

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

2-14-1970

"Hopes and Hazards of the 70s For American Secondary Education"

Robert Blanchard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Blanchard, Robert, "'Hopes and Hazards of the 70s For American Secondary Education'" (1970). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 30.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/30>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Robert Blanchard

"Hopes and Hazards for the 70s For American Secondary Education"

February 14, 1970

Portland State University

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives

Oregon Public Speakers Collection

<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/111113>

Transcribed by Ruby Bontrager, December 18, 2020 - February 18, 2021

Audited by Carolee Harrison, March 2021

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.

HOST: It's my pleasure to welcome all of you to the 11th annual John Francis Cramer Lectureship. It's one of three major education lectureships in the entire country, and it is recognized as being a rather prestige-type gathering, so we're glad to have you all here. It's named in honor of Dr. John Francis Cramer, who was a public school teacher and administrator and also was the first president of this institution, Portland State University. Today, February 14th, is a significant date for several reasons: it's Valentine's Day—I understand one of the ladies is going to be passing out kisses at the door when you leave [laughter]—we'll appoint her at a later time. Also, of course, we all know that this is when Oregon became a state; but for two particular reasons for this institution, it marks the institution of Portland State becoming a four-year college and also, several years later, within the last year February 14th also marked the date when Portland State became a university and therefore called Portland State University.

We are honored today to have as our guest lecturer Dr. Robert Blanchard, superintendent of Portland Public Schools, who received his baccalaureate degree from Bowdoin College, his master's degree from the University of Maine with honors, and his doctorate from Harvard, and in a period of less than twenty years, he's been a classroom teacher in both public and private schools, he's been a high school principal, he's been an administrative assistant to a school superintendent, and an assistant superintendent of schools, and in his last position before coming to Portland last summer he was superintendent of the Montclair, New Jersey schools.

His lecture for us today is entitled, "The Hopes and Hazards of the 70s for American Secondary Education." Dr. Blanchard. [applause]

ROBERT BLANCHARD: Thank you. Good morning. It's with a great deal of pride that I address the secondary school educators of Oregon assembled at this 11th annual lectureship dedicated to the improvement of secondary instruction. As a newcomer to Oregon, it has been particularly flattering to me to have been asked at such an early date to address you on an occasion such as this. When Professor Ray Wolfe spoke to me on behalf of Portland State University to invite me to the 11th annual John Francis Cramer Memorial Lecture, it was but further illustration of the warmth and friendliness of the educational community in this great state. Risky on their part, but nonetheless flattering. [laughter]

It strikes me that this 11th annual lectureship is unique in two respects: first, I address you at the beginning of a new and crucial decade: the 70s. It is obvious that we are not only fast approaching the last quarter of this century, but we're standing on the brink of new and exciting changes. This new era comes on the heels of a decade in which the pace of change worldwide in education has been greater than at any time throughout the recorded history of man. The 60s thoroughly tested the capacities of the American educational system. This time of testing has found education uniquely strong in many areas and lamentably weak in others. The weaknesses have been particularly related to education's response to the pace of change elsewhere in society. While assumptions of nonfeasance based on this evidence were grossly premature, it does seem apparent, as we begin this new decade, that they are now painfully realistic.

Second, man's ability to manage his resources has now joined the technological capacity to destroy civilization, as a grim reminder of the possibility that we might not make it through this century. Social, political, and economic conflicts have competed for man's attention in ways that have caused him to tragically neglect his natural environment. While no system of public or private education can be expected to have prime responsibility for these great issues that affect the very quality of life itself and all of society's institutions, nevertheless, education must shoulder its share of the load. The need for a planned attack on these grave problems of environment with respect to the education of the young today is perhaps the most crucial of all of society's responses.

My approach in reflecting on the 70s and the past circumstances that will influence them is admittedly a limited one. I come to you with an administrative perspective much more than a curricular one, and I must say I am not troubled by the recent shift in administrative leadership from primarily an education perspective to that of a managerial context. Therefore, I bring to

you biased observations from my perspective, with the hope that they will stimulate additional discussion from the different perspectives of my colleagues who have equally important input.

Let me also say that I view my role as a large-city superintendent as being primarily supportive and facilitative on the one hand, and evaluative on the other. This, of course, affects decision making, and later in my remarks I will deal with this in great detail. But first, some general observations on the process of change in American society. Let me start with the concept of progress.

Up to the time of World War II and during the late 40s, this nation, I feel, pretty much accepted a belief in the inevitability of progress. It seems to me that this concept grew fatally ill in the mid-50s, and most assuredly died in the 60s. When you think about it, it is evident that it is *change* that is inevitable, and not necessarily progress. Without drawing upon the more dramatic analogy on the use of atomic energy, let me give a lesser illustration of this matter: the matter of urban renewal. The health of our cities, it was felt, during the decades immediately following World War II, could be restored by providing housing and other services to the poor. Cities all over the nation developed high-rise, low-cost housing. In the process, they destroyed the integrity of neighborhoods once composed of admittedly marginal housing, but endowed with ingredients that responded to many human needs. This was labeled "progress." A further example lies in the area of the size of institutions, corporations, and of government structure itself. Each of these produced more effective ways to respond to human needs, but at the same time, spawned new issues and problems to a degree that make a verdict of progress extremely guarded. Hence, we have discovered more recently that change is indeed inevitable, but that progress is only likely in the presence of planning. We do have the capacity to affect the direction of change, but not its rate. Planning in a democratic society, to the extent required by this greatest industrial giant in the world, is something that American citizens do not come by comfortably, educators included of course.

Another significant fact of life that educators must learn to meet in the 70s is that the restriction of vertical mobility that exists today in our society was produced by forces over which we have had little or no control. And yet, it is one of the most difficult and important issues to which we now give attention. The percentage of parents who are unaware of the crucial impact of formal education on the future lives of their children is very small. Even among the poor in American society today, there is a recognition of this fact. This is true even among adults for whom frequently the pressures of poverty and of coping on a day-to-day basis with the grim circumstances of life itself prohibit their giving attention to that which they know is so vital in the lives of their children. The youngster who two generations ago could leave school at an early age and at his own initiative move into a high-risk business operation and succeed in a

contemporary sense, hardly exists at all today. Vertical mobility in American society today is much more rigidly prescribed and dependent upon formal educational achievement. Almost irrespective of its quality, this is true; than has been ever before.

This fact and parents' recognition of it, and the values inherent in it, are vitally significant ingredients in the growing value gap between the generations. It is also responsible for the fact that many young people today are copping out. This frequently results from a reluctance on the part of older people to accept the human priorities that economic growth in America has imposed on the life of its young. For educators, it has imposed a responsibility that they have never had before; the history of American public education is replete with examples of alternate periods, the emphasis of which has been either on excellence in education or equality of opportunity. During the periods of emphasis on excellence, education has served well a portion of the population. During periods of equal opportunity, education has also moved with much good effect to serve a broad segment of youth. Never, never, have we done both well. But that is precisely what we must do today.

The history of the New England academy is an example of emphasis on excellence, and this time for a somewhat larger percentage of young people than were permitted to achieve college education earlier in American history. Our concern for those who did not adjust to the rather formal structure of that academy was slight. By the same token, around the turn of the century when immigration reached its highest peak in our country, the public schools in the cities performed an extremely useful function of initiation of the young immigrant to the ways of American society. That an extraordinarily large percentage did not achieve especially well in the basic skills was, at that time, not a relevant concern. This was because vertical mobility in a young and growing economy, with its priority on skilled and semi-skilled jobs in the various trades, did not require this. I'll leave to your own analysis that period immediately following Sputnik.

Another major phenomenon that will, in my judgement, have deep impact on education in the 70s if we are to be successful, is the matter of planning referred to earlier. This is especially obvious in cities of this country. Many notable examples of the absence of sufficient planning at an early enough date exist. Such cities as Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and New York are now educating the poor almost exclusively. Middle-class citizens, both Black and white, have sought alternate opportunities to provide their children a level of education which their economic leverage permits, and which, in their judgement, is now absent from the public education system of those cities. With collective bargaining as strong a current in education as it has become today, there is little likelihood that professionals who work in the future in these cities will be severely penalized for doing so from a monetary standpoint. However, there is

also little assurance that the quality of education will increase in ways that make a real difference.

Parenthetically, let me say at this point that I firmly believe a city such as Portland still has the lead time to respond to this crucial challenge, but my point is that the conditions on which the public school is focused today in most cities to a large measure have developed through planning in isolation. The health of a city and community in today's world will depend to a greater extent upon a much closer liaison between municipal and metropolitan government. The business community, whose future is dependent on a healthy metropolitan area, and the professional public administrator and planner who in the past has also operated in isolation. This planning effort, while so necessary, also contains within itself the seeds of its own failure. But here again, the evidence of change is apparent and will occur. The degree of its success will depend upon the way in which those involved affect or influence the direction of that change. A big issue will, of course, be individual rights versus institutional obligations, and this presents a further hazard.

Coordination of planning moves inevitably in the direction of greater bureaucratic structure. While this is necessary, the success of planning, it seems to me, will depend on the ways in which decisions are reached as they affect the individual citizen. This really presents a paradox. For example, sound decisions in the metropolitan Portland area can logically only be reached through an involvement of the entire public and private community in all of the metropolitan area. Structurally, this represents an increase in the size of the group involved in governmental decision making. But in order to be truly viable, sufficient decentralization must occur in the practical operation of this process, so that those affected by it achieve good patterns of communication with public and private officials who are close to them and who are not anonymous.

Before turning to the specific ways in which this volume of change has its effect on decision making in public education, let me deal with one other major social issue before us: that of racism. This issue, along with so many of the other grinding problems that our society must positively work through, has a particular significance for educators. Quite simply, my own experience leads me to be in accord with the major findings of the Kerner Commission. As emotionally troubling as it may be to the individual American, we are indeed a racist society. Certainly not uniquely so, for the world gives daily evidence of the prominence of this phenomenon in all of those countries that are so quick to point the finger of blame at the United States. Nevertheless, the increasing tendency toward separation, with its potential for horrendous consequences, forms a special responsibility for those of us in the education profession.

If the youth of our society are to be adequately prepared to deal with the world in which they will live, ways must be found within the schools of educating young people to be more at home with those who are physically different than themselves. One thing is certain: our ability to provide such educational services and opportunities will stand as a measure of our competence in the future. In a world of rapid change and mass communication, the more pronounced surfacing of Black racism is neither an excuse for itself, nor for the continued irrational growth of white racism, which produced it. Nor does this excuse the defense mechanism that frequently has developed among well-intentioned white Americans to tacitly accept the growing phenomenon of Black racism. In my judgement, however, the growth of the concept of Black Power as a means by which an historically self-hating minority is moving to a position of self-pride is a *positive* circumstance with which we must learn to work. The important point I emphasize only briefly here, although it requires much further discussion, is that educators, Black and white, whether in circumstances dealing with a mixed population or not, must exercise leadership to reduce the level of irrationality that is increasingly permeating the thinking of Americans with respect to this issue. To do less would mean an abdication of responsibilities inherent in the positions we hold.

Admittedly, the foregoing review of the impact of change during the past decade and its influence on the present has not presented an optimistic picture. One could select counter-examples of great optimism, but my purpose in developing the focus I have has been to set the stage to suggest ways by which these problems can influence future planning and decision making within education, and it's to this task that I now turn.

I strongly believe that the period of personal educational leadership in the office of superintendent is past. All of us know examples of individuals in this role who have strongly influenced the curriculum program of a particular community. All too frequently, this has occurred without the involvement of either other professionals and citizens, or the students themselves, having an opportunity to influence the effects of this leadership. It is also a fact that those who expect this brand of leadership must realistically be labeled a dying breed. One of my colleagues here in the state of Oregon recently expressed to me an attitude a year or two prior to his own retirement that as long as he was in office, negotiations with professional personnel might require some of his time, but this would never influence the ultimate decision reached by him and his board. We all have seen the example of the superintendent who brought team teaching, attuned planning, or some other potentially popular positive ingredient into the operation of the school district, and who succeeded only through the strength of his own personal leadership in imposing it on the fabric of the schools and in the construction of its buildings, only to leave several years later and have matters get back to normal. [laughter]

This phenomenon, it seems to me, has its illustrations not only in the local school systems, but also at levels of educational operation more broadly based. Namely, the state and federal government. The huge and, I think, basically positive shake-up that came to the operation of the U.S. Office of Education during the 1950s in which education, as a national priority, moved to stage center—in idea, if not in action—is a further illustration of what I believe to be a fundamental weakness. Forces were placed in motion in the federal establishment to oppose the characteristics of the national establishment of educators. It was felt by some that through regulation and various formulas under which categorical aid could operate, that effective change could be supported and business as usual penalized. Funds by Congress in categorical aid areas also had this as an important motive, but I don't really feel that beyond the setting of objectives and control of funding that actual federal control has been a significant element in the past decade. It seems to me that the reason it doesn't work is the same at the local level: goals can be imposed from on high, but they are seldomly effectively realized with any degree of permanence without active participation by those most directly concerned.

The recently appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education, James Allen, apparently gives recognition to this through his insistence upon evaluation and accountability in federal education programs. I predict that as society makes itself a more realistic evaluation of the overall funding problems of education, the nation will move more to general aid rather than categorical aid, although I'm sure not without considerable political resistance. All of this cannot help but result in an increase in federal and state commitments to education. This commitment will manifest itself not in the definition of goals, and objectives, and educational prejudgements, but through the careful review, at these levels, of the success with which the public and private institutions are meeting their educational responsibilities. The flow of dollars will then become more a measure of performance in relation to locally-set goals than of the imposition of national priorities in a specific form.

I recognize that these issues I raise may have less impact on a relatively small school district than it will on a large school system, but I do believe that the success of educational programs in the future will be enhanced through a sharp revision of role definition, particularly as it affects school district leadership. For example, I have recommended to the Board of Directors of the Portland Public Schools that the scope of responsibilities at the district level be severely limited. Revision must be made at the central office level for management services such as purchasing, accounting, transportation, and cafeterias, and other similar areas. Revision must also be made for quick feedback of information to decentralize decision points in order to enhance the effectiveness of those decisions. All this, in essence, is a service function.

Parallel to these functions, but of equal importance as a central office responsibility, is research and evaluation. Competition for the public tax dollar and our own sense of professional well-being requires less global and therefore more specific local educational objectives: objectives that are subject to evaluation. In the Portland system, I am making proposals for decentralization that cut deeply into the traditional patterns of school district organization. These recommendations will increase the responsibilities of principals and staffs, and extend to them a good deal more budgetary control on their part than they have ever had before. With such fiscal flexibility, the staff, together with the administration, can set objectives in a form that are understandable and are also subject to review in large measure by the people who are going to be operating with them. This requires, of course, a revision of traditional school budget practice from line-item classification into programmed categories.

I agree with Dean Thomas James of Stanford University when he advances the belief that systems analysis and program budgeting within education is not likely to produce the sort of cost accounting or other sophisticated outcomes that those committed to it so optimistically envision. To my way of thinking, that ultimate is not essential. And it is not an adequate excuse for failing to define our objectives in more manageable terms, even if they are only subject to eyeball examination. That they be evaluated is the important thing, and that we draw a more objective analysis of that which we're about. As educators, we must depart from the absurd tradition that has survived so long in our profession: namely, that every effort we make must be successful if we are to survive public scrutiny. This is an unnatural and a false posture that, in effect, only increases the public credibility gap rather than decreasing it.

A second significant aspect of decision making in the educational context is related to my earlier observations with respect to the relationship of education between public and private agencies. Time does not permit lengthy comment; suffice it to say that in my judgement, the professional status of educators will be improved, not decreased, through a more open, mutual exchange of views concerning individual responsibilities with the private and public agencies which lie outside our own operations. My belief with respect to this is by no means limited to administrative leadership, but I also feel that it should be extended to and include teachers and their relationships with citizens, agencies, and the students themselves.

A third aspect of decision making that increases in significance today is the area of decision making powers of teacher organizations themselves, as they grow stronger in asserting their own rights and responsibilities. I firmly believe that a militant teacher organization can assist us in our responses to the many issues with which we now deal. Nevertheless, I think it is extremely important to carefully isolate those areas appropriate for decision making outside of the school system structure itself. We have seen ample evidence in the cities of this country,

cities in terrible trouble in terms of the effectiveness of their educational systems, that have sought to build some form of decision-making apparatus as a replacement for an inadequate structure of decision-making within the system itself. It is my belief that this can only be self-defeating. Teachers have a right to and should organize, to more vigorously assert themselves with respect to conditions of employment, and seek the opportunity to discuss within the organization of the schools themselves those matters that affect them, and on which they must make a professional judgement. But it is to be remembered that these organizations are dependent for their ultimate success on a basically healthy school system. Efforts to extend teachers' bargaining rights as a replacement, as a replacement for a successful internal operation, must be resisted at all costs.

An additional point, and one that is fraught with many difficulties, is the matter of staff tenure. I assure you that I am one administrator who will not, this morning, be found making recommendations for the removal of all tenure provisions. Nevertheless, it is my strong belief... it is my strong belief that a healthy profession will, in the future, to a large extent depend upon ways in which teachers become increasingly involved in self-regulation of the membership of their own group. In addition, leadership positions that keep the teacher in the classroom must be found. For the responsibilities of evaluation of effective teaching performance, under the circumstances of program evaluation that I have outlined earlier; these will be impossible to accomplish with only administrative evaluation of performance. Teacher organizations have for some time been legitimately concerned about the provision by school systems of adequate grievance machinery in order to provide proper review of professional complaints. My point is that during this coming decade, if such procedures are developed—with the involvement of teachers—which secure proper protection of their professional rights, it may be that the earlier developed tenure statutes will, in the view of the profession itself, become superfluous.

By the same token, it is my belief that the American association of school administrators should investigate the appropriateness of possible affiliation with the American management association as a means of drawing upon skills and professional training lying outside of their own profession, but nevertheless extremely relevant to the changing nature of educational responsibilities. This does *not* need to be thought of as a concept that drives an increasing wedge between members of our profession; I think this is ridiculous. But rather, as one that reflects the more rational analysis of the roles being performed by education in modern society, it can indeed contribute to the background required for a perspective of increased sensitivity to mutual responsibilities.

The final recommendation affecting decision-making that I would like to make relates to the role of the federal government in education. It's, admittedly, an ambitious recommendation.

[laughter] If the direction of federal aid, as I forecast, is away from categorical aid, and the direct necessity for federal review of expenditures of such funds, I would recommend that legislation be passed at both the state and the federal level to provide for an office of evaluation within each state, lying outside of the state departments' of education organization. Leadership for these offices in their respective states would be determined as a joint decision of the commissioner of education of the United States and each of the state superintendents. The purpose of these offices, once staffed with sufficient, trained personnel, would not be to set educational objectives, but to review the degree to which local school systems are satisfactorily responding to effective use of federal and state monies.

While the mechanics involved would pose formidable problems, the offices would reflect a true partnership as earlier advocated by Commissioner Harold Howe, when he occupied the office of U.S. Commissioner of Education. It would also provide the opportunity for local leadership to exercise judgments and decisions not only within a local context, but in ways in which there would be a clear understanding that an evaluation of the results would actually take place, not merely the pretense of evaluation in which the decisions made within the state and federal bureaucracy might be based more on a lack of reason than an exercise of it.

Let me conclude my remarks with some comments on the present, not the future. Let me examine for a moment the social climate which exists in our schools, and the major forces which are affecting the schools on a day-to-day basis. Recently, I heard Alabama governor George Wallace on a television program. In the program, he commented on the behavior of the present federal administration. His conclusion was that if he had copyrighted his campaign speeches during the recent presidential race, he would now be financially independent as a result of the use to which his remarks, viewpoints, and opinions are being used by the Nixon administration. [murmurs from the audience] While I find myself in disagreement with his analysis in many specific areas, nevertheless it is evident that the sixties have culminated with a wave of conservatism. Perhaps a more appropriate word would be "reaction." Reaction to the social efforts that were so much a part of our national scene during the fifties and the early sixties.

Educators, it seems to me, find themselves in the middle. A position to which you are all accustomed, I assume, between what has frequently been called "a law and order tradition," and what I would call "an existential view of the developments in our society." This latter extreme takes the stance that anything that properly reflects the emotional feelings and attitudes of people is basically healthy, because it represents an individual response to one's environment. And if the social consequences are destructive, they are probably no more than that which is to be expected. This tradition views the riots in Watts, violence, crime, and even

assassination as it affects public officials, as nothing more than the expected manifestations of a sick society. Many of those individuals who are interested in producing constructive change frequently go along with this direction, and join forces with those who are uninterested in internal change within institutions represented by our society. The latter group, essentially and basically, seeks the destruction of those very institutions.

How does the educator, the teacher, the administrator, move between these forces—each of which has its easy, and simple answers at opposite poles—to cure the ills of American life? One important way, it seems to me, is to be willing to take the consequences of an uptight society and to speak with reason, irrespective of the source of the attack. This is no easy chore; there are those in our profession who find it more convenient to gravitate toward one or another of those aforementioned poles. For instance, in the matter of discipline in the schools, it is sometimes more convenient to assert that diminution of standards of dress and grooming are somehow related to the problems of our time, and that by providing sufficiently precise regulatory procedures and control mechanisms, we will somehow put matters once again in order.

On the contrary, I believe that matters such as dress and grooming are most definitely the responsibility of the parents of the students, and the students themselves. Likewise, I believe it is unrealistic to determine through policy in our secondary schools that which is printed in the school newspapers. Such publications can be an effective voice for dissent, and must not be circumscribed merely because they provide public relations dividends in our relationship with parents. However, editorial practices that apply to the press more generally, of course, must be sustained, particularly as they affect the laws of libel and slander. All too often, I feel, we are inclined to silence those matters concerning which there is disagreement. This also seems to me to reflect a basic distrust of young people, reflecting an equal and matching response to their stereotyping of all of those over 30 as members of the square generation.

Our schools should also have some mechanism by which students' gripes and complaints are handled. Also, it seems to me as professionals, that we are proceeding along an unrealistic route if we do not provide opportunities by which our programs of education can be evaluated by the students, as recipients of the educational process. No institution can survive during a period of unrest if it is disinterested in the reactions to that which we are about, by those most intimately concerned. And finally, if disciplinary procedures in the schools are to be successful, the establishment of those procedures should have input from those they are to affect: that is, the students.

Having said this, I must also say that we must, with equal effectiveness, provide within our schools a climate in which the safety of all young people is assured, and a climate for learning is maintained. In the city schools and elsewhere, we have had behavior that cannot be tolerated. Assaults, the habitual absence of good manners, an increasing fear on the part of professionals to deal effectively with the small minority of students whose behavior is inimical to reasonable educational conditions. Should such conditions be allowed to increase, we will have lost the ball game through default. It is also important that what we teach, and to an increasing degree, the way we respond to the legitimate demands of young people for granting participation in matters that directly concern them, continues to be in accordance with the best practices of representative democratic society. If we fail to deal with this matter intelligently, public education and our profession will be the loser. There are already ominous signs that where and when we do not satisfactorily respond to meet these problems, other agencies will.

There are weaknesses and inadequacies in our programs, in the way in which we have failed to meet the needs of a large percentage, as large a percentage of one-third of our young people, if not all in some respects. In some instances, to fill this gap, schools have been set up on the periphery of the formal educational establishment. Many of them are doing an excellent job, but essentially their existence is created out of our own failure. Surely past experience and review of educational research must already have convinced us that we need an arsenal of weapons, not any one particular approach in meeting the needs of young people in our society. Their involvement can help us better understand the particular needs and techniques appropriate to them, but professional myopia, new and old, can be our undoing.

I hope to have a staff commitment in Portland to a perpetual Hawthorne effect. No one answer to any curriculum area, irrespective of the enthusiasm of its adherence, is going to do the job. We need the input of traditionalists, progressives, neo-progressives, as well as those who wear any other label that you may wish to use, in making today's educational decisions. The one thing we do not need is business as usual. Frequently, orthodoxy in our profession has caused the movement of the U.S. Labor Department, the Office of Economic Opportunity, corporations, and other agencies and institutions, into the educational arena; I personally am not knocking this, but it has an importance to us. Next on the horizon are vouchers that provide direct remuneration to families in order to permit their children to attend the educational institutions of their choice. Failure of organized public education to meet the challenges of the seventies could well mean its collapse, particularly in our cities. I personally have more faith in the commitment to public education as a tradition in American society. It can be saved. It is to this crucial task we must respond in the decade ahead. Thank you.

[applause]

HOST: Thank you, Dr. Blanchard, for some very appropriate comments. As far as instructions now regarding the next event... if you'll leave by this door, and go down this long hallway and cross over the walkway into the next building, on this floor, before you go downstairs, I think it will be simpler. The luncheon is on the third floor of the Smith Memorial Center, so if you just cross over the walkway and then go down one floor to the third floor, you'll find it there. Lunch will be served promptly in a line-type fashion, and I'm sure you'll see what the situation is when you arrive. Your luncheon ticket is in the packet of materials that you received in Old Main; if you have not been over there to pick yours up yet, why, I guess you'll have to do that in order to have the ticket for your lunch. We are on a relatively strict time schedule because of some plans Dr. Blanchard has this afternoon for catching an airplane, so please pay attention to the schedule here and we'll try to hustle you along too. Thank you.

[program ends]