12 years, and in varying degrees it can be said that all of them reigned but did not rule. The reasons are numerous. The most obvious are that the major agencies for the most part existed long before the department did, have little in common, savor their autonomy, and are organized to preserve it. The PHS with its corps of commissioned officers and FDA with a hierarchy which has been dominated by enforcement officers are leading examples. The HEW agencies are responsible to a number of House and Senate committees and have developed special relationships with the committees.

One recognized reason for the failure to achieve stronger central management of the department has been the weakness, both in terms of numbers and administrative leverage, of the group of officials and staff directly responsible to the Secretary. Congress has appeared reluctant to provide the office of the Secretary with enough help at the subcabinet and upper managerial levels to exert steady and effective influence on the agencies. Recently, as new programs have been enacted, however, a number of new upper-echelon posts have been created. Gardner, who has a reputation as a skillful talent hunter, will presumably fill them with people with a departmental view and allegiance. It is felt that the able HEW Under Secretary, Wilbur Cohen, who, as assistant secretary for legislation, carried much of the burden of legislative drafting and strategy, will complement Gardner strongly.

A possible precedent for the future of the department under Gardner may

Some Quotes from John Gardner

In short, the growing complexity of our social organization presents problems as well as opportunities for the cultivation of human capabilities. It tends to encourage effort—but often only up to a level of average acceptability. It opens avenues of advance, but these avenues converge on the citadels of routine where the individual pace must conform to fixed traffic patterns. It stimulates self-development but threatens to define the goal as mere competence. Meanwhile the very contribution that a highly organized society most requires—original thought and effort—is precisely that which it unconsciously discourages. . . .

The relevant questions then become: What organizational patterns and practices may be devised that are least destructive of individual initiative and autonomy? How is it that with all the intricacy of social mechanism, a good many astonishingly free, flexible, creative and independent individuals exist—some of them in the very heart of the great bureaucracies? How may we best prepare our young people to keep their individuality, initiative, creativity in a highly organized, intricately meshed society? How may we rescue talented individuals from the lowered aspirations, the boredom, and the habits of mediocrity so often induced by life in a large and complex organization? How do we shatter the informal setting in which order, harmony and predictability seem to be given more emphasis than individual achievement?

When we arrive at questions of this import we are no longer simply talking about the cultivation of talent. We are talking about some of the gravest issues in the future of our society. A continuing tension between the needs of the organization and the integrity of the person, between the effectiveness of the group and the creativity of the individual may well be one of the most fateful struggles in our future.

* * *

There is a danger of training scientists so narrowly in their specialties that they are unprepared to shoulder the moral and civic responsibilities which the modern world thrusts upon them. But just as we must insist that every scientist be broadly educated, so we must see to it that every educated person be literate in science. In the short run this may contribute to our survival. In the long run it is essential to our integrity as a society.—*The Pursuit of Excellence, Education and the Future of America* (Doubleday, 1958)

Most Americans honor education; few understand its larger purposes. Our thinking about the aims of education has too often been shallow, constricted, and lacking in reach or perspective. Our educational purposes must be seen in the broader framework of our convictions concerning the worth of the individual and the importance of individual fulfillment. It is now time to insist that this larger framework be universally explored and understood.

In a sense this is an obligation we owe to those great shapers of the Western tradition who taught us the importance of individual fulfillment. They gave us the blueprints for a cathedral, but a good deal of the time we insist on referring to it as a toolshed. Now, while the nation is re-examining its aims in education—now is the time to see our purposes in a larger perspective.—Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1958.

The society can do much to encourage . . . self-development. The most important thing it can do is to remove the obstacles to individual fulfillment. This means doing away with the gross inequalities of opportunity imposed on some of our citizens by race prejudice and economic hardship. And it means a continuous and effective operation of "talent salvage" to assist young people to achieve the promise that is in them. The benefits are not only to the individual but to the society. Nothing is more decisive for social renewal than the mobility of talent.

* * *

The most hopeful thing today is that on *some fronts* we seem to be achieving patterns of organization that avoid the stultification, rigidity and threats to freedom inherent in monolithic integrations. If this is true, it may be the most important single fact in our future.

It is possible to continue achieving economies of scale and still give attention to human needs. Too often in the past we have designed systems to meet all kinds of exacting requirements except the requirement that they contribute to the fulfillment and growth of the participants. Organizations need not be designed in such a way that they destroy human initiative. They are designed that way because we have not been willing to be as inventive about organizational matters as we have been about hardware.

It is essential that in the years ahead we undertake intensive analysis of the impact of the organization on the individual. We must examine the conditions under which

be found in the history of the Office of Education under Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel. (Gardner is said to have figured in Keppel's accession to the job under President Kennedy, 2½ years ago. Gardner and Keppel are friends, they share similar views on education, and are expected to work well together.)

During Keppel's tenure, an unparalleled program of education legislation has been passed. However, until recently, except for a few appointive jobs in the control of the Commissioner, little had been done internally to alter the agency itself, which was regarded in Washington as doing a humdrum job in a humdrum way. With the flexibility afforded him by new jobs carried in new legislation and a fresh reorganization of OED, Keppel is reportedly making changes which will improve both the agency's image and substance.

As for HEW as a whole, there have been perennial suggestions that the department should be broken up into two or three Cabinet-level agencies. There has been speculation that Gardner, who is a registered Republican, might be politically the right man to calm opposition to such a partition. Such speculation at this point appears to be quite premature and the President reportedly thinks Gardner is, by experience and temperament, the man who can shape up HEW.

The 52-year-old Gardner has been granted a leave of absence (term not disclosed) by the Carnegie trustees. Gardner heads both the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

On Excellence, Self-Renewal and Other Matters

organization is a threat to the individual, the kinds of organizational patterns that are the greatest threat and the safeguards that can be built into organization to minimize the threat. We must discover how to design organizations and technological systems in such a way that individual talents are used to the maximum and human satisfaction and dignity preserved. We must learn to make technology serve man not only in the end product but in the doing.

* * *

In some cases, young people find that the moral precepts their parents have to offer are no longer relevant in a rapidly changing world. And they often find that in moral matters the precepts their parents utter are contradicted by the behavior their parents exhibit. This is confusing, but not catastrophic. Those writers who imagine that it destroys all possibility of youthful moral striving are wrong. The first task of renewal in the moral sphere is *always* the difficult confrontation of ideal and reality, precept and practice; and young people are very well fitted to accomplish that confrontation. Their freshness of vision and rebelliousness of mood make them highly effective in stripping the encrustations of hypocrisy from cherished ideals.—*Self-Renewal, The Individual and The Innovative Society* (Harper & Row, 1963)

It isn't that people have different opinions about excellence. They see it from different vantage points. The elementary school teacher preoccupied with instilling respect for standards in seven-year-olds will think about it in one way. The literary critic concerned with understanding and interpreting the highest reaches of creative expression will think of it in a wholly different way. The statesman, the composer, the intellectual historian—each will raise his own questions and pose the issues which are important for him.

It will help the reader to know what my own vantage point is. I am concerned with the social context in which excellence may survive or be smothered. I am concerned with the fate of excellence in our kind of society. This preoccupation may lead me to neglect some of the interesting and perplexing problems of excellence as these confront the specialist striving for the highest reaches of performance in his particular field. I am sorry that such neglect must occur, but I leave its repair to other writers. This book is concerned with the difficult, puzzling, delicate and important business of toning up a whole society, of bringing a whole society, of bringing a whole people to that fine edge of morale and conviction and zest that makes for greatness.

* * *

. . . Today we have vastly more reason to respect intellect, vastly more reason to be awed by the achievements of the human mind; but in our total scale of values it must still be a subordinate good. Our admiration for the man who puts extraordinary intellectual gifts at the service of chicanery is wry at best. We cannot admire the intellectual who lends himself to the cause of tyranny and brutality. We admire the scientist because he uses his intellectual gifts in the service of one of the highest values of our civilization—the search for truth. We would not honor him if he used the same gifts for evil purposes.

In short, intellect alone is not sufficient basis for the creation of an aristocracy. There is no certainty that an aristocracy of intellect would be more virtuous, more humane or more devoted to the dignity of the individual than the aristocracy of knaves and fools which repelled Thomas Jefferson.

* * *

What we are suggesting is that every institution in our society should contribute to the fulfillment of the individual. Every institution must, of course, have its own purposes and preoccupations, but over and above everything else that it does, it should be prepared to answer this question posed by society: "What is the institution doing to foster the development of the individuals within it?"

Now what does all of this mean? It means that we should very greatly enlarge our ways of thinking about education. We should be painting a vastly greater mural on a vastly more spacious wall. What we are trying to do is nothing less than to build a greater and more creative civilization. We propose that the American people accept as a universal task the fostering of individual development within a framework of rational and moral values. We propose that they accept as an all-encompassing goal the furtherance of individual growth and learning at every age, in every significant situation, in every conceivable way. By doing so, we shall keep faith with our ideal of individual fulfillment and at the same time insure our continued strength and creativity as a society.—*Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* (Harper, 1961)