

*Rotall Pres. Conf.
Nov. 1990*

[recording began after first few minutes--Shanker was talking about Futures committee work]

...resolution of these issues which will then move forward as proposal. There are also questions as to what extent should these changes be constitutional and to what extent should we try some of them out on an extra-constitutional basis. So, in addition to a conceptual framework, there is also a question of a timetable. Ultimately, if things work well in certain ways, there would be constitutional changes, but the whole timetable and experimenting [would be done] first before imbedding them into the structure of the organization.

There is a second major issue that we have been dealing with (which mostly we have been dealing with ourselves about) and that is a question of potential merger with the NEA. The NEA relationship continues to be pretty good. You probably noticed that for about a year and half or more, maybe two years, neither the NEA nor the AFT have taken shots at each other nationally. I wrote a column that said something good about Keith Geiger's convention speech in terms of Jump Start. Keith has appeared in a number of platforms where he suggests that if legislators and business people want to be productive and positive, they ought to support the restructuring proposals of both the AFT and the NEA. On a number of platforms he has done that and surprised people... and on some legislative issues we've been in touch with them and they've been in touch with us. We've had some joint letters and other things on a number of items and we try to look for occasions when we can do that. There have some regular meetings with NEA people at the top level and there is some other luncheon that is being set up that I'll be at with Keith Geiger within the next four weeks or so.

There are merger talks about to take place between the two international affiliates. I'm the president of the International Federation of Free Teachers Unions, which is the official world trade secretary for teachers. That is, we are the only teacher international organization that has a right to bring official complaints under the procedures of international labor organization (the ILO). We have another international group called the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). There's a third group, which is the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (the OECD). This includes essentially the developed nations of the world with Japan, Canada, the United States, and the European common market. It not only has offices and money, but each country has an ambassador to the OECD. The OECD is in many ways more important than the United Nations because it's the rich man's club. They, by the way, do a tremendous amount of educational research and the [education] Ministers of these countries meet every couple of years. So when you get a privatization of schools moving in Thatcher's England, you get your research disseminated to these various Ministers in countries. I was just a keynote speaker last month in Stockholm because all the industrial countries are having the same thing happen. Namely,

they all had a baby boom at the end of World War II and now they're all getting mass retirement of teachers. So the question is, what are supply and demand issues within their countries? So, the OECD has a group called the TUAC (Trade Union Advisory Committee). They actually employ a trade unionist, full-time. There is an office to maintain relationships with the trade unions in those countries. It's the only such international body that does that and, because we are the only trade union group, we are the official group for it.

Well, the NEA over all the years has financed and been part of something called the WCOTP (World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession). Notice that this comes---both names come out of the olden days when we were the union and they were going around the world saying, "don't belong to a union, join a professional association--Organization of the Teaching Profession"...Of course, all that's muddled now. Most of their affiliates are unions. A lot of the affiliates belong to both theirs and ours. The Japanese do, the French do. Mary Futrell is now the president of their international organization. Both groups are going to meet in Geneva in January to try to merge the two organizations. The NEA delegation at the last WCOTP convention--they usually operate by consensus. There are a lot of third world countries that like the idea of two separate organizations and because the competition means that they get a lot of free trips. We're trying to wine and dine the people from Kenya to join our organization, and so are they, and so are the communist groups. So, they get one trip to Moscow, one trip to Geneva, and one trip to here. Also, a lot of these groups also say we'd like you to finance a conference for us and we'd like you to do this. So, a lot of these groups just love this international competition because they are the customers who are getting all the free samples. Also a number of them are very left-wing organizations and some of them are, basically, anti-American. So, a couple of those groups got up and attacked the AFT and attacked me. The NEA actually hit the floor and shut them up and argued against them. It showed that they seemed to have interest that actually sent the NEA delegation over to Amsterdam to see the operation that we had. So, that looks like it may well happen.

You'll remember that in my press conference at our AFT convention, I was asked a question and I made some very positive remarks about wanting a merger. Keith Geiger was then asked to respond. He wasn't totally negative. He essentially said that when he gets up in the morning one of the first things on his agenda is not merger with the AFT. But, that was a way of skirting the whole thing. Assuming that he gets re-elected, it may very well be after that there will be some more serious consideration. If there is serious consideration, it may not be a national merger--it may be state mergers. There have been some feelers in different places and there are actually some discussions going on. Florida is one place---it has hit the newspapers where it happens. In Connecticut there are some discussions.

One of the big problems, obviously, is that the NEA doesn't want to back off from its previous position. So, they tend to feel that they have a lot to lose through some direct merger, in terms of Southern states and vulnerability to the right-to-work types, of anti-collective bargaining teacher organizations. In a lot of those states the AFT presence is very small. So, there's very little to gain from merger, but there's a lot that they might lose to conservatives and to the right. They might be dead wrong on that; it might very well be that even in states like that that the excitement of a single, strong, powerful, national organization would attract lots of frightened teachers. I tend to think it would. But that has been their judgment.

We've also talked about something else, in terms of a relationship of NEA/AFT if it ever came to pass. If it comes to pass, there are several important things to see here. Suppose that you were to throw out to some of your leaders the question, "Well, what do you think would be the major impact of a merger between NEA and AFT?" and let them kick it around for a while. One of the things that they would probably not come up with, but which is definitely a very strong potential outcome, is that there might very well be a lot of negative legislation about public employees and public employee bargaining. The idea being that if we put the two organizations together we would probably go up to 3 or 4 million very quickly [because of] the combined resources of the two organizations, in terms of organizing the rest of the teachers and school-related employees, as well as other institutions such as public colleges that are now outside (either organization). Also, there are a lot of people who work for private institutions who are basically teachers, for internal training, and some of those could be organized very quickly. At any rate, an organization of 3 to 4 million people would be something where a lot of policy makers would start talking about, "Is it possible to have a union that is too powerful? Can a union with this number of members, and that kind of money, and this level of education locate in every single election district in the country?...Think of the tremendous power they have. Don't we need something to offset them? Are they too powerful? Do we have to limit it?"...

You might get a mini-Hatch Act, for instance, in states that argue that this force is too powerful. The chances are that there would be rather restrictive legislation. You've got to look at groups like the AMA and other groups that are now in many ways narrow, self-interest groups but over the years have managed to create an image of public purpose--that "hey, we're an organization that's trying to improve health care or other things in the country." In a way, the stronger, more powerful, and richer you get, the more it is absolutely essential people out there feel, see and believe that this is not just an organization that's out to kill everybody else for its own self-interest, but that has substantial public purpose. The more successful you are--well, it's a lot like what's recently happened in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles teachers recently had a lengthy strike and they were successful almost beyond belief, but there were school board members who were running in elections during the strike. What would you expect if your

school board members were running in an election while you were out on strike? If you had any school board members that favored the union, you would expect that they would lose because everybody would be p.o'd at the teachers that strike and if there's any board member that says something like, "I think the teachers may be right" or something like that--they would all lose. Well what happened, almost without exception (well, maybe one), practically every school board member endorsed by the union and who said nice things about the union got elected in the middle of the strike (re-elected or elected in the middle of the strike).

You say, "isn't that terrific." So, what's the reaction of some major people in the political and business community as the result of the union being so successful: "Well, you've got to break Los Angeles up into a number of separate districts because the unions are too damn powerful, look at that. Even when they're striking they can still control the school board. The very school board they're supposed to deal with--they can elect the people on the other side of the table. Parents, minority groups, kids, don't have a chance because the union has it all controlled. Essentially, you've got to break up the school districts to weaken the power of the union."

Now, at least temporarily, we got the wheel held. [UTLA president] Helen Bernstein met with one of the leading supporters of that and he came to the UTLA training session and they actually ended up writing a piece together for the OP-ED page opposing the dismantling of the district. Helen has done a terrific job heading off that particular problem, but it's sitting there. That was one of the reasons for the New York city school decentralization in 1968--the view that the union was too strong. We got collective bargaining in 1961. By 67-68 the view already was "they can shut the system down. They can bring the teachers out, they can get the school board to do almost anything they want." Wish that were true--it never was. [This perception persists] even when you bleed and you've got a struggle, as the teachers did in Los Angeles. It was a very painful experience for the teachers. One or two days it can be very exhilarating, but that [strike] was pretty nasty. Nevertheless, from the outside, the union [looks] so powerful you've got to break up the system.

That's the kind of thing that would happen nationally. So, now there is another piece to this that we really need to think about. Although, it has its danger, it also has a lot of pluses. If we look at the AFL-CIO right now, its holding its own membership, but holding its own means declining...because they are always two numbers you have to look at; one is how many paid-up members are there and the other is how many people are working in this country. So, as we add a million jobs a year to the economy, that essentially means that in 14 years you've got the same membership. Well, if there have been as many jobs added in the economy as you had members at the beginning and you still have the same members at the end, it means that you didn't get a single one of the 14 million new people who came on board--let alone the 85 million others that you didn't have in the first place. So, you are becoming a smaller and smaller percentage of the entire work force. Of course, there are some

pretty ominous signs out there, in spite of the efforts of the auto industry (you've got a real bad depression in that industry). We don't know whether Saturn is going to sell, but Saturn was supposed to be the thing to beat the Japanese cars. Saturn is supposed to be a good car which could have beat the Japanese car around five years ago, but meanwhile the Japanese have done a lot of different things and there is a big question mark as to whether it can sell well against the Japanese cars that are coming out now. So, the prospects over a period of time are not good. One of the things that they really need to think about, in terms of the potential NEA/AFT merger, is whether NEA and AFT (especially, in view of health care professionals being in the AFT, higher education being in the AFT, state employees being in the AFT, and school related personnel, etc.) merged like this, would not become sort of an umbrella union for all sorts of groups and people who have not felt comfortable being in a union movement before. That is whether it could represent a new kind of unionism.

If you look at other countries, many of countries that have the highest rate of unionization have two trade union movements. In the United States we have one trade union movement, but for the most part professionals and white collar people don't join unions, unless they're government employees. But if you look at all the people who are professionals out there: people who work for banks, for insurance companies, for stock brokers, for universities, and in high-tech (architects, engineers, and so forth), there is practically zero unionization, and there are huge numbers of these people. In places like Norway, Denmark and Sweden, there is a white collar professional trade union movement and there is a blue collar. They work very well together. They do everything together because they've got the same agenda. They want the same political parties to be elected, the same legislation. But, by having two trade union movements, they're dealing with the snobbery of certain occupations and professions. Namely, in most places in the world people who are more educated or work in more prestigious institutions don't want to be in the same [organization]...You know, the Groucho Marx thing, "I don't want to belong to any club that would have me." We call that Marxism!

It's snobbery, but it's something we've got to contend with. One of the things we've got to contend with is: Does the AFL-CIO have such an indelible image in the minds of large numbers of people that they would not even think of joining, and if we want a larger labor movement in this country, do we try to create in some way a organization that they feel, "Hey, that's different."

I'm not saying that we should get out of it and I'm not proposing that we get out of the AFL-CIO. It might be quite possible through some sort of huge organization, like what you would get initially with NEA and AFT, to create some sort of a new structure, new image, and stuff like that. I know that we've managed over the years to get a lot of people to join us who say, "Oh, I know you are a different kind of organization." They want to join us so they join us, in spite of affiliation. After they get in they understand the affiliation and like it.

But, that is also part of it. Could a merger between AFT and NEA result not just in the acquisition of more members for the AFL-CIO? It's one of the things we've been in business for all these years. It would be a great victory for the AFT to do that and would be a really big step for the labor movement, but do we use that occasion as a way of reaching out, projecting a different sort of picture/image and really do that as in many ways the way the CIO did? They did it independently and then merged. But is there a way of using that, just as they projected to a group of workers who were not attracted to the AFL, mainly industrial workers? Is there a way of using such a merger to reach out to huge numbers of people? Take the health care field. If we take all the unions together we've organized in this field, we have a very tiny percentage of the massive work force in that field and I don't know that progress has been made over the years. The field is growing--we spend more and more of our GNP on this. But there is no indication that without some sort of a new thrust, which would grab people in the field, that there would be a breakthrough there.

Let me move to for a minute Indiana. We had in Indiana a very expensive and very bitter campaign. I don't know whether you've been treated to some of the literature of AFSCME, but I don't know how many "Union Yes" campaigns you'd have to have to undo some of what, I would say, basically amounts to... Well, they had cartoons out that had AFT and UAW are kind of looking like huge, fat, labor bosses trying to make a back door deal to steal the dues of workers. It's the kind of stuff that an employer would put out. The big message when you look at that cartoon isn't that the AFT and the UAW are trying to steal your money, but that labor bosses, when they take your dues, are stealing your money. Obviously, the AFSCME people are trying to get a very intellectual message through, namely that that there the good labor leaders and we're the fat...bad labor leaders. But that's not the kind of thing that people who read cartoons [get].

As you know there is a dispute over one, very large unit, and we hope to get a decision very soon that would result in some re-electional voting because enough people couldn't vote. So the election is really undetermined. If we win that [unit], we will end up with the UAW as being the winners. That unit decides whether AFSCME gets the biggest share or whether UAW gets the biggest share.

Now, I know that across the country there have been lots of questions among our leadership people about is it worth it and should we have gone in? I guess a couple of things need to be said about that: One is that you can never be sure when you go in what any of these campaigns are going to amount to...I remember our California college campaign. We never thought we'd be there that long or with that many people, and with the problems, and then the outcome later on where they end up affiliating. You can't always be sure. But, let me say, if we are in the business of trying to organize these groups across the country, and we are, then when the time comes to run a campaign, you can't say, "Well, we've decided it too expensive," because you not only lose Indiana but you end up with a bunch of people in Indiana who, properly, feel that they should have gone

elsewhere. They feel betrayed and it ends up affecting you in every other place.

We would have preferred a longer period of time to build. We were building. We were growing. We had internal things going and had things gone the way we had planned we would have been in a better position down the road. As it is, we may come out of this very, very well.

You've got to look at what the consequences would have been of essentially conceding or dropping out. The other alternative was we could have gone it alone. That would have meant a greater investment, which we didn't have and it would have meant coming out with a smaller piece. This was fought like a gubernatorial campaign. These were TV commercials...I mean this was big bucks and we will end of up, when all the bills are counted, there will be very big bucks in this thing.

I'm not saying that you should end up with a position that "We agree with everything the AFT did." In any campaign you're going to find mistakes and maybe you'll find hindsight, some better ways, and maybe you would have even had the foresight to do it. But, I don't think we should be saddled out there with the notion that what we did was absolutely off the wall or wrong. When [there was] the ISEA prospects of affiliating, I heard nobody saying that we should not take them. When you take a group and a collective bargaining election comes along, one which we didn't seek at that time, the next question is do we turn around and tell our affiliate that they're out of it? That there's going to be an election and that whoever wins it's not going to be them, because they don't have the resources to do it alone and that they really should have gone elsewhere?

I hope that when this is all over that we get this unit and we come out very well. I think that one of the pluses, by the way, will be in other states where, as a result of the relationship, we will have the help or assistance or alliance with the UAW where we will be the major partner. There are a lot of states where they are politically very powerful. The long-term relationship should not be neglected.

I want to touch on election results. Those who have looked at them...The people who are drawing the conclusion that this is an election against taxes or strictly on money things really haven't looked closely. If you look closely you'll see that people who pledged that issue in all sorts of ways lost. Massachusetts was interesting...Where they elected a guy who is in favor of a very lousy tax measure but they voted down the tax measure. So, they were basically voting against Silber's personality on the governorship but voted intelligently on the money. This was a rollback, right? So, some smart group is trying to say, "Well the state has gotten in all sorts of deficit and horrible positions now. Let's make it even worse by cutting back a lot of the things they lost."

I think the bigger issue that emerges, you see it in California, I'm convinced that...and I'm now talking at the presidential level is that (--muffled--). Whether it was the Jesse Helms race or Diane Feinstein race, the major Republican issue is going to be the issue of racial quotas. Gantt did not support quotas, but that was enough of a campaign daunt during

the tail end of the debate over the Civil Rights Act and why the President vetoed it... There was no question that Gantt was ahead a number of points in the polls just before the election and in the last week and a half or so Jesse Helms ran this very emotional commercial of a white who had just found out that he had been denied a job because preferential treatment was given to a minority and his white hand was on the screen and he was crumpling his notification...Very blatant, very rough, very unwarranted against Gantt, but very effective. He won on that basis and I think that most of the people have analyzed it as that.

Diane Feinstein, early in the campaign, made a statement that she would hire people in the state on the basis of their proportion [to the population]...men, women, Blacks, Hispanics, etc...Not much attention was paid to that early in the campaign but as it got there later she got very, very close. But, there is no question that that was probably worth 5, 6, 7 and up points to turn the election. That is something that we need to watch very carefully and closely.

Now, I'd like to spend a little bit of time talking about education and reforms issues, and where we are on that, and open it up. So, if I haven't stopped by 11:15 scream, because otherwise I'll keep going. I think that you can see more and more attention being paid to school choice issues. The Milwaukee thing got reversed in the courts the other day, but not on the substance of the thing, but because it was attached to a piece of legislation which was the state budget. Apparently, there is a constitutional provision in Wisconsin which says that you can't attach legislation that benefits one particular district or constituency to general purpose legislation. I guess this will be appealed, but there is more and more of the private choice which is out there. Right in this state, there's a business group that made a report, I guess a day or so before we came here, which supports overall choice. It's an overall reform plan which was proposed and within it is a choice plan, which includes choice to private and parochial schools. So, a major business group in the state is now on record for that. That's going to keep moving.

I should talk about one other thing which is going to help these choice advocates and that is the rapid movement across the country of what I think of as a nutty type of multi-culturalism. There is a general view that we are a multi-cultural society, and the world is made up of many cultures, and therefore, the curriculum ought to be imbued with it....we ought to have a multi-cultural curriculum and especially social studies and English literature ought to be taught in a multi-cultural way.

The general idea is excellent. There is absolutely nothing wrong with it and, basically, history, social studies, and literature were moving in that direction anyway. There is more of a notion that there had been very inaccurate history, that labor hadn't been represented, women hadn't been represented, minorities hadn't been represented.

Multi-culturalism means more than that. Too many of the groups that are pushing it...I will now state it in, at least, one of its New York state lives. There was a conference

recently in Atlanta, a national conference which brought some of the figures together and the New York thing goes like this. "Kids learn or don't learn depending upon whether they have self-esteem and for a couple of hundred years the schools in the United States developed the self-esteem of white kids by having them read literature, history books and social studies books which is essentially based on the notion that all the great things that have ever been done in the world were done by dead, white men. So that created a kind of arrogance on the part of whites that made them feel great about themselves and that is why white folks are doing so well in school.

On the other hand, all those who didn't see themselves in those pictures, or in that history, or in that literature, where made to feel that they were out of it, and that they were inferior, and that were no better, and therefore they had very low self-esteem and they didn't try hard or they felt they couldn't make it. And that what is needed to an answer to this are a number of different curricula (one of which would be Afro-centric, another which would be centered on Hispanic--or perhaps not even Hispanic in general but--Mexican, or Cuban, or Puerto Rican, or Chinese, or Japanese, or whatever). That essentially there ought to be a separate curriculum for each group of kids." In New York they talk about re-writing the science curriculum, the math curriculum, and everything. To do it from the point of view of each group and the purpose of the curriculum should be to raise the self-esteem of each of those groups. In New York state there's even a thing that says that the purpose of it should be to, "lower the arrogance of White students," which means to lower their self-esteem. That's in there. Just kind of figure out what the chances are of getting that adopted in New York state or anywhere else. Nevertheless, that's what is out there.

Side two

....perfectly legitimate curriculum people in this field, but it also had people like this fellow Jeffreys from New York City University, who basically is a racist except that what he says is that, "white folks are inferior because they are cold and that people of the whatever..." He's got people divided in two kinds and people of color are superior (by the way he means it in his gut). He's rather violent in his views and expression.

Well, you've got to ask yourself what is the justification for having public schools in this country. What's the best argument if in your state they decide they want to send some kids with public money to parochial schools or other schools. Our best argument is what--the tax payer is paying money to have everybody get their own education, not a separate education for Blacks, and Whites, and Jews, and Catholics, and Farrakan, and Klu Klux Klan, and...

The whole purpose for funding public schools is, not just to get kids to read, write and do mathematics, but to get kids in our society to learn to respect each other, and each other's groups and cultures, and so forth. The whole idea of the common school--that's why our country has succeeded where other countries have failed. But then you have to ask, How can you

even use an argument like this if we end up with schools where each ethnic group has a separate curriculum which is radically different from every other curriculum? Essentially what you're saying is, "Don't send your kid to a private school, we can give him the same separate education right here in the public school where he will never meet with or see any of these other folks." That's very, very destructive.

There are a number of things that are happening, in terms of negative news stuff, that's coming out of an effort to reform the schools--one of them came out of L.A. another one came out of New York City. In these places basically the management of the school system, the principals for the most part, do not like the notion that there is going to be shared decision making. What's happening in New York City is that the principals, whenever the press talks to them about what's going on in your school have said, "We don't really know what's going on in the school because there's shared decision making, so we don't have the right to say anything or do anything anymore." What your starting to get is newspaper articles...A similar thing happened out in Los Angeles--where the Board of Ed...I mean, they just started this thing and the Board of Ed hires some outfit to do an evaluation. Imagine that school opened in September. I don't know when the evaluation took place. It couldn't have been this month and had to have been September and October, which is the first two months when people are back in school and trying this. What do they get but an evaluation which Helen Bernstein found out about and the board said, "Don't worry this is just are internal stuff. We want to know what's going on." Then, of course, it gets leaked to the press and there is a story out there saying that teachers are confused, they're not sure, the committees don't know what to do, and it makes it look like the whole place is all falling apart. That's the whole strategy...to go in early and get a very early evaluation. It'd be like you just got elected in a collective bargaining election, and you don't even have your demands put together or your bargaining team, and some outfit does a poll to find out what you got out of collective bargaining so far. Well, hell, most of your people wouldn't even know what it is yet. That's what they're doing. So, we've got some substantial problems because of management resistance, especially middle management resistance.

Basically there are three issues in restructuring schools, and they are all very hard to do, and the three issues are not presently being addressed anywhere because they all are very hard. The first issue has to do with restructuring the staffing of schools. We are already in this country hiring a substantial number of teachers who are semi-literate and semi-numerate. As more and more teachers retire who met older standards and there is more and more competition from college graduates of the baby busts period, we will get more and more people who meet low standards coming in and so the first issue can we organize a school more like a hospital, or a law firm, or an accounting firm, or an engineering firm, where there are a small number who are paid a lot more, but who also have on the team paraprofessionals, maybe two different levels of teachers--board certified/not board certified--interns and

residents, and the use of some technology and even the use of some volunteers. Now, obviously using a team means getting away from the self-contained classroom, it means essentially more adults, fewer teachers, more highly paid teachers, the use of some volunteers, some teachers.

That structure and that pattern, because without it we will end up within the next 10 or 15 years hiring a huge number of people who are really at the lowest of standards and we will have a much bigger problem than we now have in defending to the public the notion of teacher rewards, the notion of tenure, notions of anything else. But, the more people you get into a position, and locked them in as teachers, who are visibly of lower caliber...Now, I know what our argument will be. "You're not paying enough, but that's over in most of our states with fiscal problems. There was a substantial increase nationally in the last eight years or so and it would be one of those things where at the same time we got the increase, standards lowered--not because of the increase, it would have been even worse if we didn't get the increase. What was happening was demographic change. The people of one generation who met one set of standards were learning, whereas people of another---and baby boom time when there were lots of people out there looking for jobs is against this---but we'll end up getting blamed for it.

The second element of restructuring has to do with how kids learn, having a school in which there is a minimum of teacher talk. That means schools where kids are using videotapes, audiotapes, computers, seminars (where the kids are talking to each other), older kids helping younger kids. That is a variety of things which get away from the lecture as the major basis of the delivery system. So, that's the second thing...Very few places like that. Along with that would be things like, teachers and kids staying with each other for longer periods of time than one semester or one year. So, that's the second and very hard to do, again very hard, because a lot of things have to be re-thought.

The third aspect has to do with a curriculum and that is are we, in addition to teaching kids about the traditional stuff, are we incorporating the kinds of stuff that Sternberg or Gardner talk about. Namely, are there aspects of the curriculum that deal with innovation, creativity (do kids get credit for asking good questions, rather than only for answers?), and things that deal with practical intelligence. Are there aspects of the curriculum which have kids actually doing things?...So, a street smart person can be a winner not just the person who's the manipulator of words and numbers, that is the intellectual person versus the practical person, to allow those people to shine and to give people an experience in all those things.

Those are three aspects. So far, what we have are a lot of procedural things. Site-based management, shared decision making, committees that approve changes. All these are procedural. These are the three substantive pieces. To the extent to which you can see these things happening, you know that you have to fundamental restructuring, to the extent to which you can't see them happening you don't have restructuring. Because you could have school-based management

and just have the principal being the dictator of the school and doing the same damn thing he always did for the next thirty years. You can have school based management without any change at all. As a matter of fact, school based management could be negative, because with a central contract and a central administration you sometimes have a much broader view. Whereas, the guy at the school...I mean, hell a lot of what we got in collective bargaining was to prevent the little dictators in each school from...You know to create some form of justice and uniformity.

So, we really still have not figured out how to do it except to try to get...The difficulty of job is pretty clear. I think the notion that we should try to find one or two schools within a district and try to bring about some change that is very substantial there...Because these three changes are all so big to try to do the overall in a whole system would probably be impossible. Everybody would be experimenting at the same time and we'd probably end up with a lot of confusion, a lot of the kinds of articles that are coming out now, except that they would be more real (in terms of the confusion there). We are trying in a number of places to work with one or two schools that have come forward and said, "The principal's willing, the school board's willing, the union is willing." Furthermore, we're trying to gear up the AFT, in terms of its professional development staff, so that it shifts away from some of things it has been doing, and if you have a school, and you're able to do it, we are able to come in and be of some help in terms of trying to get a numbers of models that really are turned around.

Well, let me stop here for questions, except I want to share one story that I heard. Barry started with a story and Ed had a few. This is one I got from Brezinski a couple of weeks ago. He had come from the Soviet Union and he was part of a group of economists and politicians. They were meeting with a bunch of Russians and they had a ten day meeting on how to establish a free market system. At the end of the meeting (the end of the ten days) the Russians got up and thanked the Americans profusely. They said this was the greatest meeting they ever had and that they were really going to work on it. They were sure in a year or two they would have a market and that this meeting had contributed a great deal to it. As the Americans turned around and were about to head to there airplane, one of the Russians said, "Now, just wait a minute. Please, I understood everything that you said about the market, but there is just one thing I didn't understand. In a free market system who determines the prices?"