

DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE

Washington, D. C.

Interview of

DR. ARTHUR HARRIS

1968

by

Mrs. Jan Sofokidis

July 10, 1968

Room 3001, FOB 6

(This transcript was prepared  
from a tape recording.)

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 VOICE: Dr. Harris could we start back in the --  
3 early in 1963 when you became the associate commissioner in  
4 the Bureau of -- well, it was BEEP in those days--

5 VOICE: --Educational assistance programs?

6 VOICE: And could you describe a little bit, the  
7 kind of activities for which you were responsible, back in  
8 1962?

9 DR. HARRIS: Following the reorganization of the  
10 office under which the bureau system was adopted for the first  
11 time, most of the grant programs were concentrated in the  
12 Bureau of Educational Assistance programs.

13 The organization of the Bureau was along program  
14 lines with a concentration of state and local elementary  
15 and secondary programs in a division of higher education  
16 programs, and a further division of vocational and manpower  
17 training programs, in a separate division.

18 The increase in the staff, of course, was rather  
19 abrupt, was substantial, and it required a somewhat different  
20 emphasis in terms of the functions of the staff of the  
21 Office of Education and emphasis upon program operation on  
22 Federal financial assistance programs rather than the former  
23 primary of the Office of Education which had been the gathering  
24 and compiling organization and dissemination of information  
25 regarding the condition of education in the United States.

1 VOICE: The staff that you had at this time, what  
2 types of specialities did they usually have? These program  
3 operations people?

4 DR. HARRIS: Program Operations people involved  
5 administrators and particularly in the elementary and  
6 secondary field, due to the nature of the new programs,  
7 specialists in the fields of emphasis that it was. Specialists  
8 in Science, Mathematics, in English, particularly, in  
9 Counseling and Guidance and testing. At the higher educa-  
10 tion level, the emphasis here again was, \_\_\_\_\_ these  
11 same fields, but with a good deal of emphasis on student  
12 personal services, such as student loan programs, fellowship  
13 programs, foreign language programs, foreign language research,  
14 there was practically nothing in the way of, at this time,  
15 of financial assistance for construction of college university  
16 facilities. The only program in existence at that time of  
17 this nature was the college housing program, which are still  
18 located in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which was  
19 to later become Housing and Urban Development.

20 VOICE: Did you have any fiscal management  
21 specialists at that time?

22 DR. HARRIS: Yes.

23 VOICE: Was there any need for them?

24 DR. HARRIS: We had both fiscal management specialists  
25 and we had a rather extensive fiscal management group in the



1 a administrative machinery of the Bureau, a function which  
2 w later much more centralized for the entire Office of  
3 Education and the Office of the Commissioner.

4 But we did have school finance people who were  
5 responsible for assisting, both at the elementary, secondary  
6 and -- levels, and the state departments of education and  
7 the colleges and universities with particular reference to  
8 the management of extensive student loan programs.

9 VOICE: How closely tied in were your programs  
10 with the rest of the office programs and with the department  
11 of HEW at that time?

12 DR. HARRIS: We were working particularly closely  
13 with the Department on the emerging aspects of the Civil  
14 Rights program and the administration of our programs with  
15 Public Health Service, where our training authorities and  
16 responsibilities in the vocational manpower field lapped  
17 over into the field of Public Health Service. At that time  
18 we were still doing nurses' training, practical nurse  
19 training, and medical technicians training and that sort of  
20 thing, so that that required a close relationship there.

21 This continued after this legislation was developed  
22 then and providing for the student assistance programs in  
23 the medical field. The Health Education -- or Health  
24 Professions Training Acts, the loan programs, which were  
25 developed along the lines of the Title II of the National

\_\_\_\_ Education Act to apply particularly to nurses' training and to the medical professions.

VOICE: In late 1962 when Commissioner Kettle, I believe, came on board, was there, at that time, any large change from when the Bureau was started, or was the change into the swift patterns of reorganization -- did this happen fairly swiftly, or was it over a period of time, little by little?

DR. HARRIS: It happened swiftly once the determination was made as to the directions which it was felt that the office must move. The first move in this direction, of course, was to bring in an outside group at the suggestion of President Johnson, to study the office, to study its organizational structure, its staffing structure, and to make recommendations for the type of organization which would be necessary to carry out the very substantial programs and the very critical mission which the office was assuming at that time.

This occurred almost immediately after the passage of the Elementary and Secondary School Act and, as you may recall, they -- the President at the signing of that Act at his former, I believe, elementary school down in Texas, announced that he was appointing as a commission, or a special group, to study the organization and staffing and needs of the Office of Education in order to carry out its



1 ne mission.

2 This group completed its studies and recommendations  
3 for the close of the fiscal year 1963 and, I believe, it was  
4 in the Spring of 1963, the organization -- the reorganization  
5 was made effective at the beginning of the fiscal year 1964.  
6 It was extensive, it was, to a certain extent, -- well, one  
7 might say, ruthless, in that it was felt that the nature of  
8 this new mission, the new emphasis, would require a different  
9 kind of leadership than had been extensive in the Office of  
10 Education and that things had to move rapidly and while it  
11 was carried out as humanely as possible, there was a great  
12 deal of communication, there was a great deal of individual  
13 discussion, individual choices were offered where ever possible,  
14 never the less, as I say, it was carried out very expeditiously.

15 VOICE: You speak of the different nature, the  
16 different kind of leadership, could you elucidiate?

17 DR. HARRIS: Well, there still remained in the  
18 Office of Education, even though the nature of the assignments  
19 and responsibilities had changed, there was still a good  
20 deal of carryover of the former concept of the function of  
21 the individual specialist in the office of Education that  
22 he operated much independently, somewhat in the nature of  
23 a professor in a university, that he had a clientele in the  
24 field of specialization in the educational community  
25 throughout the country that he maintained a very independent

1 communication, that he made his own judgments as to what it  
2 wa important for him to concentrate on, what information he  
3 should gather, how he should gather it and what and how often  
4 he should publish.

5 Now, as I say, even though the nature of assignments  
6 in the reorganization of 1962 had changed, the emphasis from  
7 information gathering to program administration, the natures  
8 of the programs, resulted, as I say, in bringing in specialists  
9 and these specialists still tended to concentrate on the field  
10 of their specialization, rather than, or much more than the  
11 administration of the Federal programs, which were intended  
12 to strengthen, those academic fields or those instruction  
13 fields in the education establishment.

14 VOICE: You also spoke of the new mission of the  
15 office, would -- how would you characterize the new mission  
16 as different? Would that have to do with the change from  
17 information gathering to administering money programs?

18 DR. HARRIS: Administering money programs to  
19 encouraging, providing leadership, stimulation, to school  
20 systems, colleges and universities, particularly, to recognize  
21 the critical nature of the problems which faced education  
22 of the lacks and the gaps which had become apparent which  
23 were becoming obviously more and more critical, to cooperate  
24 to exercise initiative, to familiarize themselves with the  
25 best that was known, to explore, to experiment, to attempt



1 to find new and better and more effective ways, to cooperate  
2 and collaborate with all of the resources which could be  
3 brought to bear with them on the accomplishment of their  
4 particular institutional or school system or educational  
5 missions, responsibilities, objectives, and so forth.

6 VOICE: Within the office, in the administering  
7 of these financial programs, was there any internal  
8 structure that you introduced, formally or informally, to  
9 try to help institutions use the different programs that  
10 were at their disposal. Did you have any kind of consulting  
11 service to suggest that Title V of the ESEA, for example,  
12 could be tied in with some other program to bear on a  
13 particular problem?

14 DR. HARRIS: We attempted to do this through  
15 collaboration, for example, with research staffs of the  
16 Office of Education, with -- now, we're talking about having  
17 moved into the second phase of the Office of Education  
18 which was at the time when the Bureau of elementary and  
19 secondary education came into existence, the Bureau of  
20 Higher Education Facilities had been established just prior  
21 to this major organization and with the major reorganization  
22 the higher education loan programs, the foreign language  
23 fellowship programs, and that sort of thing had gone over  
24 to that particular bureau.

25 And elementary and secondary education retained  
only those higher programs which were concerned directly with



1 service to elementary and secondary school system, in other  
2 words, the institute programs, the elementary and secondary  
3 teacher training programs.

4 There was a good deal of collaboration and coopera-  
5 tion with outside agencies. I recall on several occasions  
6 when Commissioner Kepple and members of our staff sat in  
7 with rather widely representative bodies from industry to  
8 discuss the needs of industry, the resources of industry,  
9 the ways in which industry could collaborate, and cooperate,  
10 the opportunities which industry could offer which would  
11 assist the nation in meeting its educational needs.

12 The same thing was true with higher education  
13 groups, with the American Council on Education, with the  
14 American Association of Colleges and Universities, these  
15 various groups, the same thing was true with the National  
16 Council of State School Officers, with the American Associa-  
17 tion of School Administrators --

18 VOICE: Were these very new developments, this  
19 type of --

20 DR. HARRIS: The level of activity was new and  
21 the nature was new. Prior to this time, traditionally, with  
22 such groups, the Office was represented by, usually by  
23 specialists who prepared papers and delivered them and  
24 were on some subject of their specialization.

25 The emphasis changed to a discussion of the

1 critical problems facing American education and the ways in  
2 which these groups, with the United States Office of  
3 Education and with all of the other Federal resources which  
4 could be brought to bear upon the solution of these problems  
5 and the meeting of these problems, could best be deployed  
6 and put into action.

7 VOICE: Did these reorganizations, the second phase  
8 when the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, for  
9 example, got going, how much of the impetus for new programs  
10 and new directions was provided from the body of the office,  
11 as distinguished from the top, Commissioner Kepple and his  
12 associate commissioners, for example?

13 DR. HARRIS: Do you have reference to the --

14 VOICE: To the shaping of the --

15 DR. HARRIS: To the shaping of the -- mending of  
16 the development that -- the proposals for new programs --

17 VOICE: New programs --

18 DR. HARRIS: New program emphasis -- this was a  
19 collaborate task, the principal contribution which was made  
20 at the Bureau level was made on the basis of rather continuous  
21 evaluation of the ongoing programs, of changes which would  
22 be essential, which to correct or to remove obstacles which  
23 had not been foreseen, to provide authorizations which --  
24 the need for which and the desirability for which had not  
25 been encompassed in the legislation. Changes in direction,



1 and complete new program areas -- but this was not done by  
2 the Bureau independent of the other Bureaus and of the Office  
3 of Legislation.

4         There was a great deal of sitting together regularly  
5 in our Bureau staff. We had the Office of, well, what  
6 was it called in those days -- Laws and Legislation, or  
7 whatever, sat in on our Bureau staff meeting and we dis-  
8 cussed the -- on the one hand the general trends on the Hill,  
9 the thinking in the Office of the Secretary, the moves  
10 which were emerging in other Federal departments and agencies  
11 which related to the function of the Office of Education,  
12 and suggestions as to contributions that the Bureau could  
13 make in the early explorations, sometimes the development  
14 of language, likewise, sometimes we would discuss needs  
15 which had become apparent through program operation, through  
16 our contacts in the field of education throughout the  
17 country, problems which were emerging.

18         One of the rather constant problems, of course,  
19 and one which still persists in the area of elementary and  
20 secondary education is the old bug-a-boo of states' rights,  
21 state and local control of education, the fear of Federal  
22 control, suspicion of Federal leadership as aimed at control,  
23 and so forth. We attempted to keep our fingers on the  
24 various pulses, the indicators of emerging problems in these  
25 areas and communicate these and anticipate and avoid the

1 more extreme confrontations which sometimes could have  
2 developed, but sometimes did develop in the nature of the  
3 SA or the state school officers in going up on the Hill  
4 and opposing legislation which the Department and the Office  
5 felt should be passed or requesting changes in legislation  
6 which we may not have felt would be desirable.

7 In other words, we attempted not only to redirect  
8 programs, to identify needs which had not been recognized,  
9 which were becoming more and more apparent, to assist in the  
10 development of changes of legislative emphasis in direction  
11 with the development of new legislation to meet those needs,  
12 but also throughout the operation, to attempt to maintain  
13 this feeling of a community of interests, of a commonness of  
14 concern, of a sharing of responsibility, which would result  
15 in an effectiveness of total effort which, too often, is  
16 destroyed by a pulling-apart of the various parties to an  
17 enterprise through jealousy, suspicions, and so forth.

18 And, I think we were pretty successful in that --  
19 in this type of effort.

20 VOICE: That is, more successful than, we will say,  
21 1966 than in 1962 or some period after this new community  
22 of interests and ideals was established?

23 DR. HARRIS: Yes, it -- this was a somewhat new  
24 era in the office of education in that prior to this time,  
25 going back into the late 1940's and all through the 1950's,



1 there had been efforts to bring more substantial Federal  
2 resources to bear on education problems, but the various  
3 segments of American education, the various interested  
4 parties, could not agree on what these resources should be,  
5 how they should be administered, what the most important  
6 areas were to which they should be directed, and as a result,  
7 the Congress was faced with not a community of interests,  
8 but a sort of example of contradiction from the field of  
9 education.

10 As a result, it was almost impossible to pass any  
11 sort of Federal legislation providing for a substantial  
12 assistance role by the Office of Education and it wasn't  
13 until the crisis of the first Soviet Sputnik that the parties  
14 got together sufficiently to agree upon the passage of a major  
15 piece of legislation, the National Defense Education Act  
16 of 1958.

17 Even then, some areas of need which were identified  
18 could not be written into that act, for the simple reason  
19 again, that you had the higher education community disagreeing  
20 within itself as to what was most important and who should  
21 administer what and who should benefit. You had the same  
22 thing in the field of elementary and secondary, public  
23 education, as regarded the state programs and locally  
24 administered programs.

1           Where should the responsibility be as between the  
2   Federal Government, the state departments of education,  
3   and the local school districts. And then of course, the  
4   church-state issue, as reflected in the private versus public  
5   schools and how should these Federal resources be made  
6   available and to what extent should they be made available to  
7   children who were enrolled in non-public schools and parti-  
8   cularly those that were enrolled in the church-related  
9   elementary and secondary schools.

10           I would give Francis Kepple a great deal of credit  
11   for bringing all of these diverse interests together and  
12   bringing to their realization, I think, for the first time,  
13   that if this country was going to meet its educational needs,  
14   if it was going to make a beginning, if the problems of  
15   education were not to become more and more critical, more  
16   and more serious, more and more explosive, that the members  
17   of the community of education throughout the United States  
18   had to come to agreements and support a single program.

19           And until they did, either the Congress would not  
20   support the contribution of substantial Federal resources to  
21   education, or it would begin to tend to go in the direction  
22   in which it felt the national interest was greatest, with  
23   an element of Federal direction and which -- to which, very  
24   few at times subscribed, but that this might be the outcome.

25           VOICE: Does this explain how largely the reasons



1 for the various types of administering under the Elementary  
2 and Secondary Education Act had \_\_\_\_\_ had a different  
3 set of rules from the Title III and so forth?

4 DR. HARRIS: Well, Title I was recognized, of  
5 course, as a very substantial program, the largest Federal  
6 financial assistance program that had ever been conceptualized  
7 in this country. And, it was the feeling and the Office  
8 of Education was in general agreement that it was directed  
9 towards the kinds of problems which were diverse, they were  
10 peculiar to local areas and local communities, that they  
11 could be identified and adequately dealt with only through  
12 leadership exercise at those areas and with a good deal of  
13 leadership and direction and persuasion from state  
14 departments of education so that -- and then, frankly, they  
15 also, the concern of the Congress that when you begin to  
16 get into these large sums of money which were going to go  
17 into so many school districts that they -- the chief  
18 responsibility for decision-making should be vested at the  
19 state level, rather than at the Federal level.

20 So that you had the role of a state department of  
21 education on the review and the approval of projects under  
22 Title I with only a post review by the Commissioner of  
23 Education, the United States Commissioner of Education.

24 Title III, in the beginning, it was felt that  
25 it was direct to the development of a resource which did  
not exist in local school districts and that the Office

1 of Education had, or could, provide a -- the necessary staff  
2 assistance, free from a number of influences which were  
3 always brought to bear on state agencies which would assist  
4 local educational agencies to develop the type of resource  
5 to which the program was aimed, in other words, the intro-  
6 duction of experimentation, of evaluation, of innovation,  
7 of new program emphasis, of community cooperation, of  
8 collaboration with -- between public and private schools  
9 to the interest of the children.

10 They -- a contribution to the solution of the  
11 problems of Civil Rights, as regards education in the  
12 communities, and that this is going to require a rather  
13 unusual type of leadership, an evaluation on the basis of  
14 the objectives of the program rather than as it was felt  
15 would be the case if it were turned over to the states,  
16 rather than on the basis of the usual equal distribution of  
17 resources throughout a state in order to retain the support  
18 of all segments of the state, regardless of the comparative  
19 needs of different sections of the state, or of the inadequacy  
20 of the resources to produce any results if they were dis-  
21 tributed on that basis.

22 So you have these two very different types of  
23 programs. The Title III was supposed to have an impact  
24 upon Title I eventually, and the centralized leadership  
25 operating through Title III would have an influence on  
26 Title I, but Title I, where the large money was, was to



1 b. the responsibility of state departments of education.

2 VOICE: In the leadership the staff assistance  
3 that OE would provide for Title III, what kinds of people  
4 did you need on your staff to provide this kind of assistance?

5 DR. HARRIS: We needed not only the people on the  
6 staff, but the association of people throughout the nation  
7 who have exhibited a concern about the inadequacies of our  
8 educational system, the need to recognize our failures, our  
9 inadequacies, the gaps and to be willing to canvass the  
10 knowledgeability in the country, the know-how that had  
11 been developed, regardless of where, to put into effect  
12 those things which had been tested and tried elsewhere  
13 which had proved to be more effective than what they were  
14 doing, to experiment with new ideas on the basis of the  
15 best thinking that could be brought together to bear, to  
16 bring the scientific approach into the operation of the  
17 program in collaboration with the research resources of  
18 universities, of industry, wherever these were working in  
19 areas which were related to their problems.

20 In other words, those individuals who had  
21 exhibited an awareness of the critical need for change and  
22 a willingness to initiate change, and to be able to  
23 communicate and to instill this type of thinking, this  
24 attitude in education leaders at local levels, college  
25 university levels, and then to look at the proposals which  
came in from local school districts on the basis of these

1 ne , rather than on the basis of some concept of equitable  
2 di tribution of funds and pleasing or responding to particular  
3 pressures --

4 VOICE: Did this particular way of administering  
5 the program have some serious deficiencies, because it was  
6 changed subsequently? Or could you suggest some of the  
7 reasons for the change?

8 DR. HARRIS: I believe that it -- it did not have  
9 serious deficiencies other than, of course, the problem of  
10 assembling quickly the kind of staff that was needed and  
11 the problem of administering a program in which this type  
12 of thinking was a central element which was quite new, which  
13 was, sad to say, quite foreign to general practice throughout  
14 our school systems, except in scattered individual cases.

15 The change which has been reflected in recent  
16 amendments to the legislation developed in large part from the  
17 -- again a substantial increase in the authorization of the  
18 amounts of money which would be devoted to the program.  
19 When you jump from an authorization of -- well, I think  
20 the original authorization was -- well, I am not sure, but  
21 I think it was around 100 million dollars or less to an  
22 authorization of a half a billion dollars for the same  
23 program, and where you had again the pressures of the state  
24 departments of education to take over the responsibility for  
25 decision-making and program approvals, it is rather natural



11 was has taken place should develop just as was the  
12 original arrangement in Title I.

13 VOICE: How well do you feel that Title III has  
14 been as an example for Title I programs or a spur to change  
15 and innovation?

16 DR. HARRIS: We are at a period in which it is  
17 difficult and to some extent premature to make that judgment,  
18 but I think there are certain indicators as to what we can  
19 look forward to.

20 You have to recall that the two programs started  
21 out side by side. You had a very substantial Title I pro-  
22 gram with an authorization under a formula which would have  
23 provided more than a billion dollars which was cut back to  
24 I think, 959 million by appropriation, and then a small  
25 supplement, which brought it up to about 970 million, with  
26 a state responsibility, and then, right alongside of it the  
27 Title III program, which was supposed to provide the stimulus  
28 and the example for innovation in approaching the problems  
29 and solving the problems which Title I was going to solve.

30 Title III, of course, had no immediate effect and  
31 Title I proceeded on those aspects of problems which were  
32 common knowledge. In other words, they spent a great deal  
33 of money on a communications skill because it was felt that  
34 failure in school resulted from the failure of the school  
35 to adequately develop the skills of reading, writing, and  
36 speaking.

1 And that learning was thus handicapped. Too little  
2 was known as to -- and too few people were available to  
3 adequately operate a program, an \_\_\_\_\_ inflated program  
4 in his area, but it was the best that people knew.

5 Ideally, Title III should have been in operation  
6 before Title I was passed, was initiated, but the problems  
7 that Title I addressed itself to, they just couldn't wait,  
8 of course, and it was better to do the things that we thought  
9 were best to do now and then gradually bring the results of  
10 Title III to bear on it than to let the problems fester.

11 At the present time the move toward -- the term  
12 that they are using is packaging -- quite a number of the  
13 members of the Congress don't like this term, because they  
14 feel that if you put the various programs which can now be  
15 identified as separate programs and with which individual  
16 members of Congress identify themselves, inside a package,  
17 they are going to lose their identity.

18 Those looking at the problems on the outside will  
19 not be able to identify this particular activity as the  
20 program that this particular Congressman had a very key role  
21 in passing and -- but what is actually taking place is not  
22 so much a submerging of the identities of the various programs  
23 as it is a collaboration of those responsible for the  
24 administration of the various programs in deploying their  
25 various resources so that they make the optimum contribution



1 toward reaching their common objectives, so that you now  
2 have Title IV through the educational laboratories. You have  
3 Title I in the communities with high concentrations of low-  
4 income families. You have Title II with its educational  
5 materials.

6 You have Title III with the experimentation and  
7 innovation program development. You have the Education  
8 Professional Development Programs, which can all be brought  
9 together in a cooperative effort to make an optimum and a  
10 maximum impact upon the problems which you face.

11 VOICE: Of the problems that we face, would you  
12 care to discuss any ones that are not now being met or could  
13 not now be met with the existing legislation?

14 DR. HARRIS: It would be difficult to identify  
15 particular problems that say are not now being met to any  
16 degree. I think that they are beginnings but there are  
17 some areas in which the progress is very slow. I have had  
18 the experience since leaving the Office of Education of  
19 working in and with some local educational agencies in low-  
20 income areas in which they -- the leadership, the total  
21 leadership in education, in community, in the economic life  
22 of the area, the community, is still devoid of imaginativeness,  
23 of initiative, of a realization of the critical nature of the  
24 problems that they face, of the fact that the future is  
25 right at their front door and the effect which that future  
is going to have upon their community life.

For example: I think of one community which came  
in with a proposal to develop and make a revised and a  
revitalized vocational education program.

In answer to questions of why, because the students  
were leaving the community, either dropping out of school or  
after graduation from high school and were going to the  
nearby cities and that when they got to the cities they found  
that they did not have the job skills to find jobs and this  
was a reflection upon the school system of the community  
which they came from.

In other words, if you look at your community in  
the area in which you live you say that so far as your youth  
are concerned, you are slowly bleeding to death. You are  
bleeding your youth out to other communities and what you  
want to do is to devise a program which will open the veins  
a little wider and you will bleed to death much faster.

I said, why not look at your community and at your  
whole area, the geographic area from the point of view of  
taking advantage -- of identifying and taking advantage of  
certain very substantial resources which you have, and which  
eventually are going to draw a large number of people into  
this area who will develop enterprises which will benefit  
them substantially, economically and every other way. And  
take the initiative on a realization of those resources, the  
development of those resources and build and let your youth



1     h   o you to build that future.

2             Well, you can stimulate a certain amount of excite-  
3     ment and some rather ineffective initial efforts, but in too  
4     many cases no individual is willing to stick his neck out,  
5     because too many other people say he is rocking the boat and  
6     it is too comfortable a rut as it is for most of the indivi-  
7     duals.

8             VOICE: Do you feel that the Office of Education,  
9     then, could be or should be taking more initiative in the  
10    field, for example, through its field offices to do some  
11    of this boatrocking?

12            DR. HARRIS: I don't think that the Office of  
13    Education can possibly undertake this as a direct responsibility  
14    role. I think it is -- I think it is making a beginning  
15    in the development of these packaged pilot projects which  
16    will concentrate available resources in an area of high  
17    need and sometimes these are areas of high risk, too, so  
18    that an effective effort can be made and can be demonstrated  
19    and can thus challenge the local leadership, the state leader-  
20    ship and the institutional leadership, in the area to extend  
21    this movement for change.

22            Even if the Office had a staff of forty thousand  
23    people, it couldn't devote, through the staff members, the  
24    individual attention and effort that would be needed to  
25    cover the communities in this country where there is a complete

1 lack of leadership and of making a difference in desire for  
2 change on the part of those who can initiate change, but the  
3 Office can be very effective in the role in which it has  
4 and is embarking.

5 It, of course, will be most unfortunate that the  
6 total resources available are cut back below expectations  
7 and in some cases reduced below prior realization. It would  
8 be most unfortunate if the immediate future should see an  
9 augmentation of this diminution of resources available for  
10 these programs. But, the effectiveness, even at the present  
11 anticipated level of program support through the collaborative  
12 pilot concentration of resources can make a real contribution  
13 to the solution of these problems and the meeting of these  
14 needs in the future and it may very well lay the groundwork  
15 for a much more adequate provision of much more adequate  
16 measure of Federal assistance within the field of education.

17 VOICE: Do you --

18 DR. HARRIS: Because I think its results may be  
19 such as to convince the national leadership that we have  
20 reached the stage in which federal resources in much greater  
21 measure can be devoted to the needs of education without the--

22 (end of side one)

23 SIDE TWO

24 VOICE: Do you feel that the Office of Education  
25 is about to experience then, some greater programs than it



1 has ever seen in the past as a result of these pilot,  
2 packaging successes that you anticipate?

3 DR. HARRIS: I don't anticipate these -- that  
4 these are in the immediate future, in the immediate offing.  
5 I think that the general national picture, the general  
6 concern over the expenditures in Vietnam, the seemingly  
7 effective efforts to cut back on civilian spending will mean  
8 that we may face a period of time in which our best efforts  
9 and the leadership on the Hill may not be directed to the  
10 identification of other critical educational needs to which  
11 Federal resources might be directed or the identification of  
12 the extent to which the increase of those now being devoted  
13 to educational needs and problems should be increased.

14 I think that there is an inevitability, however,  
15 that thinking will be redirected to these areas of need,  
16 because the extent to which we neglect them, or reduce  
17 emphasis upon them during this period will be reflected in  
18 the degree of urgency for meeting those needs at such time  
19 as we may reach an international situation in which we do not  
20 devote such a large proportion of our resources to conflict --  
21 to international conflict instead of conflict with those  
22 forces which are -- which may well be destructive from  
23 within rather from --

24 VOICE: Do you feel then, that given the present  
25 programs of the office and the present funding levels, the

emphasis is being placed in the directions which would most benefit American education? In other words, by trying to get the states and local communities together with industry and various leaders of education, do you feel that this is the direction that it should be taking, or should it be placing more emphasis on the kind of demonstrations of these projects? Are there any directions in which we should be going faster than we now are, or should we be changing?

DR. HARRIS: Now this is an either-or proposition. The coordination or the packaging of resources can be done effectively only where you develop the cooperation of all of your human and organizational resources. In other business and industry, education at the state level, at the local level, at the institutional level -- whatever resources have a rightful concern or should be concerned about the needs which education must serve in this country should be involved and should have a part, because the contribution which they make, which is not reflected -- may not be reflected in actual dollars, certainly will increase the effectiveness of the available dollars.

I think there are areas of need which are being identified, which are emerging and I think that the concentrations of the packaging programs which are underway and which I would anticipate will develop in the months ahead will be -- will serve more effectively than the



1 machinery available in the past to make those identifications  
2 and to suggest program changes, program additions, and so  
3 forth and so on.

4 VOICE: Do you have any suggestions as to how  
5 these -- this machinery could be improved through the organi-  
6 zation or staff of the Office of Education at the present  
7 time?

8 DR. HARRIS: It is to be hoped that the Office will  
9 be able to maintain its -- the quality of its staff leader-  
10 ship. There is a certain unease and restlessness in the  
11 Office at the present time which is natural. It has been  
12 experienced before at times when the purse strings of the  
13 Federal government are drawn tightly as regard to a particular  
14 agency, but if the Office can maintain and constantly seek  
15 to improve the quality of its personnel and if it can  
16 communicate its ideas, possibly, a little bit more generously  
17 prior to the initiation of changes, I think that it will  
18 continue to be most effective and will improve its effective-  
19 ness.

20 I say this because the failure to communicate this  
21 packaging process adequately to the Hill has caused concern  
22 and unrest and initial opposition from the Hill. Congress-  
23 men have been afraid that without any authorization from the  
24 Congress they are rewriting the legislation. That they are  
25 destroying the separate programs and putting the money in  
one pot and operating as if it were a single program.

1           There have been local educational agencies, which  
2       have felt that they were going to lose because certain  
3       resources which they had been using and \_\_\_\_\_ ways  
4       were going to have to be deployed in a different way, have  
5       communicated their opposition to the Hill and to their  
6       national professional bodies.

7           The American Association School of Administrators  
8       has become involved to a certain extent. They are working  
9       on these and I think they will work them out. It is un-  
10      fortunate that all the parties which must be involved in the  
11      programs cannot be as reasonable as those who are responsible  
12      for the administration --(laughing) -- cannot see the needs  
13      for the changes that are being made as quickly as would be  
14      desirable.

15           But, it takes a little time to absorb the impact  
16      of the notification of change and to understand it and it  
17      does require understanding of why, why, why will this be  
18      better? And --

19           VOICE: Do you have any suggestions as to how the  
20      why can be gotten across to the recipients of the policy --

21           DR. HARRIS: Only through the earlier involvement  
22      of members of the committees on the Hill and not only members  
23      of the committees but identification of key members of  
24      Congress who may not be on an education committee but may  
25      have exhibited a very great concern about Federal programs



1 in his or her particular state and when from whom the Office  
2 as heard in the past, because he has disagreed with some  
3 things that the Office is doing -- in other words, the type  
4 individual who is in a position to effect the future course  
5 of action, who has demonstrated a concern in the field of  
6 education and who can provide support and leadership, not only  
7 on the Hill, but out in his respective states.

8  
9 Now, the same thing is true, of course, with your  
10 education professions, with your state agencies, your local  
11 administrators, your colleges and universities. This is  
12 probably being done more effectively than the communication  
13 on the Hill.

14  
15 VOICE: In conclusion, would you care to comment  
16 on what you see to be the greatest services that the Office  
17 is now providing to the United States in the field of  
18 education and the greatest challenges that it now faces and  
19 perhaps the greatest needs that it has yet to try to fill?

20  
21 DR. HARRIS: Well, that's a rather large order.  
22 The greatest services that it is providing at the present  
23 time are in terms of the providing of the provision of  
24 resources which can be directed to the identification and the  
25 solution of critical educational problems.

26  
27 Now these are not just problems of public school  
28 37, and Roosevelt High School and/or Central University and  
29 College, these are problems of our nation and

1 of our society or our communities to which -- or for which  
2 we must look to education for help for solutions.

3 We don't have the problem of -- which is limited  
4 to, why can't Johnny read? But it is the whole area of  
5 the population explosion, urbanization, and the emerging  
6 realization -- self-realization of minority groups, the  
7 problems of discrimination, the building of an economic  
8 system which will make it possible for all individuals to  
9 live a more satisfying, a more adequate existence, not only  
10 as between communities, between groups, between geographic  
11 areas in this country, but as between the nations and the  
12 peoples of the world.

13 And education is the absolutely essential element  
14 in the solution of these problems and the most shortsighted  
15 thing that this country, or any country can do, is to become  
16 so concerned with one of these problems, so that it devotes  
17 an inordinate proportion of its resources to that problem  
18 at the expense of education resources because it thereby  
19 simply compounds its problems for the future and lessens  
20 its effectiveness for meeting those problems in the future.

21 It is setting out to deprive itself in the future  
22 of those very resources which upon it must depend to meet  
23 those problems. And education is not merely a tool in this  
24 whole area of the national and the international picture  
25 and the societal picture, education is a great contributor



c1h30

30

CR5961

to that very economy upon which -- which we must build in order to provide the opportunities for all individuals which we envision.

In other words, the same number of dollars devoted to education that are now devoted to defense, to war, would contribute just as much or more to the building of our economy as to those expenditures. I am convinced of that. So that our investments in education are not only investments in our future, in our ability to solve our problems and meet our needs, but they are investments -- direct investments in our economy and I am talking about the fields of construction of engineering, of invention, of research, of exploration, of experimentation, direct contributions to our economy, not the contributions which have always been stressed that if you go through college, you can have a life income expectancy of so many dollars, if you go only through high school, you have a life expectancy of income of so many fewer dollars.

That isn't what I mean. I mean that the dollars that you spend for education go out into our economy and generate gross national product in the same manner in which expenditures for defense do and as we approach the realization of a world which can live in peace, I would hope that our expenditures for education can replace to a large extent those which traditionally have been made for wars past, present, and future.