

ape/Norman

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N T E R V I E W

O F

RALPH FLYNT

B Y

MRS. JAN SOFOKIDIS

- - -

Washington, D.C.

July 23, 1968

THIS TRANSCRIPT
TRANSCRIBED FROM TAPE.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Mr. Flynt, you came to the Office
3 of Education in 1934. Would you please describe what the
4 Office was like in those days, what its principal missions
5 and responsibilities were, and then bring us through the
6 years with the various changes in the organization and your
7 various duties, up to perhaps the present time.

8 MR. FLYNT: I have served in the Office for more
9 than one-third of its total life. I joined the Office of Ed-
10 ucation in 1934, as inspired by the early years of the Roose-
11 velt program. I'd like to describe myself as Secretary Cohen
12 often does, as the residual element of the Roosevelt youths
13 still left over.

14 I came to the Office by appointment by Dr. George
15 L. Zuck to stay six months, and I have been here more than 34
16 years. I don't think I would have traded this experience for
17 a university life, which was my original plan. I expected to
18 be a research historian. Well, I've had a great many experi-
19 ences that I could have equalled. I've never regretted turning
20 away from university life.

21 Perhaps the best thing I could do is to define the
22 Office of Education and its history into certain phases.

23 You will perhaps recall, by reading the original Act
24 which has been on my wall and signed by President Andrew
25 Johnson and introduced into Congress by a future President --

1 a martyred future President, John F. Kennedy.

2 Office was established originally as a statistical Bureau,
3 and we can say that in its first 35 years it essentially
4 performed this function:

5 In the late '90's and early 1900's it began to under-
6 take professional studies, first in the areas of higher educa-
7 tion and internal education, and after World War I, in various
8 other areas.

9 The second responsibility assumed by the Office
10 indeed was the function of distributing the Land Grant college
11 funds to our institutions, and the third function assumed by
12 it was that of making studies in international education.

13 The first amendment to the Act of the Office of Edu-
14 cation was passed by the Congress in 1896 to enable it to
15 study international education and thus introduced it into the
16 field of comparative education.

17 I should say that this phase ended in the early
18 '30's, essentially with the beginning of the New Deal, when
19 the two things happened: One, the National Vocational Edu-
20 cational Programs were brought by law into the Office of
21 Education, and two, the action programs for the New Deal re-
22 posed certain responsibilities on the Office of Education.
23 But in the early 1930's the Office directed the educational
24 program of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the literacy re-
25 movel program of the WPA, and a number of other action programs

1 of the time.

2 World War II brought the Office enormous responsibil-
3 ities. Its program reached then approximately a billion
4 dollars a year. There was concern with vocational training
5 for industrial workers, training for agricultural workers,
6 loans to advanced students in science and medicine, and a
7 variety of other wartime programs which turned the Office from
8 its ancient statistical research and studies program to action.

9 The close of World War II, of course, the Office
10 receded, but it never really went back to its original mission.
11 The late '40's and early '50's were a period of preparation
12 for future action programs.

13 For example, in 1952 we sent up to the Congress a
14 proposal for a national scholarship program, but it was not
15 enacted. It gave evidence of things to come.

16 The educational community was prepared to accept the
17 fact that the Federal Government was in education to stay,
18 and that a good many of the larger enterprises were going to
19 have to be financed by the Federal Government.

20 During the '50's you will recall -- in fact, during
21 the Eisenhower Administration -- there were many futile efforts
22 to pass a general Federal aid bill. They dated, of course,
23 back to the Truman Administration -- the various Taft bills
24 of 1947, 1949, while they did not pass they came very close and
25 and set the tone for future efforts.

1 We went through a period of approximately 15 years
2 of disappointment, frustration, but heavy action in attempting
3 to prepare the Office of Education for its role and the Fed-
4 eral Government for its role as a partner with the States and
5 the higher institutions in bringing American education up to
6 its present level and beyond.

7 It became very clear, I believe, to the American
8 citizens as a whole that the Federal Government's superior
9 taxing power was simply going to have to be brought to bear
10 on this problem. And while we were never able in the late
11 '40's and the decade of the '50's to bring to bear sufficient
12 influence to change this, we were always very close, and
13 finally, in 1958, with the enactment of the National Education
14 Act, we made the first major breakthrough.

15 I therefore like to feel that the second great phase
16 of the Office's activity, ranging, let us say, from 1934 to '58
17 was the period of incipient action, a period of drive, on
18 cut and thrust that ultimately broke through with the NDEA.

19 This seems to me to give a sort of thumbnail of the
20 Office's phase. Then of course one might reminisce endlessly
21 over the personalities, over individual periods. I won't
22 attempt to do so because of lack of time. But certainly the
23 personalities of the Commissioners had a great deal to do with
24 the scholarly approach of the late '90's and early 1900's,
25 of William T. Harris, the famous philosopher and disciple of

1 He, the statesmanship and imagination of the Commissioner
2 of World War I, () P. Claxton. Commissioner John D.
3 Studebaker served for approximately 14 years -- 1934 to '48.
4 He had a great deal to do with capitalizing on these various
5 movements, many of which of course were unsuccessful. But
6 they paved the way for the future, and without them I think
7 we could not of course have won through the types of legis-
8 lation we have in the last ten years.

9 I myself -- I might add a little to the personal
10 record -- spent eight years -- 1934 to '42 -- as Executive
11 of the office concerned with the various New Deal educational
12 programs, especially that of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

13 I served for approximately five years as the
14 executive -- in effect, the executive officer of the Office
15 of Education concerned with budget, fiscal, personnel,
16 statistics, library, and so forth.

17 I then spent many, many years in the Division of
18 Higher Education concerned with the development of higher edu-
19 cation programs, and ultimately became Assistant Commissioner
20 for Legislation. I served about five years -- 1961 -- I
21 became the Bureau Chief for the new Bureau of Research and
22 presided over it for approximately five years.

23 Since 1965 I have served in the Office of Education
24 as Associate Commissioner for Education, and ultimately,
25 beginning this year, as Deputy Assistant Secretary for

1 International Education in the Office of the Secretary.

2 Now, that's a quick thumbnail. Perhaps you might
3 want to question me on some of these you would like to have
4 filled out.

5 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Could you compare the fashion for
6 developing the NDEA legislation within the Office with the
7 development of, for example, the ESFA -- the techniques for
8 developing ideas within the Office, and then building them
9 into programs that are compatible both with OE's role as a
10 partner with the States and the local governments and the
11 higher education community, and politically viable.

12 MR. FLYNT: There were-- Of course, the outcome
13 was essentially no different. The process was somewhat dif-
14 ferent.

15 In the first place, in 1958 we had no large machin-
16 ery for legislative planning and development. I had a single
17 assistant, a research assistant and two secretaries.

18 The planning for the NDEA was done by a joint
19 Committee consisting of professional people drawn from the
20 Office of Education, and staff that was drawn from the office
21 of Secretary Folsom. This Committee, which Assistant Secre-
22 tary Elliot Richardson served, Under Secretary -- the Under
23 Secretary served, first Harold Hunt, Dr. Lloyd Block of
24 the Office of Education, Dr. Homer Ebbige, who was then
25 the Assistant to Secretary Folsom and now the President

1 of the University of Connecticut; Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, now
2 dead. I served as a member of this Committee. This was a
3 committee which was intended to draw from professional life
4 of the various educational associations the ideas that could
5 be put into viable legislative packages.

6 It was a sort of incipient task force. It drew less
7 on outside membership -- virtually none, as a matter of fact,
8 except in the form of liaison -- whereas in later years we
9 were able to form task forces, such as the (Hogdy) Task Force
10 in the early years of the Kennedy Administration which re-
11 sulted in the first efforts to introduce what is now the
12 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which of course was
13 not enacted at that time. And a later secret task force was
14 one which future Secretary Gardner headed, the membership of
15 which was never divulged. Of course, the (Hogdy) Committee
16 was a public committee, and its membership was well known
17 and included of course the future Commissioner, Francis Keppel
18 then the Deal of Harvard.

19 So that the legislative process was somewhat embry-
20 onic in 1958 compared to the very large staff now available
21 for planning and the ultimate use of outside task forces to
22 give guidance and help develop ideas which became viable
23 politically.

24 Nonetheless, the liaison work done by the profes-
25 sional staff of the task force appointed by Secretary Folsom

1 which led to the NDEA was equally as effective in milking
2 ideas from the profession and in bringing some parts of the
3 profession along with us.

4 The first difference, therefore, is that we were not
5 nearly so well organized to do the job.

6 The second is that we had much less sympathy in the
7 academic community, with the various parts of the NDEA than we
8 ultimately did, for example, with the Elementary and Secondary
9 Education Act and with the Higher Education Act, particularly.

10 The several titles of the NDEA had lukewarm support
11 or even hostility. Only two of the titles of the Act origin-
12 ally introduced by Executive request legislation had warm sup-
13 port from the outside. They were Title 5; the title concerned
14 with guidance and counselling had the unqualified support of
15 the educational psychologists and of the American Association
16 of Personnel Guidance Counselling.

17 The student personnel establishment in the univer-
18 sities were warmly supportive of the originally what was pro-
19 posed to be a scholarship program, but which ultimately became
20 a loan program.

21 A good deal of the-- Ultimately, after the bill was
22 proposed in the Congress, vocational forces got behind an
23 amendment to the National Vocational Educational Act which
24 was Title 8 of the NDEA. And this was strongly supported.
25 But this had not been originally request legislation but it

10

1 was accepted by us for obvious political reasons, to gain the
2 strength of this very strong organization.

3 I think it can be understood why the National Edu-
4 cational Association and a number of the other large organiza-
5 tions, such as for example the Association of School Adminis-
6 trators, and the Association of Secondary School Principals
7 were not very warm in their support of the other titles of
8 the NEA, because they had always sought a general Federal aid
9 program, and we were just off of ten years of disappointment
10 coupled with hope for a general aid program, or at least a
11 program supporting school construction would be passed. So
12 I think they felt that what they always criticized as a
13 categorical approach towards Federal support was not in ac-
14 cord with their views.

15 Now, as time went on, however -- another five years --
16 the success of the NEA, its very political ability, its
17 strong supporting funds, convinced leaders of public education
18 sector, particularly, that categorical aid was the only viable
19 approach to large-scale Federal support. And they changed
20 around, so that by 1961, 1962, and 1963 we had much stronger
21 support from the NEA and the School Administrators, the
22 Secondary School Principals, and other elements within the
23 public school establishment.

24 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Then we could go to the reorganization
25 of the Office of Education through the years, as it developed

1 its action programs and its financial aid programs. I believe
2 a major reorganization occurred in 1962?

3 MR. FLYNT: I will be glad to comment on those. How-
4 ever, I might just parenthetically say, I'm not really myself
5 -- although I have spent half of my life as an executive and
6 administrator -- I do not have much of a tendency to emphasize
7 reorganization as having any very decisive effect on the suc-
8 cess or failure of large-scale leadership.

9 I've lived through reorganization of the Office of
10 Education on the average of approximately three and a half
11 years for 35 years, and I don't really set very much store
12 by reorganization. The Office, from the viewpoint of many of
13 its staff, have suffered: reorganizations in 1944, and '45,
14 1951, under Commissioner Earl McGrath, and one in the early
15 '53, '54 or '55 under Commissioner Brownell; in 1962, and a
16 () reorganization plan carried out by a committee from
17 within, chaired by Dr. Homer B. Babbidge, Jr., now President
18 of the University of Connecticut, and the so-called "ink"
19 reorganization.

20 My own concern for reorganization is that an office
21 ought to be constantly under change, and whenever its program
22 changes the organization ought to change. In many ways the
23 most successful of all of these reorganizations was that of
24 1962, which the reorganization of the "ink" committee did
25 not materially change in structure. Now, I'm going to make

1 a distinction between the two in this respect: I-- From a
2 point of view of reorganization the "ink" committee made very
3 slight change from 1962, and that change was not, in my judg-
4 ment, to the good.

5 The real difference between early reorganizations
6 and that of the "ink" committee is that the enormous growth
7 of office programs enabled Commissioner Keppel and Mr. Loomis,
8 assisted by others, to bring in a new and vital body of
9 younger people, into the Office of Education.

10 I personally feel that the growth of office pro-
11 grams, their attractiveness to professional personnel outside,
12 a sense of cut and thrust engendered by Commissioner Keppel,
13 with whom many people may disagree as to methods, but whose
14 total purpose I am very much in sympathy with-- I do not
15 feel that the structural reorganization created by the "ink"
16 recommendations was any particular advance over that of 1962.
17 As a matter of fact, we spent the years since the "ink" com-
18 mittee redoing it and putting it back probably the way it was
19 in 1962.

20 As I said, I've lived through many reorganizations,
21 done from within, done by private organizations from without.
22 I think that the best of them on paper was that of 1962. It
23 set the organization structure into a pattern that effectively
24 fitted its program. I do not set great store by the "ink"
25 committee as an exercise in administrative management. I set

1 much more store by Commissioner Keppel's capacity to change
2 the tone and mode of professional life in the Office of Edu-
3 cation.

4 Now, there will be many staff members who won't al-
5 together agree with that, and many people who have served long--
6 I happen myself to agree very strongly with it. I feel that it
7 enabled us to bring a sense of vitality and growth.

8 Now, this was done at considerable cost and a great
9 deal of wear and tear on the personnel, which in my judgment
10 was wholly unnecessary. And had there been a more philosophic
11 attitude, a more considerate attitude taken towards the human
12 being, some of the losses suffered, some of the wear and tear
13 suffered, might not have been necessary.

14 On the other hand, the move itself was necessary.
15 Perhaps some of my veteran colleagues will not agree with me,
16 and I know that they don't. But I personally feel that it was
17 time to change the character, mode and tone of the Office
18 operations, to give it cut and thrust, to give it life, and
19 you don't do this without some wear and tear. As I said, I
20 regard the wear and tear as excessive. Nevertheless, the
21 thing still had to be done.

22 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Could we go on, then, to what kinds
23 of change do you still think there needs to be in the charac-
24 ter and tone of OE programs or the administration of its
25 programs?

1 MR. FLYNT: The Office has now reached the stage
2 of very rapid growth. 1900-- If I recall, just to give some
3 comparative data -- in 1953 the Office had a budget of about
4 \$66 million.

5 Ten years later, in 1963, it had a budget of approxi-
6 mately \$666 million. These are almost exact figures. Three
7 years later the Office has had a budget of approximately
8 \$4 billion. Obviously we haven't been able to expend \$4 bil-
9 lion, because of certain reductions in impoundment and the
10 effect of the Vietnamese war and cutbacks on expenditure.
11 But this is a more rapid increase than any program outside
12 the military that I have known in normal conditions.

13 For example, the Public Health Service, which
14 achieved a budget-- A senior professional service of very
15 admired colleagues in the Department for more than 30 years
16 going from a small budget of less than a hundred million
17 dollars to four billion. The Office has had to accomplish
18 to accomplish this in less than-- It had to go from \$500 mil-
19 lion dollars to \$4 billion within less than ten years. It
20 has had to go from \$600 million to \$4 billion in something
21 like three years.

22 Now, obviously Congressional pressures have made
23 the two succeeding Commissioners who have presided over the
24 Office much conscious of administrative management.

25 Many of these were huge grant programs, some were

1 on a formula grant basis, some on a project basis. The sheer
2 job of contracting and managing this enormous enterprise has,
3 of course, made management the number one objective.

4 The Office has suffered from this emphasis. I'm not
5 critical of it. I think if I were Commissioner or in charge
6 of it, I would have not done differently. It has, however,
7 left unsolved one problem. The Office is now very short of
8 professional personnel of real distinction in the several
9 disciplines, as compared to the past.

10 We no longer-- We have expert managers. We have
11 people who are very able in terms of running their programs,
12 but we are very short of authorities of national stature,
13 with hard-cover publications to their name. We certainly
14 haven't hired that kind of man in the last three years.

15 So I think the next forward concern of Commissioners
16 or whoever else will be in office and the Secretaries of HEW
17 will be to bring the Office of Education up to the same
18 professional level and status, for example, that the Public
19 Health Service and the National Science Foundation enjoy,
20 which we do not now enjoy.

21 Now, with regard to the Office, it has had a dif-
22 ficult struggle mastering the sheer management problem in-
23 volved.

24 The National Defense Education Act had many quality
25 emphases. Now, the next question I'm raising is, we have

1 perforce, because of the mood and tone of the country, had
2 to emphasize social education legislation which has had heavy
3 social implications. We've become concerned with the ghetto
4 school, the underprivileged, with the handicapped.

5 Compared to the NDEA, the subsequent legislation,
6 excepting some parts of the Higher Education legislation, has
7 had little emphasis on quality, on intellectual quality of
8 education. The Office needs now to turn to perfecting legis-
9 lation, or to drawing up new legislation which returns to some
10 of the emphases -- especially, let's say, Title 2 of the NDEA,
11 Title 4, which stressed intellectual excellence.

12 None of our programs today stress intellectual excel-
13 lence, or even address themselves to the problem. Now, the
14 fact that the Office is a part of the Department of Health,
15 Education, and Welfare of course has made it a part of the
16 welfare orbit insensibly, and the Commission of Education
17 have not been able to withstand this tremendous emphasis.
18 It's been needed. I do not question its utility. I simply
19 feel that the Office in future has to find a way to stress
20 quality.

21 Now the instrumentalist theory of education, looking
22 to the day when education will be used as a means of bringing
23 enrichment to the lives of all citizens is, of course, very
24 laudable. But education has a plural objective in American
25 society. It has always been a social upgrading program, in

1 the last hundred years, since education became universal.
2 Nevertheless, it also needs to have the need to stress quality.

3 Now, obviously the Office of Education isn't the
4 only educational voice in the land. It is, however, the voice
5 of the Federal Government.

6 I suspect that quality at the classroom level, both
7 in schools and colleges, has not particularly suffered by
8 this lack of emphasis of quality by the Office. But if it
9 were to be continued, for example, for a decade, I think it
10 would definitely suffer. Because the enormous amount of
11 Federal grant money requiring programs to be oriented toward
12 the underprivileged, the handicapped, with much less emphasis
13 on the trapping of the elite student and nurturing that
14 student on to great contribution, cannot continue forever
15 without having it affect quality at the local level.

16 With regard to future legislation, my third point
17 as to the future of the Office, the Office's program has
18 been very well rounded out, in my judgment, by the enactment
19 of the Educational Professions Development Act. We now have
20 in place legislation which helps build structures, helps
21 conduct research, helps train teachers, and in many ways
22 supports education.

23 So, the three-legged stool has got its third leg,
24 my feeling has always been, without a massive program to as-
25 sist the States -- it's a training activity -- the Office

1 was short one leg of the three-legged stool. It's now got
2 in place virtually all the legislation it needs. It simply
3 needs to perfect it, to amend some of it, to broaden it and
4 strengthen. But I do not now foresee any large-scale need for
5 further legislation.

6 Now I may say quite categorically, I've never had,
7 although my past responsibilities have caused me to labor
8 strongly for a general Federal aid program, I have never had
9 the sympathy that my esteemed colleagues NEA have had for
10 the so-called general Federal aid, the unrestricted grant-in-
11 aid. I'm rather strongly committed to the pluralistic system
12 of education in the United States, where the essential res-
13 ponsibility is that of the States and local communities.

14 The Federal Government is a contributor, a supporter,
15 and a partner, but I don't really have much stomach for a
16 central government control of education which is implied in
17 some kinds of legislation.

18 On the other hand, I don't have very much stomach
19 for unrestricted grants. I think that the people of the
20 United States who are citizens of the States are also citizens
21 of the United States, and the Congress of the United States is
22 really not the Congress of a foreign government. It's the
23 Congress of the same people who run the local communities.
24 And I believe that if they are going to expect Federal taxa-
25 tion to be used on a large scale, the local communities,

1 States, and the universities have simply got to recognize
2 the Congress of the United States is going to put some
3 restrictions on the use of this money in order to have the
4 assurance that it will be spent for the purpose for which it
5 was appropriated.

6 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: On the evaluation of these programs,
7 concerning the purpose for which it was appropriated, do you
8 have anything to say on the subject of assessment or the
9 Office procedures at the present time for evaluating these
10 programs?

11 MR. FLYNT: I--- Yes. I have something to say. The
12 Congress in some quarters, some of the committees, have been
13 stressed very strongly -- the requirement and the expectation,
14 the programs to be evaluated. I don't really feel that the
15 Congress can expect an internal evaluation of programs to
16 the extent that they laid out. Programs have got to be
17 evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in universities, in
18 States and local communities, and by very complicated public
19 processes. I have no great deal of confidence in internal
20 evaluations of programs. I therefore feel that some external
21 machinery is required to guarantee that these programs work
22 effectively.

23 I don't really think the Office of Education can
24 be judge and jury both.

25 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Next to the point of change in

1 research emphasis over the years, during the time you've
2 headed the Bureau of Research, I believe there were some major
3 changes made in the type of research programs that the Office ---

4 MR. FLYNT: Yes, there were.

5 During my five years as a Bureau chief, I sought
6 to bring about, and believe that I succeeded in bringing
7 about, a major change in Federally supported educational re-
8 search -- in these respects: One, hitherto most educational
9 research has been concerned with statistical enumeration. It
10 had been concerned essentially with whatever research role
11 the educational psychologist could undertake.

12 I sought to do two things: First was to interest
13 the entire academic community in the problems of education.
14 That is, to take education research not out of the hands
15 of educational psychologists, but out of their exclusive
16 control, and to bring the professors of English, of history,
17 of mathematics, of science into the problem, and expect them
18 to take some responsibility. I believe that we succeeded
19 eminently in doing this.

20 Secondly, I sought to institutionalize educational
21 research, bearing always in my mind a model of agriculture.
22 The institutionalization of agricultural research by the
23 Hatch Act of 1886, the establishment of the great research
24 centers, and the experimental farms really made agriculture
25 what it is.

1 I was instrumental in establishing research and
2 development centers, and we looked forward to what ultimately
3 became the regional educational laboratories. We did move
4 educational research out into the entire academic community.
5 We attracted their attention. And in my judgment we began,
6 thirdly, to attack some of the problems on what I would call
7 an action basis.

8 Instead of trying to develop descriptive research
9 or performance, we tried to develop motivational research;
10 we found better methods of ascertaining how learning worked
11 and how teaching could be improved.

12 I believe that in the last eight years, in the three
13 years since I left the Bureau, the same goals have been kept
14 before the Office by my successor. The regional educational
15 laboratories have been put in place. The large-scale program
16 which I envisioned, which was called ERIC, the name of which
17 was my invention -- Educational Research Information Center --
18 the acronym "ERIC" -- has succeeded beyond my fondest ex-
19 pectations, and I believe that we have put in place now
20 the structure for educational research. That is, we have
21 completely changed the approach from purely descriptive and
22 enumerative forms of nose-counting and gotten into something
23 that's going to be meaningful, and will really pay off in
24 improved instruction.

25 The purpose of education is instruction, and if it

1 doesn't do that, I don't know what else professional education
2 is about. And it has always been my view that we had to im-
3 prove knowledge of human growth and development and utilize
4 the knowledge that we could gain of human growth and develop-
5 ment to perfect instructional techniques and methodology.

6 A fourth thing we sought to do, which is moving on
7 apace, was to bring into the orbit of education the new media.
8 Title 7 of the National Defense Education Act was the first
9 cutting edge of this move. Of course, as time has gone on
10 in the last decade, we have not only had radio, which was with
11 us, but television, and the computer. We financed heavily --
12 I myself authorized directly many grants to Professor Skinner
13 and others who were concerned with program learning. In due
14 course this will come to full maturity and much of the drudgery
15 of learning will be removed from the teacher, and the teacher
16 will be left to develop his or her intellectual leadership
17 in the classroom, despite their fears of this.

18 I am convinced that the last eight years have com-
19 pletely changed the face of educational research. And those
20 were my original goals, and I am very happy and pleased to see
21 that they have been fulfilled by my successors.

22 I also would be less than a human being if I weren't
23 proud of the fact that they have not essentially changed what
24 I set out to do.

25 MRS. SOFORIDIS: The final question would be

1 concerned with international education.

2 You mentioned that this was one of the first purposes
3 of the Office -- was to study international education, and
4 your present responsibilities are in this field.

5 Could you explain what the Office has done over the
6 years in the area of international education, why it has done
7 these things, how effective they have been, and maybe cap it
8 off with the future -- maybe talk a little bit about the
9 International Education Act.

10 MR. FLYNT: Well, in the early years the Office of
11 Education began to make studies of higher education and inter-
12 national education, as early as 1889. The Office commissioned
13 the very esteemed international scholar Dr. Herbert Baxter
14 Adams to make a survey of higher education, of international
15 education. He did so in 12 volumes which are still readable
16 and remarkably current.

17 In 1896 the Office's Comparative Education Studies
18 Program became legalized by an amendment to the Act, and
19 through the years we stood, in say the '20's and '30's, as
20 probably the equal of any university in our comparative
21 studies program which continues to this date.

22 We have added two other elements: Cooperating with
23 the State Department, we have, of course, developed the
24 international exchange of teachers and training to a very high
25 level, and the National Defense Educational Act, Section 601(2)

1 st centers and brought almost a revolution in language
2 instruction and in the capacity of the American school to
3 deal with the foreign language problem and the study of
4 language.

5 These three programs are currently in good order.
6 The Congress has always had great confidence in the National
7 Defense Education Act. There has never been any quibbling
8 over it. It gets what it needs.

9 The present program in Title 6 of the NDEA which is
10 now a part of the Institute for International Studies is
11 well supported. These three elements now brought back together
12 in a Center-- I referred earlier to my feeling that many of
13 the organizational proposals of the "ink" committee were
14 improper, and this was one of the most disastrous of all the
15 recommendations, that the Bureau of International Education be
16 broken down and scattered to the various parts of the Office.
17 It has now happily been brought back together by Commissioner
18 Howe -- a move which I thoroughly applaud.

19 With regard to the International Education Act, I
20 served as a member of the President's private task force in
21 the autumn of '65. I had considerable part, for example, in
22 writing the Smithsonian speech of September 13th, 1965, and
23 in drafting the message of February 2nd, '66, out of which
24 the International Education Act came.

25 A good deal of defeatism is rampant in the land

2 In the first place, the Act was passed by Congress,
3 which was sympathetic to the concepts. It was passed at a
4 time when the Vietnam war had not deepened, at a time when the
5 New Left had not turned isolationist. And I think had we not
6 had a change of tone in Congress, we could have well happily
7 expected its financing.

8 A good many people are always asking, "Well, what
9 happened," you know -- in the teen-ager's colloquialism:
10 "Wha' happen?"

11 Well, what happened is quite simple. One, the Executive
12 Branch's priorities changed. It simply became necessary
13 to put up two top priorities: One, defense. Expendi-
14 tures in Vietnam increased. There was a deepening commitment
15 there.

16 Two, legislation concerned with the problem of the
17 ghetto, the problem of the underprivileged had to come up on
18 top.

19 You will notice a good many of the priorities in
20 higher education have had to be diminished and cut back. There
21 have been cutbacks in the construction funds administered by
22 our Bureau of Higher Education. So that first, the Executive
23 Branch's priorities have changed.

24 Second, there was a vast difference between the
25 Congress which enacted the Act and the Congress which was

asked to finance it.

There were 47 fewer Democrats in the present Congress than were in 89th Congress. So that that simply changed it.

I think also it would be less than complete if I did not say that the death of Mr. Fogarty on the opening day of the 90th Congress was a blow from which we never recovered. Mr. Fogarty's known sympathy for this program, while shared by his successor, Mr. Flood, was not shared by the subsequently appointed members of the subcommittee.

My own feeling is that I waited, for example, from 1952-- Well, let us take another case: The case of student personnel. Dr. Fred J. Kelly, who is our Associate Commissioner for Education in the early '40's and I took up to the Congress the first proposal for the scholarship program in higher education, in 1941. It was finally enacted in 1958 -- 17 years later.

So, my advice to my young colleagues about is this: One must learn to be patient. One must learn what the realities are. You cannot fulminate against the impossible.

The International Education Act is a sound piece of legislation, in my judgment, and as you know there is-- It is included as an amendment to the Higher Education Act and will give us an extension of time to finance it.

The future of it is, I think, going to pay off. I

1 believe we will get money for it. And the principal reason
2 why I was asked by Secretary Gardner to join the Office of
3 the Secretary was to be concerned with the study of inter-
4 national education in the Federal Government which the Con-
5 gress directed, and which I am not presently concerned with,
6 and to attempt to find a way to keep the IEA alive and to get
7 financing for it in some manner. One doesn't play this game
8 by any rules. One plays it by feel and by experience. And
9 I cannot say exactly what I will do, but this happens to be
10 my game. As a Southerner I'm quite conscious of the political
11 realities and can usually manage to find some way to play
12 them so that they come out right in the end.

13 This does not necessarily mean we are going to get
14 any financing in this session of Congress. But I've felt
15 that we will ultimately get it.

16 To summarize, I do not feel there is anything
17 intrinsically wrong with the purpose of the legislation, or
18 its acceptance by the academic community. Indeed, I don't
19 want to believe I've ever been associated with a piece of
20 legislation that had the universal acceptance in the higher
21 education community as this piece.

22 We are simply caught in a concatenation of circum-
23 stances which require us to bide our time.

24 Some of the things I've said here are obviously
25 adverse judgments. I don't particularly mind. Later, when

1 I look at the transcript I'll tell you which are ones. I
2 don't think any of these I particularly mind at all. I have
3 no apologies for feeling the "ink" committee was a disaster.
4 I don't care anything about that.

5 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: In speaking --

6 MR. FLYNT: But now I'm going to say ones will have
7 to be --

8 MRS. SOFOKIDIS: Could I interrupt before you say
9 this one.

10 Stephen Bailey mentions that you and Russell Wood
11 did the homework for the reorganization under the "ink" report.
12 Is this correct?

13 MR. FLYNT: Well, this of course is a very difficult
14 thing for me to comment on.

15 With the exception of the dismantlement of the
16 Bureau of International Education, which was not really a part
17 of the "ink" study, Commissioner Keppel already had had on
18 hand for more than a year a study by Education and World
19 Affairs -- Dr. William Maxwell -- and a committee chaired by
20 former president Herman Wells of Indiana, and on which Mr.
21 Gardner served, which had recommended the dismantling of the
22 Bureau of International Education.

23 The "ink" group did not study international education
24 at all. They simply folded in the recommendations of the so-
25 called EWA group. "EWA" is the shorthand for Education in

1 World Affairs.

2 There was no critical evaluation of this at all.
3 And I do not care now I think -- unless I am pressed -- to go
4 into reasons why I feel Mr. Keppel did this. If anybody wants
5 to press me I'll do it on a confidential basis. Nevertheless,
6 the remaining structure adopted by the "ink" committee ad-
7 mittedly was my proposal. I drafted a recommendation for
8 structuring of the Office which I had many long conversations
9 with Mr. Ink and Mr. Jasper and Mr. Schulkind, who was sitting
10 in for Mr. Genovich, and which was ultimately adopted.

11 Mr. Wood did a great deal of the individualized
12 study of units of the office, analysis of their staffing
13 patterns, which was very useful to the committee in its
14 ultimate analysis.

15 My main concern -- Mr. Wood's homework, referred to
16 by Steve Bailey, was essentially concerned with individual
17 units of the office and their staffing patterns. My concern
18 was the overall structure, and I personally feel that the
19 overall structure adopted, which, as I said, was not essen-
20 tially different from 1962 -- a very good one -- where the
21 Ink Committee's recommendations broke down was at the next
22 level. The Bureau of Higher Education was an internal
23 structure. It was recommended by the Bureau of Higher Educa-
24 tion, which proved to be very effective, in my judgment.

25 I personally feel, however, that subsequently my

1 proposals were modified -- not by the Ink Committee -- but
2 by others. So that the internal structure of the Bureau of
3 Elementary and Secondary Education and the internal structure
4 of my former Bureau of Research remain, in my judgment, faulty,
5 and have only been partially corrected -- particularly the
6 Bureau of Research, which has had to get its work done cutting
7 completely across the grain, dovetailing into the academic
8 world, and has had to overcome extremely serious internal
9 difficulties in order to get the job done at all.

10 It's a great credit to them to have, but I personally
11 feel the internal structure is improper. So, to respond to
12 your question, Mr. Bailey did stumble upon something which
13 is essentially correct and which Mr. Ink has himself been
14 good enough to agree was true.

15 However, I will not accept responsibility for some
16 of the internal actions taken.

17 He also said -- made some remarks concerning me
18 personally which I don't particularly mind, which I didn't
19 like at the time. He refers to me as "venerable," which I
20 think was true, but I didn't like it, and still don't, although
21 he's a very close personal friend.

22 Some of these I may want to embargo. I don't know.
23 Maybe. I don't care. I don't think I will. I probably will
24 stand by those.

25 You're not on, are you?

1 I say, perhaps later, when we are considering the
2 text, I may wish to embargo some of the things which I've
3 said, but I'm not at all sure I will. I can only say a
4 very quick anecdote:

5 A couple of years ago a Roumanian Communist friend
6 of mine, Professor Stoian, asked me to get some American
7 books for him, which I did, from the () bookstore, and
8 later, seeing him in Geneva, I said to the interpreter-- I
9 asked him if he'd like for me to give them to him in private
10 and not in the presence of his Eastern European colleagues.
11 He's quite an elderly man, and he sent back word, using the
12 German expression: "Es gibt mir Alter," meaning, "I am of
13 age. I don't really care."

14 So I am getting to the age now where I don't really
15 care. However, I do have obviously a great many more things
16 I can say. Once you get warmed up to this, and you've spent
17 your whole life in it, I could probably carry it along all day.

18 However, here's just one final concern that I have:
19 I do not feel that the Office of Education, although I am
20 now a member of the Office of the Secretary and obviously
21 a loyal member of that staff, and I cannot publicly plead for
22 this, but I share very much the view of former Secretary Ribicoff -- now Senator Ribicoff -- that the Office of Education
23 must ultimately become a Department, and without much long
24 delay.
25

1 There are a number of reasons for this: One is that
2 education itself is a venture of such large scale and the Federal
3 Government's concern for it is on such a large scale-- For
4 example, the Office of Education appropriation is larger than
5 any other government agency, government department except
6 Defense and Agriculture. I simply feel that an enterprise of
7 this social significance requires a Cabinet member with a
8 voice and with direct access to the President.

9 This does not mean that I wish to denigrate in any
10 sense the sense of dedication of such men as Folsom, Mr.
11 Fleming, Mr. Ribicoff, all of whom I was personally closely
12 acquainted with, and Mr. Gardner, who has been my friend for
13 20 years, or the present Secretary, Wilbur Cohen, who entered
14 the Government with me as a young man 35 years ago. It
15 simply is an objective view that it can't go on without having
16 a higher voice.

17 There are some local reasons. It is impossible to--
18 Secondly, it is impossible to staff the top of the Office
19 with the requisite number and level of high-ranking educators,
20 when you can have only a Commissioner who is at Grade 5 of
21 the executive salary level, which is the lowest of the five
22 levels, and a Deputy Commissioner, and a few assorted staff
23 officers.

24 The Office of Education, if it were made into a
25 Department, would have a Secretary and Under Secretary, and

1 a panoply of Assistant Secretaries and other high-ranking
2 officers, meaning that we could recruit out in the academic
3 community for the very best.

4 This does not mean that the present Commissioner and
5 his predecessors are not men of great quality and leadership.
6 They have been my friends, and I admire them greatly. But
7 they are suffering from a lack of status position in the
8 Federal Government and are not being paid the salary for which
9 they are -- which they deserve.

10 For example, a number of us in the Office of Educa-
11 tion draw exactly the same salary as the Commissioner -- a
12 number of us who have served in the Office of Education draw
13 exactly the same salary as the Commissioner of Education.
14 This is manifestly wrong.

15 Now I have a third reason which is somewhat more
16 subtle and perhaps somewhat more controversial: I feel that
17 the Office of Education cannot much longer be subjected to
18 the totality of welfare influence which overweighs this
19 Department. The presence of the enormous welfare operation,
20 the Social Security, and the insensible turning of the Public
21 Health Service toward welfare, and the fact that more recent
22 Office of Education legislation -- whether so it intended --
23 is indeed having to be administered as welfare legislation,
24 gives me a great deal of concern.

25 I would not wish for one moment to abandon the

1 concept that Federal legislation in education can be used
2 to improve the plight of the underprivileged, the handicapped,
3 and those, but I do not feel that the Office ought to be ad-
4 ministered within the umbrella of welfare philosophy wholly.

5 Now, it is with a great deal of personal pain that
6 I say this: It's wholly a professional statement, because
7 many of the men who have led the Department in recent years
8 have been my very close personal friends -- Secretary Cohen,
9 Mary Switzer, Mr. Joe Meyers, in the Deputy Welfare area --
10 many of these have been my closest associates for a lifetime,
11 and I have no personal quarrel with them whatsoever. I simply
12 feel that there are elements in the field of education that
13 require its own governments.

14 * * *