine which kinds of programs were shorted when there were overexpenditures in some budgets which were made up from surpluses in other budgets. For example, there are numerous complaints from Headstart parents and the policy council that there are shortages in such items as toilet tissue, janitorial services, and a rug, for a bare floor, at one of the centers in Headstart at the policy council meeting on 1-31-73, East Missoula parents complained that they did not wish their share of parent involvement money spent on trips to Helena. The question emerges as to whether funds are being expended for the purpose of attending meetings which produce little results and taking goods and services from our children in Headstart.

D. Allegations were heard to the effect that the LIGHT group received considerable OEO funds through MMHR. In checking the books it was found that virtually all of LIGHT's budget
is received from private sources such as church groups. In fact, only $50 in government funds has been received by LIGHT in the past year, which was allocated for low income members' travel. It was found, however, that community action staff are allowed to write checks on the LIGHT account for the purpose of providing emergency assistance to transients or other low income people for items which they could not receive through such sources as public welfare.

4. Personnel: Specific items regarding personnel issues were presented to the personnel committee. These are not reproduced here for the purpose of seeking to preserve some confidentiality about information concerning the situation of specific individuals.

Areas reported out of the personnel committee to the board for action will of necessity be brought before the board, of course.

5. Headstart policy council: In a Headstart policy council meeting during the past month, a contingent of East Missoula parents presented a petition for the removal of [the Policy Council Chairwoman] as a community representative and chairman of the council. The evaluation committee became concerned about the issue and included it in the report because the matter has gone unresolved to the present. We believe, of course, that the board should not interfere with the decision of the Headstart policy council. However, considering that MMHR board is the governing body which carries the overall responsibility for the agency and its programs. It should be realized that the East Missoula parents and [the Policy Council Chairwoman] have not had the benefit of having the matter resolved over the past two policy council meetings.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MMHR BOARD ACTION
BY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE, MARCH 16, 1973

1. The MMHR board should establish policy for use of facilities, long distance telephone, and other resources by groups other than specifically budgeted programs. A committee may need to be appointed for this purpose.

2. A billing code number of similar system should be established for long distance telephone calls, not made on the WATS line to reduce the number of unauthorized calls.

3. The board and personnel should pursue a policy that will maintain supportive services as well as action roles of the agency and reduce conflict between those elements.

4. Administrative staff must be given a mandate to establish better management systems especially in the areas of budgeting and personnel appraisal.

5. The board should insist that the agency staff should not be allowed to write checks on LIGHT bank accounts for expenditures relating to their Outreach work. It raises questions of accountability which can best be resolved by non-staff LIGHT members writing the checks and making their own disbursements.

6. Regardless of problems encountered in the current struggle to seek funds for continuation of the community action program, the integrity of Headstart funds, staff, prescribed programs, and parent groups must be carefully maintained.

7. Remind all members of the MMHR board, the Headstart Policy Council, LIGHT organization, low income caucus and their respective committees to exercise their own responsibility for establishing agendas, length of meetings and regulating inputs from staff members.

8. Admonish all persons connected with the organization to refrain from labeling other people as having "middle class standards" and "not understanding the needs of low income persons."

9. Actively seek to involve the elements of the community into MMHR concerns who are not currently active.

10. The board should maintain a periodic evaluation review of all programs and activities under its jurisdiction.
EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT ON
[THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S] PERFORMANCE

In the course of the evaluation of the agency the committee has come across occasions in which the Executive Director has acted contrary to the interests and expectations of the agency. This fact, combined with seven occasions in which the Executive Director has stated his intentions to leave or resign, has prompted the evaluation committee to request this meeting to consider either the termination or resignation of the Executive Director.

The seven occasions of which we are aware have been:
1. An executive committee meeting held on February 5th
2. A MMHR Board meeting held February 16th
3. A hearing in Helena concerning OEO held February 28th
4. An evaluation on committee meeting held February 28th
5. In private conversation on March 3-4
6. An executive committee meeting held March 5th
7. Two interviewers of the evaluation committee on March 9th

The suggestion of termination or resignation is done without recrimination and for the best interests of harmony in the future of any local low income community programs. The following situations represent reason to question [the Executive Director's] performance:

1. A situation of continual conflict has developed between members of the staff and the Executive Director. This specifically involves a polarization and division between certain members of the staff who has [sic] disagreed with him. In particular this has resulted in the Executive Director being involved in an attempt to fire the Head Start Director without following due process. The actions of the Executive Director has [sic] been evident in two distinct incidents:

   1. A meeting of the executive committee on which [....] will report.
   2. A meeting of the Headstart policy council on February 14 on which [....] will report.

There now exists a division among the staff which cannot continue if any low income program is to survive. This division has been present over a number of years but has apparently surfaced recently. It has evidenced itself in disagreements between the low income caucus and staff; the Head Start Director and Executive Director, and a long standing argument over the thrust of the Head Start program.
Based on an assessment of interviews there is widespread support for the Head Start Director, especially by those involved in the program. (See letter of February 16, 1973 by the Head Start teaching staff.) No negative reports have been received from a regional level in regard to the work of the Head Start Director.

This division has been further stimulated by the Executive Director's reaction to board direction (Meeting of the board on February 18, 1973.) Specifically this involved his reaction to a duly appointed evaluation committee, in which he interpreted the process as a personnel vendetta against himself. In subsequent meeting with the interviewers he has labeled this committee an illegal committee, even though he does not question similar committees appointed by the Chairman such as the Legislative [sic] or Phase Out Committees.

II. One of the consistent comments that has occurred in interviews with the staff and other interested people, has been the statement that "there is no direction". One member of the staff stated, "I was confused when I started this job and I still am." This person explained that despite attempts to find out what the job entailed, he could not. and had to learn through time what was expected. Of all the staff interviewed all but two stated in one form or another that there was a lack of direction. This confusion exists despite written job descriptions, personnel manual, etc. Specifically it may be attributable to the following:

1. There is an apparent lack of delegation of authority to staff responsible for particular functions. The Executive Director is the staff member who makes comments at Head Start policy meetings. This occurs despite the fact that it might be expected that the Head Start staff themselves might answer technical and policy questions about Head Start programs.

2. The Executive Director has disregarded the plans of the Training Officers and Training Consultant. One year ago the agency training officers, [....], [....], and [....], as unpaid training consultant, were given the assignment to develop a training plan for employees and board members. After considerable work and polling the needs of the staff, a plan was written up by the two training officers. The plan was totally disregarded by the Executive Director who pursued his own directions. One of the training officers complained to the committee that she was never allowed to conduct her own training sessions with staff members.

3. Budgeting problems have also occurred which may be attributable to the lack of administrative direction. The agency had to pay $400.00 in interest charges on money that was short
in the Head Start program and had to be borrowed at the end of the fiscal year 1972. There may have been reports of other shortages which had to be made up and may be a function of what has been described by one of the people interviewed as a "Spend-now-budget-later approach".

4. From the period of April 5, 1972 to the 30th of January [the Executive Director] has been absent a total of 90 days out of the 120 working days of that period of time. This approximates about 50% of the time he is supposed to be present at the agency. This absence occurred at a critical point in the agency's life, i.e., when [the Deputy Director] was gone and a new Head Start Director had been appointed. While all of the absences were within the guidelines of the personnel policy, they border on the neglect of the best interests of the agency, since the Executive Director is responsible for the management of the programs and staff.

III. Comments by interviewers:

1. Several staff have commented on their fear of discussing any sensitive matters over the phone. The reason for this fear is that their feeling that the conversation might be recorded. Evidence exists that phone conversations have been recorded without the consent of the individuals involved.

2. Complaints have been voiced over excessive long distance telephone charges. A comparison of phone bills based on a random selection has indicated that despite the installation of a WATS line there are as many, if not more calls within state that are charged to the agency than previously. Some of the groups which have been allowed to use the facilities of the agency have engendered fairly large bills. For example, during November of 1972 about $87 worth of phone bills were incurred by a group other than the agency itself.

3. There is a concern over the involvement of members of the staff in handling the funds of the LIGHT organization. At an informal meeting of the LIGHT group, [the Executive Director] stated that he had instructed [an agency employee] not to be involved in the finances of the LIGHT organization. However he apparently he [sic] had not, or was not able, to have the same instructions pertain to [an agency employee]. [The latter employee] has been one of the signators of the checking account of LIGHT and has issues [sic] checks over his signature.

4. An almost universal comment by staff members, program participants and others is the accusation by the Executive Director that individuals have "middle class values and to [sic] not understand the needs of low income people." In several
specific cases of which the Evaluation Committee has direct knowledge, the accusation was directed towards people who were critical of [the Executive Director] and did not support his philosophy.

5. In spite of considerable amount of staff time and committee effort and board approval for a recently updated personnel manual, the Executive Director has not pursued the written personnel evaluations as called for in the manual. [...] recently appointed Head Start Director has complained to the evaluation committee that no written evaluations have been done on him as called for during the six months probationary period. However, he is beset by rumors of alleged dissatisfaction with his performance.
APPENDIX B
June 15, 1975

[...] 
CAP Board Chairman 
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. 
Tarkio, Montana 59872 

Dear ...:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we will suspend Grant Numbers 6057, 8181 and 3749 awarded to the Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., Board of Directors for purposes of operating a Head Start program. The grants mentioned above are suspended as of 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973 for 10 days. This proposal is based on the following circumstances:

1. $2,246 was paid to Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. by the State of Montana to pay for day care services provided by the Head Start program for children of mothers in the WIN program. These monies were diverted from their intended use and instead, used to settle an audit exception with the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is documented in your letter of January 9, 1973 to ... who was then the Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and in other correspondence.

2. Prior to February, 1973, Head Start facilities were made available to other persons, allegedly members of the American Indian Movement. These individuals made excessive long distance telephone calls costing several hundred dollars. These bills were paid with Head Start funds, although the calls were not made for that purpose. Permitting this use of the facility was gross mismanagement and paying the telephone bill with Head Start monies is a misuse of funds. Additionally, while these individuals were permitted access to Head Start facilities, cluster classes were interrupted, supplies were taken, mail destroyed, facilities damaged, and individuals remained in the facility for unauthorized and illegal purposes. The Executive Director did not take corrective actions.

3. On June 5, 1973, you suspended ..., the Head Start Director. This action was not approved by the Policy Council and, therefore, was a violation of regulations.
4. There have been numerous complaints made to this office with respect to the management of the program. The substance of this evidence is that the program is operated in such a way as to divide the community. That program is designed to serve and prevent the management of a quality Head Start program.

Based on the above, we have concluded that there is a serious risk of loss of project funds or property and, therefore, the grants mentioned in this letter are suspended effective 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973 for 10 days. You are forbidden from making any new expenditures or incurring any new obligations in connection with any part of the affected programs, except if you request and receive specific approval from this office.

You have a right to request an opportunity to show cause why the suspension should be rescinded. You may submit written material or request an informal meeting with a responsible official. Such a request should be directed to ..., Regional Program Director for the Office of Child Development.

In the event you request an opportunity to show cause why the suspension should be rescinded, the suspension will remain in effect until the decision is made and in any event may be extended under certain other circumstances.

You may discuss this matter with ... in the Office of Child Development should you desire more information.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ ...

..., Regional Director

cc:
CAP Director
Head Start Director
PC Chairman
RAAUIJAZ RUWLRDJØØØ4 179144Ø-UUU--RUWLSDG.

HWCS

FM .... REGIONAL DIRECTOR DHEW RD DENVER CO
TO RUWLSDG/6/[HEAD START DIRECTOR]
TO RUWLSDG/6/[POLICY COUNCIL CHAIRMAN]
TO RUWLSDG/6/[MMHR (old) BOARD CHAIRWOMAN]
TO RUWLSDG/6/[EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MMHR INC.]
TO RUWLSDG/6/ ... HEAD START TRAINING OFFICER
TO RUWLSDG/6/[MMHR (new) BOARD CHAIRWOMAN]

BT

THIS IS IN FURTHER REFERENCE TO OUR LETTER OF JUNE 15, 1973, SUSPENDING, AS OF JUNE 19, 1973, GRANTS NUMBERED H-6Ø57, H-8141 AND H-3749, PREVIOUSLY AWARDED TO THE MISSOULA MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION OF THOSE GRANTS BY THE MISSOULA MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC., HAS SINCE COME TO THE ATTENTION OF THIS DEPARTMENT AND IT IS NOW PROPOSED TO TERMINATE THESE GRANTS AND ALL RIGHTS TO EXPEND ANY FUNDS THEREFROM, EFFECTIVE AT 5:00 P.M. ON JULY 31, 1973, FOR CONTINUED FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL STANDARDS, GUIDELINES, INSTRUCTIONS AND CONDITIONS, WHICH FAILURES HAVE RESULTED IN SERIOUS MALADMINISTRATION OF THE HEAD START PROGRAM. IN PARTICULAR, THOSE CHARGED WITH ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAMS ON BEHALF [sic] OF MISSOULA
MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC., HAVE FAILED TO LIVE UP TO AND COMPLY WITH FEDERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS, AS FOLLOWS:

1. THE HEAD START MANUAL 6108-1 REGULATION ON FAMILY INCOME ELIGIBILITY SPECIFIES THAT AT LEAST NINETY PERCENT OF THE CHILDREN TO BE ENROLLED IN EACH CLASS MUST COME FROM FAMILIES RECEIVING A LIMITED GROSS INCOME. THE INTAKE RECORDS OF MISSOULA MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC., SHOW THAT DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN WERE MADE ON THE BASIS OF ADJUSTED FAMILY INCOMES, RESULTING IN ENROLLMENT OF A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN HEAD START CLASSES IN EXCESS OF TEN PERCENT FROM FAMILIES ABOVE THE POVERTY GUIDELINES.

ALSO, OF SIXTEEN CHILDREN IN THE CLASS RECRUITED IN SUPERIOR FOR THE YEAR 1972-1973, ONLY NINE MET THE INCOME GUIDELINES ON THE BASIS OF GROSS INCOME. SEVEN CHILDREN WERE FROM OVER-INCOME FAMILIES. VARIOUS IMPROPER DEDUCTIONS WERE MADE FROM THE GROSS INCOME OF FAMILIES IN ORDER TO CLAIM THAT THESE CHILDREN WERE WITHIN GUIDELINES. UNDER THE GUIDELINES ONLY ONE OVER-INCOME CHILD COULD BE INCLUDED IN THAT CLASS.

THIS OFFICE SOUGHT TO REVIEW OTHER RECORDS OF YOUR AGENCY AND, ON JUNE 26, 1973, ..., A DULY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, PRESENTED HIMSELF AT THE OFFICE OF MMHR IN MISSOULA, MONTANA, AND ASKED FOR ACCESS TO INTAKE RECORDS. ..., ACTING FOR AND UNDER INSTRUCTIONS OF ..., REFUSED HIM ACCESS TO THE INTAKE RECORDS. AS YOU KNOW, FAILURE TO MAKE HEAD START RECORDS AVAILABLE TO A PROPER REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DEPARTMENT IS A VIOLATION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

THE PRACTICE OF DISREGARDING OR ALTERING THE GROSS INCOME OF FAMILIES TO BRING ABOUT THE ALLEGED "ELIGIBILITY" OF CHILDREN TO ATTEND CLASSES WAS SANCTIONED BY ..., FORMER HEAD START DIRECTOR, IN INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF IN SUPERIOR AND ALBERTON PRIOR TO RECRUITING FOR THE 1972 CLASS. THIS PRACTICE WAS ALSO SANCTIONED BY ..., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MMHR, AT A MEETING IN ALBERTON, MONTANA, ON JANUARY 31, 1973. [THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR] SUGGESTED, FOR INSTANCE, THAT IT WAS
PERMISSIBLE FOR TEN PERCENT OF THE CHILDREN IN THE PROGRAM TO BE OVER-INCOME WHEN, AS PREVIOUSLY

MENTIONED, THE REGULATION READS ONLY THAT TEN PERCENT OF THE CHILDREN IN EACH CLASS CAN BE OVER-INCOME. ALSO AT THAT MEETING, [THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR]

STATED THAT HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE GUIDELINE REFERRED TO GROSS INCOME BUT THAT THE PROGRAM HAD BEEN USING NET INCOME AND HE WENT ON TO SANCTION THIS PRACTICE TO THOSE PRESENT.

IT WAS WELL KNOWN AMONG RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUALS IN THE PROGRAM THAT AN EXCESS OF OVER-INCOME CHILDREN WERE IN THE PROGRAM AND NO EFFECTIVE CORRECTIVE ACTION WAS INSISTED UPON BY [THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR] OR ANY RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS OF YOUR AGENCY.

2. THE AGENCY HAS CONTINUALLY FAILED TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL AUDIT INSTRUCTIONS, SPECIFICALLY SECTION 243 OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY INSTRUCTION 6801-1 4B(1), AND OUR GENERAL LETTER OF FEBRUARY 15, 1973 TO COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES. SECTION 243 STATES THAT A GRANTEE MUST PROCURE AN ANNUAL AUDIT OF ITS FISCAL RECORDS AND MUST EXERCISE SUCH ADDITIONAL FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND COMPLY WITH SUCH OTHER ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS AS THE HEAD START DIRECTOR MAY ESTABLISH. OUR EARLIEST INSTRUCTION REQUIRED THAT AUDITS BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED.

3. THE AGENCY USED FUNDS DERIVED FROM THE STATE PROGRAMS FOR AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN TO PAY INTEREST ON A COMMERCIAL LOAN. THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY REPORTS, IN ITS AUDIT NUMBER 8-73-111, DATED MAY 23, 1973, THAT

"...DUE TO POOR MANAGEMENT, THE CAA HAD NOT RECEIVED FUNDS FROM OEO AND THE DIRECTOR OF MISSOULA MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC. WAS FORCED TO BORROW MONEY AND PAID $400 INTEREST ... THE $400 INTEREST WAS NOT CHARGED TO OEO BUT WAS PAID FROM STATE ADC FUNDS FOR WIN (HEAD START) PROGRAM."

THIS WAS IN DISREGARD OF OEO INSTRUCTION 6806-03, ACCOUNTING FOR PROGRAM INCOME, WHICH REQUIRES THAT "ANY INCOME RECEIVED FROM FEES MUST BE USED TO REDUCE THE TOTAL COST OF THE
COMPONENT PROJECT."

OUR EMPHASIS, AND SEE ALSO OEO INSTRUCTION 683-2, ALLOWABILITY OF COSTS INCURRED TO BORROW FUNDS. THUS, THE FUNDS USED TO PAY COMMERCIAL INTEREST ON BORROWED MONIES WERE INDIRECTLY CHARGED TO THE HEAD START PROGRAM THROUGH IMPROPER DIVERSION OF WIN/ADC FUNDS.


"... A PROPOSAL CAN NOT BE ADOPTED OR PROPOSED ACTION TAKEN UNTIL AGREEMENT IS REACHED BETWEEN DISAGREETING GROUPS (E.G., POLICY COUNCIL AND BOARD OR INDIVIDUALS)."

NO SUCH AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BETWEEN THE COUNCIL AND BOARD AND, THEREFORE, THE DISSOLUTION WAS IN VIOLATION OF THIS INSTRUCTION.

5. THERE HAVE BEEN IRREGULAR PERSONNEL ACTIONS PURPORTEDLY EFFECTUATED BY THE AGENCY MANAGEMENT IN VIOLATION OF FEDERALLY-REQUIRED PROCEDURES:

A. ON JUNE 13, 1973, A LETTER SIGNED BY ..., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF MISSOULA MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC., WAS SENT TO ...., HEAD START DIRECTOR, INFORMING HIM THAT HE WAS
REMOVED AS HEAD START DIRECTOR. THIS ACTION DID NOT HAVE THE CONCURRENCE OF THE POLICY COUNCIL. REFER TO OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT NOTICE 70.2, INSTRUCTION 1-30, SECTION 2B, FOR SPECIFIC POLICY ON REMOVAL OF A HEAD START DIRECTOR. THE ACTION APPARENTLY HAS BEEN REPUDIATED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

B. .... HAS BEEN APPOINTED ACTING POLICY COUNCIL CHAIRMAN, ALTHOUGH WITHOUT POLICY COUNCIL CONCURRENCE.

6. THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL INSTANCES OF MISUSE OF FUNDS.

A. ON JUNE 11, 1973, ...., EDUCATION COORDINATOR, WAS ISSUED A CHECK IN THE AMOUNT OF $5.00, SIGNED BY [THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR], DRAWN AGAINST HEW--PUBLIC SERVICE CAREER FUNDS. .... WAS NOT A PUBLIC SERVICE CAREER ENROLLER AND FUNDS FROM THIS ACCOUNT WERE NOT PAYABLE TO HER.

B. SOMETIME AFTER APRIL 6, 1973, A VOUCHER WAS APPROVED FOR [THE FORMER POLICY COUNCIL CHAIRWOMAN] FOR BABYSITTING EXPENSES FOR A DAY CARE MEETING HELD ON MARCH 13, 1973. THE VOUCHER CLAIMED BABYSITTING EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD OF 5:30 P.M. TO 11:30 P.M. THE MEETING IS KNOWN TO HAVE LASTED FROM 5:30 P.M. TO APPROXIMATELY 9:30 P.M., WHEN IT ADJOURNED. THEREFORE A PORTION OF THIS VOUCHER CONSTITUTED A FALSE CLAIM.

C. PRIOR TO APRIL 4, 1973, [THE WIFE OF THE POLICY COUNCIL DELEGATE FROM CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR] WAS ASKED BY ..., A TEACHER, TO SUBSTITUTE AS A TEACHERS AID IN A HEAD START CLASSROOM. SHE DID SO, EXPECTING TO BE REIMBURSED. SOMETIME LATER, ..., MMHR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INFORMED HER

7. DURING THE MONTHS OF FEBRUARY, MARCH AND APRIL 1973, HEAD START FACILITIES AT 508 TOOLE WERE MADE AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS. THERE HAS BEEN EVIDENCE THAT INDIVIDUALS HAD SPENT THE NIGHT IN THE CENTER AND CONSUMED FOOD WHICH BELONGED TO THE HEAD START PROGRAM. PROPERTY HAS BEEN DAMAGED OR LOST, MAIL DESTROYED AND THE CENTER LEFT IN UNHEALTHY AND INSANITARY DISORDER. ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THE CENTER HAD TO BE CLEANED BY THE TEACHERS BEFORE CLASSES COULD BEGIN.
TELEPHONE WAS USED FOR NON-HEAD START PURPOSES AND THE HEAD START PROGRAM BILLED. THESE INCIDENTS WERE REPORTED TO ..., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF MMHR SEVERAL TIMES. WITH ONE KNOWN EXCEPTION, NO DIRECT AND TIMELY ACTION WAS TAKEN TO REMOVE UNAUTHORIZED AND DISORDERLY INDIVIDUALS, OR PREVENT OTHER ABUSE OF PROPERTY.

8. CONTROVERSY IN THE COMMUNITY: THE HEAD START PROGRAM HAS BEEN OPERATED IN SUCH A WAY THAT HEAD START STAFF AND PARENTS HAVE LOST CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY OF THE MMHR TO ADMINISTER THE PROGRAM. THIS HAS RESULTED IN THE POLICY COUNCIL REQUEST OF JUNE 12, 1973, TO ..., DHEW REGIONAL DIRECTOR, THAT THE HEAD START GRANT NO LONGER BE ADMINISTERED BY THE MMHR. FURTHERMORE, IT HAS RESULTED IN 12 OF 23 TEACHERS SIGNING A PETITION DECLARING THEY WOULD RESIGN IF MMHR WERE TO BE RETAINED AS THE SPONSOR. FINALLY, NUMEROUS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES HAVE APPEARED, CLEARLY INDICATING THE EXISTENCE OF OPPOSED COMMUNITY GROUPS AND DIVIDED COMMUNITY OPINION RESULTING FROM THE FISCAL AND PERSONNEL MALADMINISTRATION DISCUSSED HEREINBEFORE.

THE FOREGOING ACTIONS ARE TAKEN UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 604 AND 602(N) OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, 42 USC 2944, 42 USC 2942(N); AND DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITIES TO SECRETARY OF HEALTH, ED. & WELFARE, 34 FR 11398. THIS LETTER SUPERCEDES OUR LETTER OF JUNE 15, 1973. BECAUSE OF THIS PROPOSAL TO TERMINATE ALL GRANTS TO YOUR AGENCY, THEY CONTINUE
TO BE SUSPENDED AND THE BALANCES OF FUNDS THEREIN MAY BE USED FOR NO PURPOSE UNLESS FIRST SPECIFICALLY APPROVED BY THIS OFFICE. SINCE OUR LETTER OF JUNE 15, 1973, HAS BEEN SUPERCEDED, NO INFORMAL MEETING WILL BE HELD ON THE MATTERS DISCUSSED IN THAT LETTER.

YOU MAY REQUEST A HEARING, IN WRITING, WITHIN TEN DAYS AFTER RECEIVING THIS LETTER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE TERMINATION SHOULD NOT OCCUR.

YOU ALSO MAY REQUEST AN INFORMAL MEETING TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS SUSPENSION OF PROGRAMS SHOULD BE RESCINDED UNTIL TERMINATION PROPOSAL PROCEEDINGS ARE CONCLUDED.

ALL HEAD START PROPERTY AND RECORDS ARE TO BE PACKED AND STORED. MONIES IN PROGRAM ACCOUNT 22 MAY BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE. PLEASE INFORM US WHEN THIS HAS BEEN DONE AND OF THE LOCATION OF THE STORED PROPERTY.

WE ARE AVAILABLE TO DISCUSS THIS PROPOSAL WITH YOU AT YOUR REQUEST.

BT
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FM .... REGIONAL DIRECTOR HEW OHD OCD DENVER CO
TO RUWLSDG/6/ [HEAD START DIRECTOR]
TO RUWLSDG/6/ [POLICY COUNCIL CHAIRMAN]
TO RUWLSDG/6/ [MMHR (old) BOARD CHAIRWOMAN]
TO RUWLSDG/6/ [EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MMHR]
TO RUWLSDG/6/ .... HEAD START TRAINING OFFICER
TO RUWLSDG/6/ [MMHR (new) BOARD CHAIRWOMAN]

BT

THIS IS IN FURTHER REFERENCE TO MY TWX OF JUNE 28, 1973. GRANT NO. OCD-CB-433 WAS INADVERTENTLY OMITTED FROM THAT LIST. WE PROPOSE TO TERMINATE THAT GRANT ALSO FOR REASONS CITED IN OUR TWX. GRANT IS CURRENTLY SUSPENDED PENDING OUTCOME OF TERMINATION PROCEDURES.

BT

NNNN
TENTATIVE AGREEMENT TO BECOME PERMANENT AGREEMENT
UPON RATIFICATION BY PARTIES
BETWEEN MMHR BOARD OF DIRECTORS, INC.
AND
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

This tentative agreement is entered into between the
Regional Office of the United States Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare and its Office of Child Development,
Region VIII and Missoula Mineral Human Resources, Inc.,
508 Toole Avenue, Missoula, Montana, the grantee for grants
numbered H6057, H8141, H3749 and OCD-CB-433.

[The Regional Program Director of OCD] is the signator
for the Office of Child Development. [The Acting Deputy
Director of MMHR] was given verbal authority to sign this
Tentative Agreement by [Board Chairwoman, MMHR] at the negoti­
tations held on July 12, 1973, and [the Acting Deputy Director's]
signature to this Agreement indicates that it has been read to
her on the telephone and verbally and tentatively approved by
her. This Agreement represents the intentions of the parties
and will be fully effective only following ratification by the
Board of Directors of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc.
and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the
reasonable expectation is that the Board of Directors will
make a determination no later than July 20, 1973, and that
..., Regional Program Director, Office of Child Development,
will be notified of the determination of the Board of
Directors by telephone in the late afternoon of July 20, 1973,
to be followed by a letter to him no later than July 23, 1973.
1. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region VIII agrees to rescind the suspension imposed on June 19, 1973, and to rescind the continuation of it on June 29, 1973, of Head Start Grants Nos. H6057, H8141, H3749 and Nutrition Grant No. CB-433, under the following conditions:

and

2. MMRH agrees to relinquish any right or claim of right to receive Head Start grants after November 30, 1973; provided, that a prime grantee is designated and a smooth transition from the current grantee to the new prime grantee can be guaranteed. By mutual agreement between the parties, extension of the operation of Head Start and Day Care programs by the current grantee shall be permitted, if necessary.

3. Following consultation with HEW concerning procedures for soliciting a new grantee, MMRH will solicit a new grantee for the Head Start program in Missoula and Mineral Counties. MMRH may comment to HEW on any proposed selection of a new grantee. MMRH will not interfere with the rights of any group to apply for selection as a grantee and agrees that such selection is the sole responsibility of HEW in consultation with MMRH. Search for a new grantee shall begin by August 3, 1973; and

4. No less than 90 percent of the children in each Head Start class will be from low-income families as those terms are defined in the Head Start Fee Schedule Issuance. Recruitment will be done in accordance with Part B of the HS Manual.
6108-1. Gross income, with allowable deductions only as stipulated in the Fee Schedule issuance, will be used to determine eligibility of families and children; and

5. For the period of operation of Head Start grants by MMHR, the HEW Regional Office reserves the right to review the eligibility of children recruited for classes prior to their final enrollment. No final commitment on enrollment may be made by MMHR until the Regional Office has conducted its review and such review is to be completed on or before September 1, 1973;

6. MMHR will do everything in its power to operate efficiently and without dissention among its personnel, board, and Policy Council in the period prior to October 31, 1973. Applicable OEO and HEW regulations and the By-Laws of the MMHR Board and of the Policy Council will be scrupulously followed. Disagreements will be eliminated or minimized through the agreed-upon MMHR arbitration and grievance procedures. It is understood that HEW will not permit the operation of the Head Start program in an atmosphere of dissension and chaos and, should that reoccur, reserves the right to reinstitute suspension of MMHR; and

7. The proposal to terminate MMHR as a Head Start grantee is withdrawn by HEW upon ratification of this agreement; and

8. The Policy Council chaired by [the current chairman] is recognized by the parties hereto as the legally constituted Head Start Policy Council for MMHR until a new Policy Council shall have been legally constituted in accordance with MMHR
and Policy Council By-Laws and OCD Instruction 30; and
9. The Head Start Director may be hired or fired only with
the concurrence of the Head Start Policy Council. Previous
personnel actions taken without requisite Policy Council
concurrence are to be rectified in accordance with appli­
cable law, including restoration to duty with appropriate
back pay, if legally warranted; and
10. A full audit will be made by the firm of ...., or
another firm mutually agreed on, of the Head Start grant from
November 30, 1971, to the present; and
11. MMHR, Inc. will pay all legitimate claims for proper
program operations from June 19, 1973, at 8:00 A.M. through
date of ratification of this Agreement by the parties; and
by no later than July 31, 1973 provide the Department with
documentation of claims paid and justification for paying
them; and
12. No funds coming to MMHR for the Head Start program will
be used for any other purposes.
13. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare and
its Office of Child Development, Region VIII, recognize
that certain Board of Directors of MMHR, Inc. which began
service for one year, more or less, on May 18, 1973, as
the duly constituted and elected Board of Directors of
MMHR, Inc.; and
14. It is agreed that special support will be given to
neighborhood Head Start classes where Indian children are
a significant portion of the population to be served; and
15. HEW agrees to provide to the extent of its available resources, technical assistance to MMHR and to any prospective prime grantee, to insure smooth transition for the operation of a quality Head Start program; and

16. All grants are to commence normal operations on the date of ratification of this Agreement. Ratification of this Agreement shall occur upon ratification by MMHR and notice thereof to HEW from MMHR by Certified Mail.

DONE this 13th day of July, 1973.

Regional Program Director
Office of Child Development
Region VIII
Denver, Colorado

Witness by HEW

By ..., President
Missoula-Mineral
Human Resources, Inc.
Board

Witness by MMHR
HEW'S PROPOSAL

AGREEMENT BETWEEN DHEW-REGION VIII AND MMHR

MMHR will relinquish all rights to grants numbered H-6057, H-8141, H-3749 and CB-433 effective August 10, 1973, under the following conditions, to take place on or after that date:

1. Prior to August 20, an ad hoc parent advisory group will be formed, composed of representatives of parents of children recruited for the class originally scheduled to begin by October, 1973. The Regional Office will provide technical assistance to the parents in the establishment of this group.

2. The Regional Office will issue the attached press release once this agreement is signed.

3. The prospective sponsors will be invited to submit a three to five page prospectus to the Regional Office for its consideration in selecting a new sponsor 10 days after the newspaper announcement is made.

4. Prior to a decision on the new grantee, the Regional Director, HEW, and other HEW staff will visit with the ad hoc parent advisory group and receive their advice on the selection of the new grantee. The ad hoc committee will cease to function immediately upon selection of a new Head Start sponsor.

5. The new sponsor must assure a quality program. The new sponsor will keep the commitments made by MMHR to the parents of eligible children recruited for next year's class. The new sponsor will continue the employment of current staff who are performing satisfactorily. No individual has a right to a job which he is not performing satisfactorily.

Therefore the new sponsor will conduct individual performance evaluations after the employees have been on the job for 90 days. Decisions on retention or release will be based on that evaluation. Positions subject to Policy Council concurrence in accordance with the Parent Policy Manual, I-31, will be handled in accordance with that instruction. The new sponsor will maintain a program for 180 children within the current funding level.

6. A new Policy Council will be elected as soon as feasible after HEW/OCD selects a prime grantee. Technical assistance will be provided by the Regional Office immediately to insure that the Policy Council is knowledgeable about its role in the operation and management of the Head Start program.
7. Upon the selection by the Regional Director of a prime sponsor, MMHR agrees not to pursue any contemplated, impending or future litigation concerning the selection of a new grantee on any related matters thereof.

Regional Director
Department of Health, 
Education and Welfare
Region VIII - Denver, 
Colorado

Chairman, Board of Directors
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, 
Inc.
Missoula, Montana
PRESS RELEASE

..., Regional Director of HEW, announced today that the issues between MMHR and the Regional Office of HEW had been resolved to the satisfaction of both parties in the interests of maintaining the Head Start program for the benefit of the children in Missoula and Mineral counties.

According to the agreement reached in Missoula on August 9, 1973, MMHR would relinquish all rights to the Head Start grant, effective August 10, 1973.

An ad hoc parent advisory group will be established with the aid of the HEW Regional Office to advise the Regional Office on the final selection of a new sponsor.

...will personally visit with the Missoula parent group to receive advice prior to making a decision.

The Regional Director invited potential sponsors to make their interests known to him and to submit a three to five page prospectus to the Regional Office by August 20, 1973. They may call...to receive more information. Sponsors must be willing to keep the commitments made to eligible children in next year's class and retain the current Head Start staff to the extent feasible governed by effective management practices. 180 children will have to be served within the current funding levels.
MMHR'S PROPOSAL

AGREEMENT BETWEEN DHEW-REGION VIII AND MMHR

MMHR will relinquish all rights to grants numbered H-6057, H-8141, H-3749 and CB-433 effective August 10, 1973, under the following conditions, to take place on or after that date:

1. Prior to August 20, an ad hoc parent advisory group will be formed, composed of representatives of center parent committees (Superior, Alberton, East Side, West Side, South Side, North Side and Day Care). Parents of children recruited for the class scheduled to begin in October, 1973 will be included in the membership of the Parent Center Committees. The Regional Office will provide technical assistance to the parents in the establishment of this group.

2. The Regional Office will issue the attached press release once this agreement is signed.

3. The prospective sponsors will be invited to submit a three to five page prospectus to the Regional Office for its consideration in selecting a new sponsor 10 days after the newspaper announcement is made.

4. Subsequent to submission of prospecti and prior to a decision on the new grantee, the Regional Director, HEW, and other HEW staff will visit with the ad hoc parent advisory group and receive their advice on the selection of the new grantee. The ad hoc committee will cease to function immediately upon selection of a new Head Start sponsor.

5. The new sponsor must assure a quality program. The new sponsor will keep the commitments made by MMHR to the parents of eligible children recruited for next year's class.

6. The new sponsor will advertise, screen, and select staff according to the following schedule and conditions:

a. Condition #1: All Head Start employees who were low-income when hired by MMHR and subsequently enrolled in Career Development programs will be given preference for re-employment. Career Development program participants are defined as those employees who began their employment at an "aide" or entry level and then progressed through upgrade training on a career ladder.
b. **Condition #2:** All Head Start employees who are not participants in a Career Development program will have the right to apply for re-employment. However, the applications of these employees will be treated on an equal basis with applications from qualified persons who were not employed by MMHR through the Head Start program.

c. **Condition #3:** Personnel actions effectuated in terms of the schedule set forth below shall be handled in accordance with the Parent Policy Manual, I-31. When appropriate and feasible, the new sponsor will attempt to cooperate with representatives of Center Parent committees when selecting staff to work in a particular center.

d. **Schedule for Staffing of New Sponsor:**

   **September 10**—Completion of recruitment, screening, and selection of persons to fill the following positions:
   1. Head Start Director
   2. Education Director
   3. Nutrition Director
   4. Parent Invol. Director
   5. Supportive Services Director

   **September 21**—Completion of recruitment, screening, and selection of persons to fill the following positions:
   1. Health Educator  
   2. Admin. Assistant  
   3. Teachers  
   4. Fiscal Officer  
   5. Training Specialist

   **September 28**—Completion of recruitment, screening, and selection of the persons to fill following positions:
   1. Teacher Aides  
   2. Parent Involv. Specialist  
   3. Bus Drivers  
   4. Janitors  
   5. Cooks  
   6. Nutrition Aides

7. A new Policy Council will be elected within 10 days of the selection of a new prime sponsor by HEW/OCD. Technical assistance will be provided by the Regional Office immediately to insure that the Policy Council is knowledgeable about its role in the operation and management of the Head Start program. For the immediate future, the composition of the Policy Council shall conform to the proposal submitted and adopted by the MMHR Board of Directors on July 20, 1973.
8. Upon the selection by the Regional Director of a prime sponsor MMHR agrees to dismiss Civil Action Number 2320, Montana United States District Court, Missoula Division.

9. Despite any suspension of the said grants, MMHR is authorized to pay all bills contracted for operations of those grants prior to the designation of the new prime sponsor. This is to be done in the interests of maintaining the Head Start program for the benefit of the children in Missoula and Mineral Counties, Montana.

Regional Director
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Region VIII - Denver, Colorado

President, Board of Directors
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc.
Missoula, Montana
PRESS RELEASE

"... President of MMHR Board of Directors and ..., Regional Director of HEW, announced today that the issues between MMHR and the Regional Office of HEW had been resolved to the satisfaction of both parties in the interests of maintaining the Head Start program for the benefit of the children in Missoula and Mineral counties.

According to the agreement reached in Missoula on August 9, 1973, MMHR will relinquish all rights as presumptive sponsor of the Head Start grant, effective upon the selection of a new prime sponsor.

An ad hoc parent advisory group will be established with the aid of the HEW Regional Office to advise the Regional Office on the final selection of a new prime sponsor.

... will personally visit with the Missoula parent group to receive advice prior to making a decision.

The Regional Director invited potential sponsors to make their interests known to him and to submit a three to five page prospectus to the Regional Office by August 20, 1973. They may call ... to receive more information. Sponsors must be willing to keep the commitments made to eligible children in next year's class and retain current Head Start staff to the extent feasible governed by effective Head Start management practices. 180 children will have to be served within the current funding levels.
MISSOULA-MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.
508 Toole Avenue
Missoula, Montana

August 24, 1973

RESOLUTION BY MISSOULA-MINERAL HUMAN RESOURCES, INC. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

... moved to resolve that the agreement by ..., August 21, 1973, be adopted by the Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. Board of Directors, and that the signature of ..., President of the Board, be indicative of the resolution of the Board of Directors of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. Seconded by ....

I, ..., President, Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., Board of Directors, hereby certify that Board of Directors of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., at a special meeting following sufficient written notice of that meeting to all Board members, did meet on August 24, 1973, at 3:00 p.m. at 508 Toole Avenue, being the offices of Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., established a quorum of 18 members of the Board of Directors present, and that the majority of that quorum by roll call vote did adopt the agreement, and by unanimous voice vote of that quorum did adopt the above resolution.

... President
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. Board of Directors

WITNESSED BY:
... Secretary
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Members Constituting Quorum and Vote Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairman, Board of Directors
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc.
508 Toole
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear ....:

My staff has reported to me on the results of the prehearing conference held with Judge ... on August 17. I was pleased to hear that we are close to an Agreement that will best serve the needs of children in Missoula and Mineral Counties. That is certainly a better solution than a long hearing which might have the result of further inflaming the community and jeopardizing the eventual success of the Head Start program with which we are both concerned.

In regard to the draft Agreement which was prepared with the help of ...., your counsel, and ..., Secretary of the MMHR Board, I can support all the points therein except one. I appreciate the Board's desire for the information referred to in paragraph two so that a self-correction process can be entered into, where appropriate, to serve the best interests of MMHR. We can send you our supporting documentation on most of the issues which would include those you would be most concerned with from a program management basis. In some cases, however, I am concerned that raw information would be disclosed which might only cause further dissention and imperil the effective delivery of Head Start services to children.

For that reason, I have asked that paragraph two of the Agreement be rewritten so that a summary of the evidence would be given in those cases. I have requested that this summary be drawn up by our Regional Attorney to insure that the information contained therein will be as concise, pertinent and useful as possible.

I have signed the Agreement, in duplicate, and enclosed it. I trust that the Board will take similar action by an appropriate resolution, so that we can act for the best interests of the children in Missoula and Mineral Counties.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ ....

Regional Director
THIS AGREEMENT is entered into on this _____ day of August 1973 by and between the Regional Office of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), Region VIII, and Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc., 508 Toole Avenue, Missoula, Montana (MMHR), the grantee for HEW grants numbered H6057, H8141, H3749 and OCD-CB-433.

This Agreement represents the intentions of the parties and will be fully effective only by the adoption of a resolution by the Board of Directors, MMHR, on or before August 29, 1973, ratifying it and delivering a certified copy of the resolution to..., Regional Director, Region VIII, HEW, and when ... executes the Agreement and delivers copy thereof to ..., Chairman, Board of Directors, MMHR.

WITNESSETH:

1. The suspension of the aforementioned grants by HEW on June 19, 1973, and continued indefinitely by HEW on June 29, 1973, is hereby rescinded as of 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973. MMHR will pay all legitimate claims for program operations, as described in the aforementioned grants, from 8:00 a.m., June 19, 1973, through August 31, 1973, from grant funds provided or to be provided by HEW and will document all such payments by August 31, 1973, subject to audit. Upon termination of the aforementioned grants on August 31, 1973, MMHR will surrender all books, papers and accounts pertaining to the grants ..., or any other accounting firm mutually agreed upon by MMHR and HEW, for audit and payment of any lawful unpaid program obligations incurred by MMHR.

2. HEW will provide MMHR with documentation, or in some instances a summary thereof, substantiating the allegations against MMHR contained in the letter of ..., Acting Director, Office of
Child Development, HEW, dated August 7, 1973, mailing them to ... counsel for MMHR, or to ... Chairman, Board of Directors, MMHR, 508 Toole Avenue, Missoula, Montana, 59801, no later than August 27, 1973. This information will be held in strictest confidence by MMHR and its counsel.

3. MMHR agrees to relinquish any right or claim of right to receive the above numbered grants from HEW after August 31, 1973, whether any of the above-numbered grants have expired or not.


5. HEW will promptly form an ad hoc parent committee composed of two representatives from each target area, one such area being located in each of Superior, Alberton, Eastside, Westside, Southside, Northside, and including Day Care participants. One of the representatives from each of the aforementioned target areas must have had a child enrolled in the Head Start program in school year 1972-73, and the other representatives from each of the aforementioned target areas shall be scheduled to have a child enrolled in the Head Start program for the school year 1973-74. The Regional Office, HEW, Region VIII, will provide technical assistance to the parents in the establishment of the ad hoc parent committee.
6. HEW will exert itself to protect and encourage the cultural integrity of Indian children.

7. HEW and MMHR will endeavor to provide means by which the full Day Care component of the above-mentioned grants will operate continuously through at least November 30, 1973.

8. HEW will invite prospective grantees to submit three to five-page preliminary applications to the Regional Office for consideration to be awarded the unexpired portions of the above-numbered grants which are terminated on August 31, 1973, with respect to MMHR by the provisions of this Agreement. Prior to the decision on the new grantee(s) and subsequent to the submission of preliminary applications, the Regional Director, HEW, will personally visit the ad hoc parent committee and receive its advice on the selection of the new grantee(s). The ad hoc parent committee will cease to function immediately upon the selection of a new grantee(s) by HEW. MMHR will not interfere with the right of any group to apply for selection as a grantee and agrees that such selection is the sole responsibility of HEW in consultation with MMHR. Search for a new grantee(s) shall begin immediately.

9. HEW will require the new grantee(s) to assure a quality program. HEW will endeavor to have the new grantee(s) keep the commitments made by MMHR to the parents of eligible children recruited for next year's classes.

10. HEW will endeavor to ensure that the new grantee(s) will advertise the Head Start Director(s') position(s) and
hire a director(s) from among those who apply.

11. HEW will endeavor to ensure that the new grantee(s) will continue the employment of current Head Start staff who are performing satisfactorily as limited in paragraph 10 above.

12. The HEW Regional Office will issue the attached press release upon ratification of this agreement by the parties.

13. HEW, Region VIII, has full authority for HEW to enter into this Agreement and does enter it upon the signature of ..., Regional Director, Region VIII, HEW, who is its agent with full authority to enter into this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands on the day and year first above written.

s/s ....
Regional Director
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Region VIII
Denver, Colorado

... Chairman, Board of Directors
Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc.
Missoula, Montana

Witness .... Witness
PRESS RELEASE

..., Chairman, Board of Directors, Missoula-Mineral Human Resources, Inc. (MMHR) and ..., Regional Director, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), announced today that the issues between MMHR and the Regional Office of HEW had been resolved to the satisfaction of both parties in the interest of maintaining the part and full day-care Head Start program for the benefit of the children in Missoula and Mineral Counties.

According to the agreement reached on August ____ 1973, MMHR will relinquish all rights as the Head Start grantee.

An ad hoc parent advisory group will be established with the aid of the HEW Regional Office to advise the Regional Office on the final selection of a new prime grantee.

... will personally visit the Missoula parent group to receive advice prior to making a decision.

The Regional Director invites all interested applicants to make their interest known to him and to submit a three to five-page preliminary application to the Regional Office, HEW, 11037 Federal Building, Denver, Colorado, 80202. Further information can be obtained by writing to the Regional Office or by calling the Regional Office at 303-837-3107.