

CREATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Guy Benveniste

ABSTRACT

This is a personal account by Guy Benveniste, now retired from the Berkeley faculty, of his participation in 1961-1963 in the creation of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) at UNESCO in Paris. The account covers the early days of financing education at the World Bank (IBRD), UNESCO's early interest in educational planning including various major regional Ministers of Education Conferences for Asia and Africa, and the UNESCO Santiago Conference of Ministers of Education and of Economic Planning in March 1962. The account focuses on the problems of coordinating foreign aid to education and the potential conflicts that might arise as the World Bank began to finance education projects. Benveniste relates how various multilateral and bilateral agencies sought to avoid potential conflicts by agreeing to establish an autonomous institute that could assist in such coordination. He goes on to relate how UNESCO finally reached a direct agreement with the World Bank, how meanwhile the Institute was established, and how the Institute began to train educational planners and conduct research. The account provides many details on the bureaucratic intricacies of creating a new international agency. It points out that what finally happened was not exactly intended and the path of change is not always straight. The account ends in March 1963 when the IIEP held its first seminar.

INTRODUCTION

I have written this personal account to contribute to the documentation about the history of the educational planning movement. Personal accounts are shaped and limited by memories and documentation. I happen to have been involved between 1961 and 1965 with the US aid program, educational and cultural affairs at the State Department, education at the World Bank (IBRD), and the first years of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) at the United Nations Educational, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). John Hall, now retired from the IIEP, has been most helpful in finding and transmitting relevant documents and editing this text. My account pays attention to the strategies pursued by organizations. I will show that the IIEP was born out of concerns at the World Bank and UNESCO, the Ford Foundation acting as catalyst (or midwife). I also will want to illustrate that bringing about change involves many people in different roles and results from a fair amount of fortuitous and unpredictable events. My account is based on personal experience, the people I knew at the time, the changing roles we played. Like all personal accounts, it is incomplete.

PLANNING

In the 1950s and 1960s planning was considered necessary for the economic and social development of third world nations. As backdrop there was the experience of socialist countries. There was indicative planning in France. There had been planning during World War II and subsequently in British overseas territories. There also were management considerations. It was argued that "rational integral planning" would avoid the inevitable disorders, waste, corruption, or overlap of plain everyday politics. Importantly, it would allow the coordination of bilateral and multilateral public and private foreign aid. There existed no consensus about the meaning of "planning." No one could state what worked or did not. This explains why the IIEP was conceived, in June 1962, as a place where, "The results of the work going on throughout the world can be brought together; where a synthesis, so to speak, of this work can take place; where new ideas can be advanced and discussed and where practitioners and potential practitioners in educational planning can take courses and get useful experience" (UNESCO, 1962, p. 1).

UNESCO

In the late 1950s UNESCO became fully involved in planning promotion, discourse, and action. But our story begins elsewhere. In Colombia, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner, a young Spanish engineer who had completed a plan for technical education, was recruited in 1956 by the recently appointed Minister of Education Gabriel Betancourt-Mejia, to prepare a Five-Year Overall Education Plan along the lines

of the development policies pursued by Dr. Raoul Prebisch, the influential head of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA). Several years later, in June 1958, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner was in Washington at the Organization of American States (OAS), undertaking the first Inter-American Conference on Overall Educational Planning, so as to share more widely the Colombian initiative. At that point in time, he was recruited by Luther Evans, then UNESCO's Director General, to come to Paris as an expert in educational planning. In that capacity he laid out a broad program of proposed planning activities for UNESCO. These included regional conferences, establishing regional training centers for educational planners, sending advisory missions on educational planning at the request of member states, and last but not least, the idea of creating an International Institute for Educational Planning (Diez Hochleitner, 2007).

With funding from the UN Special Fund and later the Development Program, UNESCO began sending planning missions to various third world countries. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, then UNESCO Assistant Director General, an economist and student of Lord Keynes, was encouraging many of these activities together with René Maheu, the Deputy Director General who was to become the new DG in 1961. At the same time UNESCO organized a succession of meetings of Ministers of Education. Broad and bold target plans for primary education in Asia were discussed: at Karachi in late 1959, for primary and secondary level for Africa at Addis Ababa in May 1961, and then at a meeting in Tokyo in April 1962 when the Asian targets of Karachi were reviewed. At all these meetings the need for training educational planners and to coordinate external assistance was stressed. A major meeting bringing together Ministers of Education and Ministers of Planning was to take place later in March 1962 in Santiago, Chile (Cerych, 1965). By then UNESCO had become concerned that economists and planners also should attend. Michel Debeauvais, of the French Institute for the Study of Economic and Social Development (IEDES, Sorbonne, Paris), was asked by René Maheu to travel to Latin America before the Conference to ensure that both Ministers of Education and Ministers of Planning be present in Santiago (Debeauvais, 2007).

One reason for this concern was that UNESCO was not the only international organization moving in the new field of the economics and planning of education. In 1961 the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) replaced the Marshall Plan's Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) created after General Marshall's speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947. The OEEC and later the OECD were concerned with chronic and persistent shortages of scientific and trained workers. This brought them to establish in the late 1950s a Study Group on the Economics of Education. This Group began a series of studies and activities, including a concern for the organizational aspects of education and manpower planning. At the beginning of the 1960s the OECD was planning two major activities in education: an international conference to take place in October 1961 in Washington on the Economics of Education and a major multi-country manpower planning project called the OECD Mediterranean Regional Project involving Portugal, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey and Yugoslavia (Gass, 1967).

As these international organizations moved in a new field of activity, there were many opportunities for both cooperation and competition between them. And at this point a third actor emerged: The World Bank.

THE WORLD BANK (IBRD)

In September 1960 the scope of lending at the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) was expanded. In addition to providing loans financed on the world's bond market, a soft loan (low interest) window was added: The International Development Association (IDA). It was financed mostly by member state contributions. Soft or low interest loans were intended for countries or projects that were not expected to rapidly create economic wealth and consequently were less able to repay conventional loans.

With the IDA in place, the financing of education and other social sectors became possible. Until then, the Bank had concentrated on infrastructure projects such as dams, ports, roads, power plants, and railroads. There had been long delays in initiating and terminating projects, and these delays were often due to insufficient educated and trained workers. A mission to Tunisia headed by Andrew Kamarck, Director of the IBRD Economic Development Institute, had found that the economic infrastructure left

by the French was under utilized. There was no need for the kinds of loans the Bank made. What was needed was more entrepreneurial activity. This led to thinking about investing in education (Kamarck, 2007). As economists formulated the notion of human capital, they provided a rationale and methodologies to justify investments in education. The IBRD moved into education. At first, the Bank would assume that the expected additional stream of income generated by more educated workers would legitimize such investments, just like savings in the maintenance of lorries provided legitimation for road investments. Later, in 1963, the Bank would consider using manpower forecasting for that purpose (Heyneman, 2005).

In 1961 the Bank began searching for staff to carry on educational investments. The first selected to head the new education group was Ricardo Diez Hochleitner. At that time he was still working in Paris but also helping Gabriel Betancourt-Mejia who was now at the Organization of American States (OAS) in Washington. They were elaborating a Ten Year Education Plan for Latin America under the “Alliance for Progress,” which President John F. Kennedy had called for in his inaugural address on January 20 of that year. That plan would be issued in 1963, but meanwhile Ricardo was commuting back and forth each week between the two capitals. The second selected was Duncan S. Ballantine, former president of both Reed College in Portland, Oregon, and Robert College in Istanbul. He was to go on a Bank mission to Colombia, to take place early in 1962, and would join the staff later. And I was the third to be selected. I was working on economic development at the Stanford Research Institute in California and had been lent to the Labouisse Task Force. President Kennedy, very soon after his inauguration, asked Henry L. Labouisse to head a task force to reorganize US foreign assistance programs. This work led in September 1961 to the Foreign Assistance Act, which separated military from non-military aid. In November the President established the US Agency for International Development (USAID). To return to our account: Mr. Labouisse, a UN civil servant, recommended me to the World Bank, and I was invited to join the Bank staff in November 1961.

PHILIP H. COOMBS AT THE STATE DEPARTMENT

I declined the Bank offer. Instead, I accepted to become a Special Assistant to the first American Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Philip (Phil) H. Coombs had come from the Ford Foundation to join the Kennedy administration, at the suggestion of Chester Bowles who remained Under Secretary of State for only 10 months in 1961. I joined Phil on December 1, 1961. The new unit at the State Department had many tasks, and these were exciting days. Phil was very busy as mentioned in his own recollections of the origins of the IIEP. He had much to do with improving cultural relations with the Soviet Union. He also chaired in October 1961 most of the sessions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Washington Conference on Economic Growth, and Investments in Education. There, for the first time, he floated the idea of having the OECD and UNESCO jointly sponsor an institute for educational planning (Coombs, 1992).

I had three tasks early in 1962: a) To prepare the US position for the March 1962 UNESCO Santiago Conference; b) To plan and undertake a mission to Spain to identify post Franco leaders who could be invited to the USA under our cultural exchange programs. At that time, Gabriel Betancourt-Mejia and Ricardo Diez Hochleitner had many contacts with Phil. I worked closely with Ricardo on arrangements for that mission; and, c) Phil had been asked by President Kennedy during a White House meeting to make sure USAID paid attention to education. I was to coordinate that activity. I therefore attended interagency meetings. During that period USAID was shifting from providing direct budgetary assistance to foreign governments to insisting on host country national planning to guide US allocations of aid for broader long-term development. The British were already insisting on five year plans for its colonies as a condition for receiving assistance under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts (Williams, 2007).

I attended the Santiago Conference in March 1962 with Phil. This is a story in itself and I will not go into much detail. Suffice to say that the US Delegation was very heavily involved with the UNESCO Secretariat and the Director General in discussions of what a “plan for Latin American Education” could be or could mean. The UNESCO Secretariat, actually a young American statistician named Erwin Solomon, prepared a region-wide target plan for primary, secondary, and higher education similar to

the plans prepared at Karachi and Addis Ababa. He had used target enrollments and obtained their estimated cost. He then had used the GNP estimates of a well-respected economist, Paul Rosenstein-Rodan, and applied target percentages to be devoted to education by Latin American governments to obtain resources. The difference between costs and resources had to be provided by donors, and a formal commitment for earmarking this level of aid was sought at the Conference. The US Delegation insisted that planning had to take place at the country and not the regional level. In that regard we reflected very recent US policy. USAID had just decided to tailor its programs to host country integrated national planning. At a rather dramatic plenary session of the Conference, Phil, helped by Rashi Fein, a member of the President Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers and on our delegation, demonstrated that if one used the estimates of future GNP, targeted at Punta del Este early in 1961 for the "Alliance for Progress," which were higher than those of Rosenstein-Rodan, the proposed plan resulted in a surplus and no foreign aid was needed. How could the "Declaration of Santiago" repudiate the "Alliance for Progress"? As a result René Maheu got to know Phil and me quite well as we participated in endless and sometimes heated negotiations. A compromise was reached. The "Declaration of Santiago" called for countries to elaborate national plans including education. Several delegations asked for foreign aid coordination. But the "Declaration" also urged the signatories of the "Alliance for Progress" to target no less than 15% of public foreign aid to education (Cerych, 1965, pp. 19-20).

I went to Spain in April 1962. While there, to my complete surprise, I received a cable from Phil informing me that he had resigned from the State Department effective April 19. I returned to Washington on April 28. Phil was not in town. I immediately arranged to have lunch with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who was a Special Assistant to President Kennedy. Schlesinger told me that Phil had been testifying in Congress to obtain a larger budget. He had lectured Congressman John J. Rooney, a Democrat from Brooklyn, New York, for past failures to sufficiently fund cultural affairs at State. Rooney, who chaired Appropriations for State, did not appreciate this. He placed considerable pressure on the President to get rid of Phil. The President had resisted several previous Congressional attempts to dislodge other appointments. By the time Rooney complained, President Kennedy felt it was time to assuage Congress. Phil was told to resign immediately. He was told to announce he was returning to the Ford Foundation in New York, which was not true. Schlesinger admitted that the firing had been far too draconian: "Someone goofed somewhere."

I attended the swearing in of his successor Lucius (Luke) D. Battle. I called the World Bank. I was told the offer from the previous November was still good. I accepted it. We were in early May 1962. I would transfer to the Bank staff on June 8, 1962. Meanwhile Phil, who had not gone to the Ford Foundation, was in Essex, Connecticut, and at times in Washington at the Brookings Institution.

THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE IIEP: JUNE 25-26, 1962

Before leaving my post in the State Department, sometime in May, a request from the US mission to UNESCO landed on the desk of my colleague Robert H. B. Wade for an American expert to attend a meeting on the IIEP in Paris in June. We shared an office, and he consulted me. Time was very short; I recommended myself. Wade and I went to see Lucius Battle, and Battle accepted to send me. Wade also would go to Paris later. He became permanent US representative to UNESCO in 1964.

During the rest of the month of May 1962, I spent considerable time consulting about the IIEP. I went to New York to meet with the Ford Foundation. I went to the Bank and met with Ricardo Diez Hochleitner and Hugh Ripman, who headed Technical Operations where the education group was housed. I also consulted with Phil on the phone. As he relates, in his account of the origins of the IIEP, René Maheu had contacted him (Coombs, 1992). We discussed the idea of the IIEP and the need for autonomy. The Bank and the Ford Foundation had management concerns. They were preoccupied with the duplication and potential conflict between international and bilateral missions sent to advise on education. Potential conflict between the recommendations of different missions could lead to conflict between donors. Planning was seen as a way out. It had already been suggested that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) might undertake this function since the membership of the OECD included the principal donors. But the OECD was not part of the UN. UNESCO was strongly opposed to that idea. Instead, the institute Ricardo had included in his original plan of action

for UNESCO and that Phil had suggested at the OECD Conference was now taking shape. It would be sponsored by the Bank and UNESCO and other donors. It would be able to send missions to coordinate the actions of donors. The Ford Foundation was interested. Ricardo discussed it with other Bank directors including Richard H. Demuth who would undertake the necessary negotiations later on. The idea of the IIEP took importance. All these conversations centered on the idea of an autonomous institute. Many suggestions were made as to how to achieve autonomy. These went as far as suggesting that the IIEP be created as an autonomous new institution with its own international treaty within the UN. That idea was obviously far fetched, but it indicates the level of preoccupation.

I attended the Paris meeting of the Consultative Committee. By then, I was already on the staff of the Bank, but went there as representing the State Department. Harry Curran of the IBRD Paris office represented the Bank. At first, the Committee was chaired temporarily by Malcolm Adiseshiah, UNESCO's Assistant DG. I happened, by chance, to sit next to Hellmut Becker of the Max-Planck Institute for Educational Research in Berlin. He knew Phil, and when he found out I had worked for him, he asked what had happened to Phil, why he had resigned from the State Department. I recounted the story and told him also about my consultations with the Ford Foundation and the Bank. At the start of the meeting, Malcolm Adiseshiah informed us we would elect our Chair and Vice Chair, and that UNESCO would provide the rapporteur. I did not know what the rapporteur did at such meetings. To my surprise Becker objected strongly and nominated me as rapporteur. I was elected. I did not know our elected Chair, Sir Alexander Carr Saunders, but I had worked in Santiago with Paulo de Berrêdo Carneiro, the Vice Chair. The rapporteur, I found out, writes the final Committee report and has therefore some limited influence on the outcome.

At one point, I was able to brief the Committee about my conversations at the Bank and the Ford Foundation. I explained why the Bank and the Foundation thought that an autonomous institute, benefiting from academic independence to conduct research, also would be able to send impartial missions to coordinate donor aid to education. I mentioned that they might be willing to support the Institute at least in its formative years. But Malcolm Adiseshiah objected. It was clear to him that UNESCO and only UNESCO should send such missions and be responsible for aid coordination. After all, UNESCO was the "conscience of the world on education." He also saw autonomy in a different light. He argued that the UNESCO Institute of Education in Hamburg, Germany, had sufficient autonomy. The DG appoints each member of their Governing Board, and he also appoints the Director. But they run their own programs. The UNESCO Institute in Hamburg had more autonomy than the IBRD Economic Development Institute, which, he pointed out, was a mere department within the Bank. Why insist on so much autonomy for the IIEP? The final report I wrote in July stated that "a lengthy discussion" took place. As I recall, Hellmut Becker took a leading role in our discussions of the IIEP statutes. Those finally recommended by our Committee gave more autonomy to the Institute than those adopted later on by the General Conference. We had the Board both select and appoint the Director. The DG only appointed his representative on the Board. Other members of the Board were appointed by other UN institutions or elected by existing Board members. Malcolm Adiseshiah dissented, and this was noted in the report. The report also stated that the Institute, once staffed and established, would send missions to advise on foreign aid. Malcolm Adiseshiah again dissented and he promised to draft further documents on the subject. That matter did not appear settled.

Before leaving Paris I met with René Maheu. I brought him up to date on the work of the Committee, and we discussed the resignation of Phil Coombs. I explained the situation at the World Bank, the mission and autonomy problem. We discussed the possibility of having Phil head the Institute and the fact that Phil would be seen as a desirable Director by both the Bank and the Ford Foundation.

THE EDUCATION DIVISION AT THE WORLD BANK

At the end of June 1962, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner, head of our new education group, Duncan Ballantine, and I were at the Bank under Hugh Ripman, in the Technical Operations Department. The formal creation of the Education Division did not take place until February 5, 1963. Ballantine went to Tunisia in an "accelerated" mission in the footsteps of a fall 1961 UNESCO mission headed by Michel Debeauvais of IEDES in Paris. A first IDA soft loan for education was made to Tunisia as early as

September 1962 (Ballantine, 1986).

We had several tasks: First, we had to convince more traditional European finance people that investments in education would not reduce the attractiveness of Bank bond issues. With the help of Americans, familiar with school bond issues, we were able to assuage these fears. Second, we had to have our methodologies accepted within the Bank. We argued that expected additional income streams could justify investments in education because that methodology seemed more similar to the methodologies used in other sectors financed by the Bank such as transportation. This would mean the Bank would tend to select vocational training investments, in contrast to UNESCO, which, until then, would tend to want to articulate the various components of education systems. This led us back to the issue of mission conflict. I briefed the Bank and the Ford Foundation about the Paris meeting on the IIEP and went to work as rapporteur of the Consultative Committee. At this point in time a tentative decision to sponsor an autonomous Institute was emerging.

In September 1962, I went on a month-long Bank mission to Afghanistan to study a second soft loan for education. The mission was headed by Ahmed Tukan, a Palestinian educator. We were concerned about aid coordination and visited UNESCO in Paris, FAO in Rome, the UN Economic Commission for Asia in Bangkok, and the Ford Foundation in New Delhi. Later, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner would head a mission and make several visits to help the Royal Afghan Government formulate their request. The second soft loan for education was approved for Afghanistan in 1964.

Meanwhile, in that summer and early fall of 1962, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner found time to work with me on IIEP matters. The Bank, UNESCO, and the Ford Foundation were exchanging formal indications of intent to finance the IIEP in its initial years if and when approved by the UNESCO General Conference. Ricardo was drafting the letters the Bank was sending to UNESCO and the Ford Foundation. But his contribution did not stop there. He had contacts in the UNESCO Secretariat. He also drafted the responses of René Maheu to the Bank and to the Ford Foundation. During that period from June to September, the Ford Foundation acted as catalyst (or midwife). When problems arose or opposition began to build, we were able to point out, that “The Ford Foundation thinks it is a great idea” or, “The Ford Foundation would never approve of that” and when on the phone to someone at the Ford Foundation we would say, “But the Bank or UNESCO insist on it.”

THE FORMATIVE IIEP

Upon my return from Paris in late June 1962, I sought out Phil to tell him about the Paris meeting, my conversations at the Ford Foundation and at the Bank. In all three institutions his becoming the first Director of the IIEP was seen as highly desirable. In fact, at the Foundation there had been considerable resentment at the shabby treatment Phil had received at the State Department. I found him in Essex, Connecticut. I told him about Paris, the Bank, and what his friends at the Ford Foundation wanted him to do. I also explained the opposition of Malcolm Adiseshiah. We had a good dinner at a fish restaurant, and this is when I first claimed I had “hired” Phil to become the first Director.

I kept in touch with Hellmut Becker who understood fully the procedures of UNESCO. He assured me everything would work out. He had made sure that his colleague Friedrich Edding would be involved in the three-person Working Party charged with reviewing the recommendations of our Consultative Committee just before the UNESCO General Conference in the fall of 1962.

In due time, Phil was invited by René Maheu to attend the General Conference and present the proposal for the IIEP. It was fortuitous that Phil knew the head of the Russian delegation, who was reportedly opposed to the idea. There was considerable uncertainty given the known opposition of Malcolm Adiseshiah, the Assistant DG. A concession was made. The Working Party modified, somewhat, the degree of autonomy we had recommended. The Board would select the Director but the DG would appoint. Thus a veto was provided to UNESCO. At that time the Bank was still concerned with the mission problem and the Institute was thought to be the solution. René Maheu supported the proposal. The General Conference voted unanimously to adopt the recommendations of the Working Party. The French Government pledged to provide it with a building.

Malcolm Adiseshiah was only defeated temporarily. The proposed role of the Institute as a sponsor of missions to coordinate foreign aid did not survive six months. People in the UN objected. If the Bank

was to begin to finance several social sectors, new institutes would have to be created. Such proliferation made no sense. UN pressure was applied on the Bank to reach an agreement with UNESCO. This agreement was reached later. As a result, in 1964 Ricardo Diez Hochleitner would transfer back from the IBRD in Washington, to head a new Office of Educational Planning and Finance at UNESCO under Gabriel Betancourt-Mejia, who, meanwhile, had become the Assistant Director General for Education. Malcolm Adiseshiah would become Deputy Director General in 1963. But the General Conference had voted: the semi-autonomous IIEP had been approved.

EARLY DAYS OF THE INSTITUTE

Prior to the first meeting of the IIEP Board, while still in the US, Phil became the Director Designate of the Institute. As of January 1, 1963, I was assigned by the Bank to spend one day a week working for him in Washington. The Board had to be brought to life and meet. We had to make arrangements to obtain space and staff in Paris. In May the Bank asked me to accompany Phil for two weeks in Paris. We arrived on May 1, and stayed at the Hotel Duquesnes. We obtained three small offices in the basement of the UNESCO building. Madeleine Alpert, the first secretary, occupied one, Charles Berkowitch, our administrator, took the second, and Phil and I were to share the larger third one. This never worked when Phil was around, and I would retreat and occupy the “observer” desk of the World Bank in the General Conference auditorium. I was, after all, on the Bank staff. We saw no indication that the French Government was actively obtaining a building for us, as promised at the General Conference.

The Bank transferred me and my family to Paris in June 1963. I remained on the Bank’s staff until I could be appointed at the IIEP on October 14. The IIEP was to reimburse the Bank later. Those early days were spent preparing for a meeting of the Board, selecting the first staff members, and looking for a building. The latter took considerable time. We decided we could not wait for something to happen. We decided to embarrass the French Government. We would make appointments in various Ministries and ask if space could be provided for our Institute. The Ministry in charge of French refugees from the war in Algeria occupied a lovely building bordering the Champs de Mars on Avenue Charles Floquet, very close to the UNESCO headquarters in the 7th arrondissement. The work of that Ministry was coming to an end. We had high hopes for that location. The Minister was charming but could not help us. Phil also recounts our meeting with Andre Malraux, then Minister of Culture and with the Mayor of Paris. All these visits were unsuccessful (Coombs, 1992).

Meanwhile, I was still at my Bank desk in the auditorium on September 30, 1962, when Yuri Gagarin, the first man in space, addressed UNESCO. My desk was high in the back next to the center aisle. When Gagarin finished his speech, he came up the aisle followed by René Maheu. Gagarin saw me writing, maybe he thought I was an important newspaper reporter. He stopped, shook my hand several times and beamed. René Maheu looked very puzzled. I tried to mimic to him that I had no other place to work. Maybe that influenced Maheu: if I was such a good friend of Gagarin, the IIEP should get a building?

We needed space for the new international staff. Raymond F. Lyons, an English social scientist who had been a consultant on human resources at the OECD, and Raymond Poinant, a Frenchman who was the rapporteur for education under the French Plan and a member of the Conseil d’Etat, were joining us. We were arranging to transfer George Skorov, a Russian who had been on the staff of the World Economy and International Affairs Institute in Moscow, from his UNESCO appointment to the IIEP. Secretaries were being interviewed. Our new Board headed by Sir Sydney Caine, who was Director of the London School of Economics and included Hellmut Becker, was beginning to be concerned. Poinant and Maheu probably made phone calls. The French Government finally came to life, and we were offered a dilapidated villa, at 7, rue Eugène Delacroix situated on a very large lot. This was across the Seine from UNESCO headquarters, in a plush part of Paris: the 16th arrondissement. Phil accepted, although at the time it was supposed to be a provisional solution. We immediately asked for a temporary prefabricated conference building, which Poinant, who had worked on French standards for school construction, knew existed and could be readily obtained. Other new staff included Jane King. She worked on a catalogue of educational planning training and research institutions. Tony Wheeler worked on a bibliography of educational planning. Jacqueline Schwab became our librarian. Phil also hired two

consultants: John Vaizey of Oxford University to prepare a seminar at Bellagio on priorities for research and Hector Correa of Pittsburgh University to work on our first Latin American seminar. Other staffers included Monique Roche, Jacqueline Bouquemont (later to wed John Hall), Sonia Brodie-Smith, Nicole Leclerc (who worked with me), Monique Amand, and Harold Rose.

During five weeks, in April and May 1964, we held that first Latin American seminar in conference facilities at UNESCO headquarters (the prefabricated conference building was not erected in time). Some 80 or so participants came from nine Latin American countries, Europe, the Soviet Union, the USA, the UN, and several other agencies. Phil, Lyons, Poignant, and I were on hand. Good friends were there: Gabriel Betancourt-Mejia, now Assistant Director General for Education at UNESCO (father of Ingrid); Ricardo Diez Hochleitner, still at the Bank; Ladislav Cerych from the Atlantic Institute; Ronald Gass from the OECD; Albert Baez, head of the Office of Science Teaching at UNESCO (father of Joan); Fred Harbison from Princeton; Michel Debeauvais and Sylvain Lourié both at the time with IEDES in Paris (Sylvain, my best friend at the Lycée du Parc Imperial in Nice in 1941--we recognized each other at the seminar); Peter Williams of the Overseas Development Institute in London; and, many others. The seminar was a success. Interestingly, foreign aid assistance coordination was still a topic. Harry Curran of the IBRD mentioned the agreements being negotiated between the IBRD, IDA, UNESCO, and the FAO (Lyons, 1965). Many seminar participants would play important roles in the educational planning movement: both Poignant and Debeauvais would become Directors of the IIEP. Lourié also would head the IIEP and culminate his career as Assistant Director General for Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation at UNESCO. Ricardo Diez Hochleitner would serve four years at UNESCO to become, after 1968, Under Secretary of State for Education in Madrid where he initiated a major reform of Spanish education. He would conclude his career as President of the Club of Rome.

The last night of the seminar we held a roaring Latin American party at the old villa in the 16th arrondissement with food, music, and dancing. Roger Grégoire, head of the European Productivity Agency, was a seminar participant. He was a tall, imposing man, decorated member of the Conseil d'Etat. Raymond Lyons, our British senior staff member, was also tall, a careful man prone to wry humor; I would say very English. I want you, dear reader, to remember as I do, that late that night with all the music, at one point Roger Grégoire and Raymond Lyons were dancing a duet together on top of a desk to the acclaim of all of us.

The International Institute for Educational Planning had been launched.

CONCLUSIONS

Much of our current literature on educational planning, or on planning in general, did not exist in 1961. We had very little experience. The field was new, at least to most of the education people with whom I was involved. We knew very little about politics. In fact, we distrusted politicians. We thought of planning as a technical professional activity divorced from politics. I would go on and publish *The Politics of Expertise* in 1972, but that was much later. At that time, many of us were involved in foreign aid and the problems of coordination of foreign aid loomed large. We hoped planning would help coordinate and rationalize these activities. The international and bilateral aid agencies were concerned with this problem and sought solutions. The OECD, UNESCO, IBRD, the Foundations, the bilateral aid programs were all interested. There were turf considerations. My purpose here was to show that this search led to the creation of an Institute with considerable autonomy. This IIEP did not solve the aid coordination problem, but it went on to widely contribute to research and training in educational planning. It is now a thriving institution with a large permanent modern building, which the French Government finally built on the same site: 7, rue Eugene Delacroix. You will ask me: "What is the lesson from all this?" I guess the lesson is that the path to change is not always straight, and our understanding of educational planning evolved and is still evolving.

REFERENCES

- Ballantine, D. S. (1986). *Summary of oral transcript*. Washington: World Bank Archives.
Cerych, L. (1965). *Problems of aid to education in developing countries*. New York: Praeger.

- Coombs, P. H. (1992). Recalling the origins of UNESCO's International Institute for educational planning. *The Beeby Fascicles – I*. Wellington: Te Aro Press.
- *Debeauvais, M. (personal communication, July 3, 2007)
- *Diez Hochleitner, R. (personal communication, July 23, 2007)
- Gass, R. (1967). The Evolution of OECD's Approach to Educational Planning in Developing Countries. In G. Z.F. Bereday & J. A. Lauwerys (eds.), *Educational planning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Heyneman, S. P. (2005). The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960-2000. In D. Baker & D. Gustafson (eds.), *International perspectives on education and society*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- *Kamarck, A. (personal communication, July 19, 2007)
- Lyons, R. (ed.). (1965) *Problems and strategies of educational planning: Lessons from Latin America*. Paris: UNESCO/IIEP.
- UNESCO. (1962, June 25-26). Report of the Consultative Committee on the IIEP, Paris. (Document 12C/PRG/19, General Conference 12th Session)
- *Williams, P. R.C. (personal communication, August 27, 2007)

*Is not recoverable date, but important for reference list.