

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

INTERVIEW WITH WAYNE O. REED

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

HISTORY OF U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Friday 8 July 1968

Interviewer: Jack Broudy

P R O C E E D I N G S :

MR. BROUDY: This is Jack Broudy of the Office of Public Information, U. S. Office of Education. We are talking with Dr. Wayne O. Reed, Associate Commissioner for Federal-State Relations in the U. S. Office of Education.

Dr. Reed, during your seventeen years of service with the Office, you have held several responsible positions, starting with the post of Assistant Commissioner for State and Local School Systems. Your continuity of service and variety of responsibilities, including your work as Career Deputy Commissioner, have placed you in an advantageous position to observe development of Office of Education functions and policy.

How would you describe the significant developments of the Office during the Johnson Years? Perhaps you could start with a brief summary of the situation before 1963.

DR. REED: Well, Jack, you certainly are going to test my memory a bit this morning. I joined the Office in 1951. At that time, as I recall, we had about two hundred and fifty people; an administrative budget of about two and a half million dollars; and a grant program of roughly forty million dollars.

I was invited to join the Office under the career service by Commissioner McGrath. He was in the process of reorganizing the Office along the lines recommended by an outside committee, and he

wanted me to take on the job of running one of the three major divisions. Each of these divisions represented a major level of education--one for elementary and secondary education, one for higher education, and one for vocational education. The one I had responsibility for--called the Division of State and Local School Systems--brought together several units that under the former organization had been separate: the division of school administration and the division of elementary and secondary schools, for instance, together with some units formerly called services, such as those for libraries and audiovisual aids. In addition, the new division included the program of grants-in-aid authorized the year before in Public Laws 815 and 874--the program to help build and operate schools in areas designated as "federally affected."

Also in the new division, at the outset at least, was the major part of the former division of international educational relations.

One of my first assignments, along with the building of the organizational structure for the new division, was to help initiate the new program for federally affected areas. This program had not yet been funded, and that matter had high priority. The money, when it came, was substantial. The first appropriation, for fiscal year 1951, ran well over 75 million dollars--28½ million of it for operations. In addition we got funds to hire staff for administering the program--as I recall, enough to hire about 70 or 80 persons.

That program grew so quickly that it soon was large enough to warrant being made into a division by itself. In 1953 I so recommended



to Commissioner Thurston, and before the year was up that recommendation had become fact. By 1953 we had already created a separate division for our activities in international education. These activities had begun to expand early in the 1950's, mainly in response to funds provided by the Department of State in return for assistance in carrying out that Department's responsibilities in matters pertaining to education.

So much for background. It's enough to indicate how things stood in my first two or three years in the Office of Education.

The first major piece of legislation to be enacted after I came to the Office was the Cooperative Research Act. This was passed in 1954, but no money came with it until 1956. It happened to be my privilege to be acting commissioner during the first successful effort to obtain funding. Congressman Fogarty, I remember, was in the forefront of this effort; and it was largely through his good offices that we obtained the first million dollars for the Cooperative Research Act. Because Congress at that time had tremendous interest in the educational problems of the handicapped--particularly of the mentally retarded--most of that first money was earmarked for research on mental retardation. About \$750,000, I believe. There was very little time left in the year for putting that money into action, and I remember how fast we had to move to get it done.

Then 1958 came along, still under the Eisenhower Administration. That was when Sputnik went up and the American people suddenly became convinced that the schools weren't putting enough emphasis on mathematics and science and foreign languages. Suddenly the people were

willing to accept aid from the Federal Government in stepping up the quality of instruction in the public schools, particularly in those three fields. That's how we were able to get the National Defense Education Act of 1958--and the substantial Federal aid that went with it. That act meant substantial increases also for the Office, which was given the responsibility for administering nearly all of the act.

Lawrence Derthick was Commissioner when this act was passed. It was during his term that I was named deputy commissioner, with the understanding that the post would be in the career service--a post I held through Mr. Kennedy's Administration and well into Mr. Johnson's.

I vividly recall the first day of Mr. Johnson's Administration. Francis Keppel was Commissioner then. We were sitting in his conference room, meeting with some persons from Chicago--one of them, I remember, a very wealthy man--who had come in to discuss the possibilities open to private capital for strengthening international education. Mr. Keppel was at the east end of the table, presiding. We had been talking for about an hour when the Commissioner's secretary brought him a note. He read it and turned white. In all my life I had never seen a person turn so white. Tears came to his eyes. "President Kennedy has been assassinated," he said. He adjourned the meeting at once.

Out in the hall I could see that others knew what had happened. It was as if the Office was in shock. Secretaries were standing in small groups in the hallways, with tears running down their faces.



Radios were on, and television sets; everyone was trying to get the latest news.

Well, life must go on--and you pick up the pieces. Mr. Keppel went back to the work of trying to put together what was left of Mr. Kennedy's legislative program for education. Mr. Kennedy had tried hard to get a general-aid bill through the Congress. This was a broad bill, ranging across all levels of education; at the elementary and secondary-school levels it would have concentrated, basically, on helping the States to build classrooms and raise teachers' salaries. But this general-aid omnibus bill had fared no better than all other attempts to get general aid. It had failed in 1961 and again in 1963, mainly because it had run into the Church-State issue; but also because it had awakened the old fear of Federal control and the fear, especially in the South, that the Government would use its grants to force integration in the schools.

The upshot of it all, after the defeat of the omnibus bill, was that all provisions pertaining to higher education were pulled together to make a new bill--the Higher Education Facilities Act. This bill was up for consideration in the Congress late in the fall of 1963. It was part of the immediate task facing Commissioner Keppel at that time--to advise the Congress as the bill ran the gauntlet of the legislative process. He had the satisfaction of seeing that act signed into law just before Christmas in 1963.

Immediately the responsibility fell to the Office of Education to design the administrative machinery for this act. It was my great pleasure to help with this, to be chairman of the general task force--about 40 members of the staff--appointed for the purpose. Fortunately some of the design was already written into the act--in the requirement that every State had to name a broadly representative State Commission to draw up a State plan for using the Federal funds.

I remember very well some of the thinking that put this requirement into the act. It was the recognition that no agency in Washington could run this program and, in doing so, cope with the differences existing among the several States. There was Nebraska, for instance, whose laws do not permit either a State agency or a public agency at the local level to make public monies available to nonpublic schools, no matter what the level of education.

Other States had other situations. What was needed, in each State, was a legally constituted body that represented not only the interests of the public but also the interests of the several types of educational institutions--the graduate school as well as the undergraduate, the public institution as well as the nonpublic, the technical institute and community college as well as the university. A body that could determine the State's greatest needs for higher education, both in the immediate present and in the long-range future, and then set priorities on that basis. The priority list then was submitted to the Office of Education, which contracted directly with the individual institutions for the funding of construction projects.



That's why these commissions were made a prerequisite for all States receiving funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act. What we had to do, in the Office of Education, was to work with the governors in getting these commissions established--or in designating, as commissions, State bodies already existing. No one set of specifications could be written that fitted every State. I remember what differences of opinion arose in the States like New York, New Jersey, and Florida, each of which had a single State board of education responsible for all levels--elementary and secondary as well as higher. The question here was whether this board would have the time--whether it was broadly representative enough of higher education--to serve as the State commission required by the act. In Florida--and I think this was generally true of all States in similar circumstances--the matter was resolved by designating the State board to be the commission and then requiring the board to work through a specially appointed committee which did have the time and was broadly representative. This committee, then, would make its recommendations to the board, which in turn would represent the State's interests vis-à-vis the Federal Government. Our responsibility, in the Office, was to set up a broad administrative framework that would accommodate itself to the various State structures at the same time that it insured that the criteria set up in the act were met.

Paralleling all this, of course, was the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This act reflected the findings and recommendations of the Willis Commission. I was acting commissioner during the time that



the Commission's report was submitted to President Kennedy, and I remember the day when we went over to the White House to make the presentation. Secretary Celebrezze was with us. I still have a picture taken of the scene as President Kennedy received the report.

Yes, the design of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was set in the recommendations of that commission, during President Kennedy's term and at his behest. But the final push came from President Johnson. He moved fast. His dispatch, his sense of timing, his long experience with the legislative process, and his influence in the Congress--all these things combined to make, I think, a great difference.

Barely six months later the Civil Rights Act was passed, and it pushed the Office of Education into the middle of a hot political issue. I worked closely with Commissioner Keppel on how the Office would carry out its responsibilities. Title IV required the Office to assist State and local educational agencies, with money and advice, to desegregate the schools. Title VI, which created an injunction against Federal grants to school districts and institutions practicing discrimination, asked the Office to keep track of progress--or lack of progress--in the individual States, and to report to the Justice Department on schools not in compliance with the law.

The Office had long been painfully aware of the segregation problem. Title IV was basically lifted from an idea the Office proposed back in the early 1950's, when Mrs. Hobby was Secretary. At that time the Office was thinking in terms of getting Federal money to support

a study on how school districts might direct their efforts toward gradual desegregation. But that idea got no substantial support on the Hill. Secretary Flemming tried to get a similar idea through, but he failed too.

Under Secretary Ribicoff, however, we did try on a small scale to use Federal funds to encourage desegregation of the schools. In early 1962 Mr. Ribicoff made his announcement that local school districts enrolling children from Federal military bases and receiving funds under Public Laws 815 and 874 had to desegregate or lose their Federal funds. If these schools failed to desegregate, he said, the Federal Government would use its funds to build its own integrated schools right on the bases. I was acting commissioner at the time when the letters were sent out to the bases, telling them of Mr. Ribicoff's decision, and therefore had a good opportunity to see three Federal departments--Justice, Defense, and HEW--work together on this effort toward integration. We were dealing with about thirty districts; but the ultimatum, in the end, went to only four districts carefully selected on the basis of local circumstances. The fact was that, if every one of the thirty schools had refused to integrate, we would not have had enough money to make good on our promise to build an integrated school on base for every local school that refused. Actually, we had only enough money to cope with four refusals; and, as it turned out, only two refused.



Then, in 1963-64, under Secretary Celebrezze--and later, more emphatically, under Secretary Flemming--we got some down-to-earth experience in coping with the problems of segregation in the schools. That was in connection with a situation in Prince Edward County, Virginia, where hundreds of boys and girls had been without formal schooling for four years. The Office of Education became involved when it supported a research proposal aimed at finding ways of helping these children make up what they had lost.

So you see we were not entirely strangers to the responsibilities given us in the Civil Rights Act. Strangers for the most part, however. One of the first tasks we faced was the writing of the guidelines. It was at this stage that Mr. Keppel designated David Seeley as his special assistant to carry out the Office's responsibilities under the act. Mr. Seeley had been trained both as a lawyer and as an educator.

MR. BROUDY: Dr. Reed, could you give us some idea of the different considerations that went into drawing up the guidelines for the school desegregation: There must have been many.

DR. REED: Yes, many. One of the principal ones was the need to keep the responsible State and local authorities informed. I got on the telephone and we called the State superintendents in, four at a time. Our first effort, you remember, was directed at the seventeen southern States maintaining dual school systems. We called in Jack Tubb from Mississippi, and Charlie Carroll from North Carolina, and

J. W. Edgar from Texas . . . all of these State superintendents, a small group at a time. With each group we sat down with a preliminary draft of the guidelines and went over it word for word, line for line. As we went, the superintendents made suggestions: "If you do it this way, we can live with it." From these men, speaking frankly in small groups, we got the advantage of their familiarity with the State and local situations. From us they got information in advance and the opportunity to have a hand in the tooling-up process. Then when they went back to their own States, they called in their own local superintendents and prepared them for what was to come. This way, schoolmen weren't caught cold.

So we had the practitioners helping us--the men with the responsibility, at both the State and local levels, for the operation of the schools. Our bringing the State officers in, in the early stages of implementing the act--this, I think, was one of the most valuable things we did. We made it a cooperative effort. Sure, there was great resistance and turmoil, but together we got the thing going. Of course we made mistakes--freedom-of-choice, for instance, didn't work out as we had hoped--but all in all we made a good beginning. Looking back on it now, I can see how much credit is owed to the Johnson Administration--both for its great sensitivity to the plight of minority groups in this country and for its willingness to invest the drive and the power of the Presidency in the effort to get the Civil Rights Act passed and enforced.



While all this was going on, a lot of thinking was being done, both inside and outside the Office, on how to get Federal aid for elementary and secondary education. When those two levels were knocked out of the omnibus bill, back in 1963, a great many persons were upset. Expectations had been built up, and when nothing came of it, many persons and organizations felt that they had been sold down the river, so to speak. In the aftermath there was a good deal of soul-searching; and I do not doubt that a great many persons felt guilty for their part in defeating Federal aid for the lower levels of public education.

Almost at once Mr. Keppel began to put his mind to this question: What kind of bill would it have to be, for elementary and secondary education, to pass both houses of Congress? All the while, of course, President Johnson was continuing the effort to gain more Federal support for education. When he was running for election, in 1964, he appointed a task force, under the chairmanship of John Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Foundation, to consider what it was that education most needed and what it was that the Federal Government should do. Commissioner Keppel spent much time working with this task force, with Mr. Gardner, serving as a link not only to the Office but also to the committees of Congress and to the various national education associations.

I know something about all this because Mr. Keppel's house and mine were only a few blocks apart, and I used to pick him up every morning on the way to work and carry him home every night. I saw him when he was fresh, and I saw him when he was weary after a long

and hard day. During these rides we had many conversations, particularly about this problem of getting Federal aid for the elementary and secondary schools; and I got a good deal of the flavor of what was taking place.

Keppel was greatly influenced, I think, by the ideas of Dr. Conant. Dr. Conant had concluded that the more experiences our children have in common, the better it is for the public interest. He made the point that the public schools, by bringing together the banker's children, the candlestickmaker's, the shoemaker's, and so on, have given the American people a broad base of common experiences conducive to mutual understanding; and it is in the national interest that the schools be equipped to continue to do this, and to do it more effectively than before.

In Mr. Keppel's mind this point suggested a solution to the Church-State issue, on which so many general-aid bills had foundered through the years. Suppose, he said, that a Federal-aid program could be put together in which the money would go to the public schools but the services it purchased would be available to all pupils, no matter where they went to school, whether in public institutions or nonpublic. The benefit would go to the pupil, not to the school. On the basis of the pupil-benefit theory, Mr. Keppel said, the public schools could provide all children with some of the common background that Mr. Conant had deemed so necessary for building a cohesive society.



There's still another thing to be said for the pupil-benefit theory: it would provide a rationale by which the Federal Government could give aid to the public schools without changing the quantitative mix of public and nonpublic-school enrollment. Fears that Federal aid would change this mix have long been a barrier to Federal-aid bills. These fears were expressed, for instance, as long ago as the 1940's, when Cardinal Spellman and Eleanor Roosevelt exchanged views on the subject. The fight, even then, was over general aid to the public schools. Mrs. Roosevelt defended it as a means for raising teachers' salaries; and Cardinal Spellman replied that if Federal aid were used to boost salaries in the public schools, the nonpublic schools would have to close for lack of teachers. In effect, the Cardinal said, the Federal Government's action would change the quantitative mix of public and nonpublic enrollments.

I had been prompted by the pupil-benefit theory myself, on occasion, back in the days when I was county superintendent of schools in Otoe County, Nebraska. I remember telling Frank Keppel about it one evening on the way home. I had been so prompted, I reminded him, in a State with strict constitutional bars against the use of tax money for non-public schools. Whenever we had a teachers' institute in Otoe County on how to improve instruction in science, mathematics, or any other subject in the curriculum, I invited the brothers and sisters from the parochial schools to sit in. They didn't pay any registration fees, but we had empty seats in the auditorium; and because the presentations

centered on better services to pupils I felt that the teachers in church-related schools should hear them too. Apparently this seemed fair and logical to everyone else; at least I never heard any objection to it.

We kicked the idea around, Frank and I. What had been done locally in Nebraska to improve quality for all pupils without upsetting the quantitative mix of public and nonpublic enrollment--why couldn't it be done across the Nation with support from the Federal Government?

Of course the idea of pupil benefit wasn't new in the Congress. It had come up before, notably in connection with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. When that act was first passed, the title providing for loans to college students said that as much as one-half of the loan would be forgiven any borrower who went into teaching in the public schools. This provision aroused so much discussion that the Congress reconsidered the matter and finally amended the act to grant the same forgiveness to teachers in nonpublic schools. The pupil-benefit argument prevailed, you see: the argument that if the money was loaned to each student on the basis of his individual ability and promise, there was no logic in discriminating among borrowers on the basis of where, eventually, they taught.

Congress had made a similar change in the teacher-institute programs--both in the program administered by the National Science Foundation for teachers of science and mathematics and in the programs administered by the Office of Education under the National Defense



Education Act. For all of these institutes the laws originally gave an advantage to public-school teachers. Teachers in nonpublic schools could attend the institutes, but they could not, as public-school teachers could, receive cash allowances for their dependents. But now the law has been amended to authorize such allowances for all participants, no matter where they taught.

Historians of education will probably see both of these changes--the one in the student loan program and the one in the institutes program--as turning points that helped to make the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 possible. They moved us closer to an acceptance of the pupil-benefit theory and resolved, for the purposes of that act, the Church-State issue.

MR. BROUDY: Were there any other issues, other than the Church-State?

DR. REED: Well, of course the race question--the fear on the one hand that Federal money would go to segregated schools, and the fear on the other that the money would be used to force desegregation--that issue had been an obstacle for a long time. Congressman Powell, you remember, from time to time would threaten to put a civil rights rider on any education bill reported out of the education committee. But the civil rights issue was taken out of the picture by the Civil Rights Act, and it therefore did not constitute a problem in 1965.

And then there was the fear of Federal control. That was assuaged, I think, by the fact that there again the Federal Government was just following its traditional procedure: it was identifying a problem tied in with the national welfare and was moving in to offer aid in getting that problem solved. That is, the pattern of categorical aid was becoming familiar and therefore had lost some of its frightening aspects.

Add to this the fact that all the old objections to Federal aid to elementary and secondary education were yielding to a growing awareness that State and local taxes could not alone pay for the outlay necessary to improve the schools. Also the fact that public opinion had become convinced that education is a factor in production--that this country cannot maintain a free and open society and a high rate of economic growth except through educated manpower. In other words, the American people had come to believe that Federal aid to education is a necessity and that compromises would have to be made to get it. What they had gone through in the defeat of Mr. Kennedy's general-aid bill seemed to have changed their mood. Now, instead of just wanting to fight and dig in their heels, they seemed eager to find reasons for agreeing with each other.

Well, you know the history--that we got at last, in 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. What got it for us, what made it possible for President Johnson and the Johnson Administration to be so effective in putting it through, was simply this--that the old arguments were drowned out by the persuasive voices of change.



And where are we now?

Right now we are in the process of seeing the pupil-benefit theory being tested in practice. We are working with the nitty-gritty of the question. The theory is being tested in the courts, and one of these days the Supreme Court will decide how valid the theory is and how far the dimensions of its validity can be stretched in behalf of the elementary and secondary-school child.

Right now, too, we have some laws up before the Congress for extension and amendment. We have the National Defense Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Higher Education Act of 1965. But that's all so current that the picture changes even as we speak. Besides, you have many persons in the Office who can speak more definitively than I can about these developments.

Let's move back, instead, to follow a line parallel to the events I have been describing, and see how these events affected operations within the Office.

I'll start at a point shortly after the National Education Act of 1958 went into effect. In 1960 Commissioner Derthick appointed an internal committee to consider what the responsibilities of the Office of Education would be in the next decade and to draw up, with those responsibilities in mind, a new organizational structure.

In the Office the report of this committee was called the Babbidge Report, after the chairman, Homer D. Babbidge; but its formal title was A Federal Education Agency for the Future. By the time it came out, in 1961, Larry Derthick had left the Office; and the task of judging the

committee's recommendations and reorganizing the Office fell to his successor, Sterling McMurrin. In the reorganization that ensued, the Office was once more divided into three major parts, but this time the division was on the basis of Office function, not on the basis of level of education. There was a bureau of assistance programs, a bureau of research and development, and a bureau for international education. Within each of the first two bureaus the lines were drawn more or less to distinguish the several levels.

This is what we operated under until after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed. By that time the feeling was fast developing that we would be better served if the major divisions in the Office identified the levels of education--elementary and secondary education, higher education, vocational education and so on--and that the Office functions should be divided at the branch level instead of the bureau level. Under that arrangement the school superintendent, the State superintendent, the vocational educator, the college dean, what have you--each could take a look at the organizational chart and see at once who was in charge of programs and activities related to his particular sphere. He would know whom to call if he had a problem.

The idea of reorganizing on this basis was kicked around quite a bit in discussions within the Office after Mr. Keppel came in. When it began to look as if the Elementary and Secondary Education Act might indeed become law, Mr. Keppel and I had several conversations about the impending need for organizational change. The Office was increasing



in size, its duties were growing, and its relationships with other Federal agencies, with the States, and with the public were fast becoming more numerous and complex. The prospect of larger responsibilities for the Office convinced Mr. Keppel that in the future the deputy commissioner's job should be exempted from the career service--a point of view in which I readily concurred, knowing from experience some of the problems of adjustment attendant upon the teaming-up of an appointive officer with a career-service deputy.

In our discussions on necessary organizational revisions, Mr. Keppel and I often returned to the idea that the Office of Education should have a more deliberate arrangement than it had yet had for smoothing the working relationships of the Office with the public at large and with non-Federal agencies--that is, with State and local governments and with State and national organizations. It was in this realm that we both felt I could make my greatest contribution for I not only represented, at the professional level, the career service in the Office of Education but I was well acquainted with the responsibilities and points of view dominant at all levels of government. My new title was associate commissioner; my new responsibilities were such that they enabled me to cut into the organization at any point where problems of relationships with State or local governments or with State and national associations had become critical.

The papers proposing the establishment of an office for Federal-State relations were sent up through channels in September 1964. They

came back approved about in November, but I continued to serve in my old post until Keppel found his deputy, in Henry Loomis. When Mr. Loomis came on the job, in March of 1965 as I recall it, I just changed my title, kept my old quarters, and took up my new responsibilities. Mr. Loomis moved into rooms adjoining the Commissioner's office.

By that time we were all sure that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would pass and that it would mean tremendous and sudden expansion of the Office of Education. Keppel and Loomis decided that what they had to do, they had best do quickly, if they were to have the new organization ready when the act was passed. They got President Johnson to appoint a small committee of highly sophisticated persons to give full time to the problem and come up with a plan within ninety days.

MR. BROUDY: Was this the Ink Committee?

DR. REED: The Ink Committee. The Ink Committee worked up a series of staff papers--one on personnel, one on budget and fiscal arrangements, one on information services, and so on. The reorganization as it affected administrative practices was carried out first; but by the end of July the whole Office had been reorganized.

I say "whole office" with reservations, however. International education, pending more thorough study of recommendations from a special committee appointed earlier by Mr. Keppel, was decentralized throughout the Office of Education. Dr. Flynt, who was named associate commissioner for international education, was given a staff relationship with the various segments for coordination purposes.



The field services of the Office felt no impact from the Ink Committee. The committee made a report about field services, but the recommendations were held in abeyance, with the idea that they would be followed later.

The underlying purpose of this reorganization was to transform the Office from the data-gathering and consulting service it had been steadily becoming over the years, into a grant-management agency. In my opinion the reorganization went too far in this direction. It left no room for the concept of professional leadership from the Office of Education, for it virtually wiped out the specialist staff.

I am glad that this effect of the reorganization is not on my conscience, especially in the way it disrupted the careers and lives of many capable persons dedicated to the improvement of education. The speed with which the reorganization was carried out, and the ruthlessness with which assignments were changed, often without consulting the persons involved, left painful scars. As I see it, it could all have been done differently, without losing any of the objectives sought; but that would have taken more time and thought, of course--time and thought to learn what kinds of abilities the original staff had and to consider how it could be adapted to serve the new purposes. It was a trying period, especially for the specialists, who sometimes called it the year of the locusts.

But I interrupt myself. Going back to the reorganization, I would like to say that the kind of organization we got in 1965 was

colored by the feeling that the foundation for a separate department of education was being laid. At that time most of the conversations in the Office on this subject were based not on the question of whether but on the question of when. I think that if you look at the organization as it now stands, you'll see that it pretty much parallels the kind of organization you'd have in any department of the executive branch. It has a centralized administrative staff, each bureau has its own well-defined entity, and so on.

While we're on the subject of a separate department, we should perhaps refer to what has happened to this idea since the reorganization. You will recall that Mr. Gardner, shortly after he became Secretary, said that he wanted time to study the matter and that in due time he would make his recommendations to the President. What these recommendations were can be assumed from a statement the President made from the Little White House in Texas early in 1966. At that time the President announced that he had no thought of calling for a separate department of education; and then he went on to say what Mr. Gardner subsequently has often said--that the relationship binding education to health and welfare is so close that to separate any one of these from the others, in the programs of the Federal Government, could only result in a loss of the efficacy and efficiency of those programs.

MR. BROUDY: Dr. Reed, perhaps you would give us some background on the passage of the Higher Education Act similar to the narrative you have provided on the Elementary and Secondary--and also, before you



finish, would you give us some idea of what the situation is in regard to Federal-State relations in education?

DR. REED: I'll try. As far as the Higher Education Act is concerned, a good place to begin is with the so-called lawyers' brief--the Administration's brief--that was sent up to the Senate during the debate on S. 1021, the first Kennedy bill. This brief, which addressed itself to the constitutional authority of the Congress to enact this bill, drew distinctions between higher education and elementary-secondary education. It pointed out that whereas schooling at the elementary level long had been considered essential for every child, and schooling at the secondary level was fast coming to be considered equally essential, attendance at a university or college had always been considered a matter for the individual person to decide for himself. As a consequence, attendance at the lower levels is in all States compulsory for every child, at least for a number of years; whereas no State compels its children to attend college. On the basis of this distinction--and also on the basis of the fact that, at the higher education level, public institutions alone cannot begin to cope with the number of young persons wanting a college education--the brief concluded that aid to institutions of higher education was less likely to encounter constitutional difficulty than aid to elementary and secondary education.

Well, of course that turned out to be a fact, as I've already pointed out: The Congress in 1961 and 1963 defeated general aid for the lower levels; but in the latter year it had less difficulty finding a rationale for aid to higher education and passed the Higher Education

Facilities Act. That act was of course limited to the construction of facilities, and it also spelled out some limits on the purposes for which those facilities could be used. It found a way of accommodating the Church-State issue, you see: it authorized grants to be made to private colleges, including sectarian colleges, but only if these facilities were not used for religious purposes.

In general this was the accommodation that was also made in the Higher Education Act of 1965, which enlarged considerably the purposes for which colleges and universities could get Federal aid. Of course this accommodation, which is essentially political, has yet to be definitively tested by the Supreme Court. But in the terms of this act we can find evidence that public opinion in recent years has been changing in its attitude toward the necessity for education beyond the usual elementary and secondary levels. More and more we are finding acceptance of the idea that the responsibilities of public education should be broadened and extended in all directions--upward, downward, and outward. President Johnson expressed it when he spoke of a new freedom for all Americans--the freedom from ignorance. Secretary Cohen expressed it when he spoke of the continuum of publicly supported education, beginning for every person in very early childhood and continuing throughout his life span, even into old age, offering him as much education as he can profit from.

The idea prevalent now is that any person who has the ability and the desire to continue his education after high school should be able to do so without being restrained by lack of financial means. And the



Federal Government has begun to underwrite this privilege of post-high-school education. Now, as the bulge of enrollment is moving into the post-high-school levels, there is no question but what the Federal Government will try to determine the best way of supporting these levels. Somewhere along the line, I think, you are going to see some type of general aid to higher education. Whether that will come in the form of assistance to the individual student, accompanied by a grant to the institution to compensate it for the cost of educating that student--paying faculty salaries, providing equipment, and so forth--this is not clear right now. This is one of the questions that the higher education community, along with leaders in the Federal Government, is trying to think through.

This inclination toward more general Federal aid is showing up at the elementary and secondary levels too. Right now this inclination is expressing itself in discussions and debates all over the country about how to consolidate the many Federal programs of categorical aid, how to make them more flexible, how to cut the red tape. We're working on this right now in the Office of Education, trying to make our management of these programs as efficient and smooth as possible and to keep the complexities at a minimum. Of course any substantial consolidation of these programs will have to await Congressional action: Congress created them as discrete and separate, and only Congress can combine and consolidate them.

The States, you know, have already set us a pattern of consolidation of categorical programs. State aid to local schools originally began

in the form of categorical programs, each one designed to encourage some specific improvement; but as time went on, and program was added to program, the red tape got more and more in the way. I know that one State at one time had twenty-seven different programs of aid to local schools! At last the States, seeking some way out of the complex mass, simply incorporated their several forms of categorical aid into some kind of a general support program. Not only did they make things easier for themselves at the State level but they also gave the local operating units more flexibility. Then, whenever new needs arose in a State--for driver education, for example, or for some special effort in health education--the State would provide temporary categorical aid for the purpose, keeping it in that form until Statewide interest in it had been stimulated, and then merging it at last into the general-support program.

This is the pattern that I think will eventually take shape at the Federal level for elementary-secondary education. I think we'll eventually get general aid, general support, for public education, plus aid given in such a way that it stimulates and supports improvement in certain selected areas.

Let's move now to the question you raised about Federal-State relations. This is a subject that always carries me straight to another: how public opinion arrives at consensus.

During the eight years that I was deputy commissioner under the career service, I was pretty much chained to my desk. Commissioner



Keppel, like Commissioners Derthick and McMurrin before him, worked a great deal on drafting and supporting legislation; and I had the job of handling internal operations in the Office. But all the while I kept up an active interest in the changes taking place in public opinion outside the Office--an interest engendered in me during the days when I had been State superintendent of schools in Nebraska.

I'll never forget the experience that first made me aware of the process by which the public forms its opinions. I had gone into the State superintendency when I was thirty years old, and I was pretty aggressive. I had been elected by the people; as a constitutional officer I had no State board to answer to; the Governor couldn't change my budget; and that was it. I early introduced several bills before the legislature, calling for such things as bigger salaries for teachers, reorganization of school districts, and a retirement system for teachers. These bills were being held up in committee, and I got impatient. One day, talking to reporters, I called a spade a spade and named some of the legislators. When the story came out in the papers, it caused quite a stir. C. Petrus Peterson, dean of the legislature, phoned me at once.

"Wayne," he said, "I'd like to come over and talk with you."

When he arrived he got straight to the point. "The committee likes your bills," he said. "It agrees with them."

"Then why doesn't it report them out?"

"Because you haven't done your homework."

"What do you mean, 'homework'?"

"You think the legislature passes the laws, don't you?" he said.  
"Well, we don't pass the laws any more than the local council passes the laws or the Congress passes the laws. The laws are written back home in the hearts and minds of the people. Once the people decide they want something done, all that remains for their elected representatives to do is to find the words to put in the statute books."

I have never forgotten that lesson--that if you want to bring about any changes in education, you've got to go out and work to create a climate that's friendly to change. That lesson has stood me in good stead in the last few years, particularly in my present post as associate commissioner for Federal-State relations. During these years I have drawn upon my personal friendships with the leaders of the various national organizations interested in education. As local school administrator, as a county superintendent, as a State superintendent, and as a college president I had made many such friendships--most of them, however, in elementary and secondary education, where I had worked the longest.

When I took over my present responsibilities, therefore, I really began to concentrate on working with these longtime associates in an effort to set the American people thinking about the role of the Federal Government in education. What is its proper role? The answer to this question is one I have been probing for in speeches and discussions up



and down this country for more than three years now. I have worked with the National School Boards of Education, the NEA, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Association of School Administrators, as well as some of the more specialized groups, such as the Elementary School Principals, the Secondary School Principals, the American Vocational Association, and the American Library Association.

I have seen some opinions change a good deal in the last few years about whether Federal aid to education is justified and about the form in which it should be given. Take for example the National School Boards Association, which a couple of years ago invited me to participate in five regional conferences around the country on the challenges facing lay control of public education. Up to three years ago that organization was opposed to any more Federal aid to education. It wanted nothing added to the categorical aid already on the books, and it was particularly opposed to the idea of general Federal aid. Well, since then it has made a complete turnaround. This year, at its annual national convention, it passed resolutions calling for general aid and for full funding of present categorical programs. In her main address before the convention, the outgoing president spoke of the need to raise substantially the percentage contributed by the Federal Government. "Would you believe 40 percent?" she asked. "In my judgment," she said, referring to the public schools, "we could wisely spend \$100 billion a year right now-- 20 percent from the localities, 40 percent from the States, and the balance from the Federal Government."

A change as sweeping as this can of course be largely explained by

the fact that our society is making new demands on the schools--demands the schools cannot meet unless they get a great deal more money from somewhere. But a good deal of it can be explained by a greater public understanding of what the Federal Government is about, a greater understanding of the role of the Federal Government in education. Once the people understand that the role of the Federal Government is not to control education but to support the States and localities in their efforts, to stimulate improvements, and to gather and disseminate the facts the people need for making their decisions--once the people understand that, they are more likely to be willing to take help from the Federal Government.

Well, it's this whole business of climate, of public opinion, that I have been concentrating on. The great need, it seems to me, is for greater understanding all around. Take, for example, the problems that have arisen in connection with the funding of the new Federal programs. In many instances State and local education agencies haven't known what help would be available for a particular period until it was too late for them to use the new funds effectively. But by keeping the channels of communication open between the school people and the Federal Government, we have managed to make adjustments to correct this problem. That is, the Congress has passed a law providing for forward funding. It will take time to get this law implemented to the point where late funding is no longer a problem, but at least the Congress understands what is needed. It understands because it has heard the voice of the people.



MR. BROUDY: Do you get the feeling that during the past few years the States have become more resigned, shall we say, to the idea of more Federal participation in education?

DR. REED: I wouldn't put it that way, Jack. The States are the ones pushing us into it. We get some letters and some harangues about the Federal operations being pretty rough on State superintendents and on the local school administrators, but these represent only a small part of the reaction from the States. I think I can safely say that our relationships with organized education are better today than they have ever been.

It's a different kind of relationship, I'll grant you that. It's a relationship that grows out of dealing with problems--really tough problems. Having to take the national interest into account, having to assimilate Federal programs into State and local programs without disturbing the balance of the educational program as a whole--all this has brought about some tremendous organizational changes at the State level and at the local level. Now the State and local agencies have got the strength, they've got the personnel--not as much as they should have but enough to make a difference--and they are fighting back.

At the State and local level you have people as sophisticated as any we have at the Federal level. They call our hand. They are not afraid of us. And that's good. It's not a case of the Federal Government's using its tremendous resources to force decisions on the States and localities. Far from it. State and local leaders are sitting down with us and telling us the facts and showing us the way; they are helping to shape Federal policy.

Look, for example, at the Education Commission of the States. You'll find nothing there that speaks of resignation to anything, not even to the Federal presence on the education scene. I have been in on the development of this organization from the very first, and I have taken note of its aggressive and positive purposes. The Commission was not set up to be an action organization, but to be a forum for thought and discussion--a place where political leaders, educators, and laymen in general can explore the pressing issues of our time. But it is going to be one of the principal places where nationwide policy for education is made.

In the sense that it is a new mechanism for meeting the educational needs of our times, the Commission strikes a note made familiar by some of the accomplishments of the Johnson administration. I am thinking now of this Administration's efforts to find new ways of doing things and to create new institutions for doing things that the old institutions either were not able to do or found it difficult to do. I am thinking, for example, of the regional laboratories, the research and development centers, and the program for strengthening State departments of education. All of these are means by which workers in education can cross the old provincial boundaries once confining them and work with others in other jurisdictions and other fields to find new solutions to their common problems.

There's been much of this kind of interchange in the last few years. The Vice President, for example, not long ago called a national



meeting for educators, a kind of briefing session in which the educators and the Federal Government, as it were, could come face to face and talk out the problems that affected both. The Vice President had such a briefing with the mayors, too, and with other groups of persons responsible for State and local action. In these meetings the Vice President was trying to convey his conviction that this is the people's government, and that local officials have to be responsible stewards of the people. Only by an exchange of information--by a free flowing, back and forth, of questions and responses--can the people and their stewards do a responsible job of making government serve their best interests.

It's the prevalence of this kind of interchange that makes me so optimistic about the future of the intergovernmental partnership we have in this country. After all, it's the people who eventually determine the role of each level of government in education; and the more sophisticated they are, the more they are in command of the facts, the more likely they are to make the wise decisions. So far, by the people's will, we have consistently followed the traditional division of powers in our intergovernment partnership for education. The local level has had the responsibility for actually running the schools; after all, that's where the action is. The State has had the basic constitutional responsibility for seeing that every child in the State has the same opportunity to get a good education as all the other children have. And the Federal Government, with no responsibility given it by the Constitution for education, has come to be considered responsible for using its tax resources to help correct those weak spots that threaten the national welfare.

MR. BROUDY: I have one final question. To revert briefly to reorganization. You have already referred to the loss of the specialist function in the reorganization of the Office three years ago. Do you think there's a chance that it will ever be restored?

DR. REED: I think there is a very good chance indeed. It's because I am convinced that it not only should be restored but will be restored, that I was willing to accept the chairmanship last year of the Education Career Service Board for the Department.

I think that the Office of Education had to go through the phase, or stage, that it is in now. There is no question--and this applies to every level of government--but that government has to be accountable for the money it dispenses. As long as it is managing public money--large amounts or small--government must demonstrate fiscal accountability.

Consider what this meant for the Office of Education in the first half of the 1960's. Suddenly the amount of money it was asked to manage for education was drastically increased; and its responsibilities in the realm of fiscal accountability increased just as drastically--perhaps even more so. For all their size, the new sums of money were limited, as money for education always seems to be, and had to be dispensed with great discretion and skill. It was only natural that the accent in the Office of Education in the mid-1960's was on management. To those of us who were deeply disturbed by the Office's loss of its leadership role, there was some consolation in knowing that a special effort would be made through the Elementary and Secondary Act to strengthen State departments of education and to develop their leadership capacities.



Now, toward the end of the decade, opinion seems almost unanimous, both inside the Office and outside it, that the Federal Government must again equip itself to provide professional leadership in education. Obviously such leadership cannot be effectively exercised as part of the enforcement of rules and regulations surrounding Federal grant programs. Enforcement activities are more likely to have quite the opposite effect-- to make the Office of Education look like a control center in American education. Professional leadership, it seems to me, can be provided only through a staff of professional educators free from responsibility for the administration of grants.

Certainly any deliberations on what the responsibilities of the Office should be for the final third of this century should have high on the agenda the matter of reconstituting the specialist's role. Particularly now, as we seem to be moving toward a consolidation of Federal-aid programs and toward some form of general aid, the time seems to be getting ripe for giving serious attention to this matter. What is more, the results of research and experimentation are accumulating fast, bringing us each day not only new facts but also new meaning for old facts; and the need is sharper now than ever for specialists in every field who can help us to understand what research is trying to tell us. I think we can say with assurance that we have a sound basis for change. I think we are close to the time when the role of the specialist will come back into full flower in the Office of Education.

As research and experimentation have increased during the past decade, little cadres of researchers and practitioners in the various fields have been forming, working with each other and with neighboring colleges, universities, and State departments of education, as well as with local school systems. Most of them are working with or through the regional laboratories and through the research and development centers, trying to develop the consensus that leads to action. They are working in ever-widening circles to bring the results of research, the implications of research, to the attention of more and more persons.

Now is the time, it seems to me, for the Office of Education to establish the kind of professional staff that can become a unifying and reenforcing element for all these efforts and activities.

Let me describe it this way. I can conceive of this staff as being something like a university faculty--each staff member a recognized authority in his field. These specialists would be brought together under some kind of an arrangement that would permit them to work part of the time in the Office and part of the time outside it, somewhere on the firing line. At any rate, the Office would require each specialist to keep in constant contact with developments in his field through actual encounters with problems and situations and through close professional relationships with, for example, those cadres I was talking about a minute ago.

What the specialist learns from all this he will of course feed back in various forms to State and local education agencies and to the many institutions and organizations working in education. What



he can add to the process of milking practical benefits out of research and experimentation, of relating research to research, of bringing the facts together and sending them out--all this will have only one purpose: making the change take place that will benefit children. That's what it's all about.

One thing the specialist service in the Office will not want. It will not want Federal control of education. Remember that every piece of legislation providing Federal aid to the schools has written into it a provision that no Federal official is authorized to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, the program of instruction, the administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system. Obviously the Congress is thoroughly opposed to Federal control. So is the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. President after President has spoken against it; and none has spoken more strongly in support of State and local control than President Johnson.

With the Federal Government so thoroughly on record to favor State and local control of education and to oppose Federal control, you can expect to find the Office of Education's professional staff leaning always backward a little, being ever careful to avoid giving even the appearance of wanting to tell the people what to do. If we are going to keep a free and open society, a society based upon man's freedom to think for himself, it is important that we do not have a centralized system of education, where someone at the top selects the textbooks and determines what people will think and what they will say.