

Or you can take it in terms of military effectiveness. Look at draft rejections or any other measure of military effectiveness. This linear correlation recurs. Now, since this correlation is there, you have to say, "Well, irrespective of its quality, no matter what it is that they seem to be doing in these schools, for all their diversity, the fact is that the more time people spend there the better off we are. Therefore it must be okay." There is a whole school of people who argue this way. I suppose there is some validity to the argument. This is the same kind of argument that is made by the people who are talking about the carcinogenic effects of cigarette smoking. They establish these relationships and that proves their case. The only trouble with this line of argument is that it has proved the wrong case.

What it proves is that the planning we did for American education in, let's say, 1918, was sound. That was a great watershed year in American education; it was the year a little booklet called "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education" emerged. This was the highwater mark of what I call the "behavioral movement" in American education. It said that the great goals of education are: command of fundamental processes; effective citizenship; good use of leisure time; ethical character; vocational competence; things of that sort. The pluralizing of the philosophy of American education dates from that time.

Was it wrong? Well, from the fact that we have proved that the schools we built on that philosophy are producing, in some sense, well for us, I take it that it could not be wrong. It had to be, in some part, right for then. But if you start to talk about policy; if you take education from the point of view from which you gentlemen must take it, you get a different answer. We must ask different questions. It is not enough to ask whether things that we did 50 years ago have been of benefit to our country. Our real concern is to decide what will we do now that will benefit our country in the future.

Furthermore, the future we must look at is not close. If you are proposing some kind of structural improvement which you might make in schools within a practicable future, you are referring to a rather distant future. If you knew what to do now--as of this minute--how long would it take before you could have constructed the legislative consensus at the national, state, and local levels that would enable you actually to impact what is done in schools? How much time would go by before you had political