(NOTE.—A copy of a letter from Hendrik D. Gideonse, author of the aforementioned article, to John D. Herzog appears below.)

Mr. HERZOG. For a variety of reasons that are in my prepared statement which we have not talked to and some of the ones we have talked about, our greatest problem right now is to continue the interest of our top people in education and Harvard in general in working on education through the U.S. Office of Education.

There are procedures and policies and expectations which really seem to come from the Office which effectively discourage the really top men in various academic disciplines from wanting to work with USOE. This is a tragedy.

In some cases they can go to another Government institution like the National Institute for Child Development, for example, or they can go to foundations and continue their work. In other cases I think the discouragement, and it is a new one, is when an eminent man who is becoming newly concerned with education, may effectively turn his concern to something else which he can go into without this bother and problem.

This really bothers us now and I am sure it should bother USOE. I am sure it does, but I don't think they realize how serious it is here and maybe elsewhere.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you very much.

Mr. HERZOG. Thank you.

(Letter from Hendrik D. Gideonse to John D. Herzog.)

(Dr. Gideonse is the author of the article entitled "The National Program of Educational Laboratories," to which Mr. Herzog referred in the course of his testimony.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 3, 1967.*

Mr. JOHN HERZOG,
Executive Director, Harvard Research and Development Center, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: I recently became aware of the testimony you delivered before Representative Edith Green's Special Subcommittee on Education in their Boston hearings on December 3, 1966.

You have imputed a number of things to the November, 1965, *Phi Delta Kappan* article and the Office of Education's view of educational improvement which demand comment and correction. Insofar as anyone thinks of the process by which *knowledge* is created and applied about learning and education (or for that matter *any* area of human concern) it makes a great deal of sense to talk about a logical flow from research through development and demonstration to implementation. But that logical flow is vastly different from the process of changing any system so that it can accommodate the newly developed knowledge and its applications in its everyday ongoing operations.

I agree with you, therefore, that the application of anything approaching a "pipeline" model to change in the educational system would be inappropriate. It would be so because it would make it appear that improvement in the schools followed a direct linear route. We both know that is not the case. If you wish to use the word "pipeline" generally, if somewhat infelicitously, in connection with the logical description of the *knowledge-building* process, then I have no objection. But to describe the model of *change* underlying the article using the word "pipeline" is to make a fundamental mistake. One of the principal purposes of the laboratory program is to marry (not merge) more closely the logical process of the development of new knowledge and improved procedures to the empirical processes of change and growth in the educational system as we now find it. Quite to the contrary of your contention, then, the article is about a program part of whose rationale is that the "pipeline" model you describe will not work by itself. (I might add here that even the clearest explication I know