4-1-1945

Federal aid to schools

Madge Arbogast Henderson

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

by

MADGE ARBOGAST HENDERSON

" " "
"
" " "

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE
FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

1945

DEDICATED

to

MY FAMILY

Ed, Virginia, Helen, Bill

and

Billy

#

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge and thank the following: Dean W. L. Prince for his most helpful and constructive criticisms on this paper; Mr. Francis S. Chase, Executive Secretary and Editor of the Virginia Journal of Education, for supplying materials on work being done and not being done in Virginia; Mr. R. B. Marston, Director-Legislative Division of the National Education Association, for supplying materials of untold value and interest; the Library of the State Board of Education and the Library of the University of Richmond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It is my purpose in this thesis to present as far as possible an analysis of the social and economic bases of national interest in education. It would appear that a nation which is able to prepare for war so speedily, so effectively, apparently so efficiently as did this United States of America can "afford" to educate every citizen for democracy and the democratic way of life. The nation did not set up draft boards in each state independent of the National Government, but rather the National Government took and assumed the responsibility of setting up draft boards in each state. Some inequalities may have existed, but on the whole it has operated very successfully. Then why cannot an educational system be operated efficiently on the same basis?

CHAPTER I

IMPORTANT LEGISLATION AFFECTING EDUCATION

When our nation was first settled, due to the conditions of pioneer life--lack of transportation, communication, and density of population-- so called education was, of necessity, centered in community life, but with the passing of the years conditions changed. The radio, magazines, newspapers, automobiles, good roads, airplanes--all sorts of devices of communication evolved making a heretofore far-away community an integral part of the state, nation, and world.

When our constitution was written, not a word was inserted with regard to education, but by the tenth amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1791, "Powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." So the power of the promulgation and administration of education passed to the respective states.

In 1862 Congress passed what is known as the Morrill Act which

> shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

This bill provided for 30,000 acres of land for each Senator and Representative, and military science and tactics was added as a required study. A total of 11,367,832 acres of public land was given to the States to endow institutions for the teaching of new subjects. Fifty-one states and Territories, counting Porto Rico Alaska, and Hawaii, now receive money grants from the National Government to help carry on this work.

It was not until 1866 when Mr. E. E. White, State Commissioner for Education of Ohio, read a paper before a meeting of the Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association entitled National Bureau of Education that a bill was introduced in Congress "to collect statistics and facts concerning the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and to diffuse information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching."

Following this Congress passed an Act establishing a Department of Education. This "Department of Education" was and is actually not a Department in the strictest sense, if in any sense at all, because the head was not given cabinet rank and money has never been appropriated in sufficient amounts by Congress to adequately carry on the work.

The work and functions of this department have been allocated in varying degrees to many other departments. The work is not coordinated and there seems to be very little cooperation. Much money, time, and energy are wasted and overlapping ensues as a result.

Every important federal educational act that has been passed since the Morrell Act in 1862 has encouraged some special phase of education. The Hatch Act of 1877 provided for money to be expended for scientific investigation in the field of agriculture; the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 was passed to aid agriculture and home economics; the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was passed by Congress to assist the states in the Vocational Education programs. The Smith-Hughes plan, if adopted by a state, must be approved by the federal agencies. The Act requires that any money derived from this source must be matched by the state or community.

The Smith-Hughes plan has apparently been used quite extensively by the states and the term "vocational education" includes: agricultural education; training in manual arts, trades, and vocations; home economics education; and the establishment of part time schools for young persons employed in industry.

The Smith-Towner bill introduced in Congress in 1919 to have the Bureau (now Office) of Education made into a Federal Department with its head a member of the President's Cabinet and that $100,000,000 a year be granted by the National Government to the States, to be used for the most part in exterminating illiteracy, the Americanization of immigrants, the promotion of physical and health education, the training of teachers, and the better equalization of educational opportunities, failed to pass and, in 1921, a bill very similar in content to the Sterling-Towner Bill, was introduced and again failed to pass.

In 1923 a bill was again introduced into Congress which was known as the Sterling-Reed Education Bill. No action was taken on this bill but, in 1925, the bill became effective and was changed to the Education Bill. Also, in 1923, a joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of Government Departments recommended the creation of a Department of Education and Welfare, but no action was taken.

In 1887 Congress appropriated $15,000 a year to each of the land grant colleges for an agricultural experiment station. This amount has been increased from time to time, amd in 1941, each college received around $134,500.

The Second Morrell Act was passed in 1890 providing for the maintenance of these land-grant colleges. Beginning at $15,000 per year, it has reached the sum of $99,000 per school in 1941. Approximately $233,000 was available for each state and territory for the purpose.

In 1929 fifty-one members were appointed on the National Advisory Committee on Federal Relations to Education. The Committee recommended the consolidation of all educational functions of the federal government under a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet. His duties were outlined by this committee as aiding the President in the consideration of educational problems, as planning and organizing the national research and information service and to "contribute constructively to development of the leadership which American education needs for its coordination and intelligent advance." Assistant Secretaries were to be appointed to direct the technical work of the Department, supervise the research and publications, and maintain cooperative professional relations with the States and with educational institutions.

But, up to the present time, that is as far as these recommendations have gone.

In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, issued a report in which they set forth facts, principles, and policies, as they saw them, which should determine federal relations to education in the states. In this report the committee advised that future grants should be made in general rather than for specific purposes.

In 1936 the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill sponsored by the National Education Association providing for an initial appropriation of $100,000,000 with an increase of $50,000,000 each year until $300,000,000 per year would have been reached, was introduced and approved by the Senate Committee, but nothing further was done about it.

Also, in 1936, President Roosevelt appointed a Committee on Vocational Education to study the experience of the states under the programs that had been set up. In 1937 the name was changed to Advisory Committee on Education and it was asked to consider all aspects of federal aid to the states.

The committee gave its report in 1938 and following are some of the recommendations:

1. General federal aid to the states for elementary and secondary education should begin with $40,000,000 per year and should

be increased annually to $140,000,000 the sixth year. These grants should be allocated by the formula according to the number of school-age children and the financial ability of the states. Each state should plan jointly with the U. S. Office of Education so as to lessen most effectively the inequalities of educational opportunity within the state. State and local agencies should continue to administer the schools, determine the content and processes of education, and decide how federal funds shall be used within the types of expenditure permitted. The U. S. Office of Education should audit the federal funds accounts of each state and should suspend payments to any state which fails to maintain an adequate administrative agency or fails to make required reports promptly.

2. Special federal funds should be established to assist the states in (a) improving the preparation of teachers, (b) constructing public school buildings, (c) administering state departments of education, (d) providing education services for adults, (e) extending library service to rural areas, and (f) carrying on educational research, demonstrations, and planning.[1]

The National Education Association again drafted a federal aid bill known as the Harrison-Thomas-Fletcher Bill following the suggestions in this report, but, again, nothing came of the bill. It died on the calendar in the Senate and in the House Committee on Education.

---

[1]Mann, Charles R., Chairman, Federal Relations to Education, Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education, Washington, D. C., Part I, p. 140, Part II, p. 448, 1931.

By 1941 a bill was drafted under NEA sponsorship to meet the following needs:

1. School facilities for children recently removed to areas of defense activities and industries

2. Better financial support of education for Negroes in states maintaining separate schools for Negroes

3. Equalization of opportunities for general elementary and secondary education among and within the states

4. School facilities for children of migratory workers other than those in defense activities

5. Suitable education for children of federal employees residing on government properties or reservation

This bill authorized a general appropriation of $300,000,000 each year and provided for a board of apportionment to determine the educational needs and financial abilities of the states and to make such allotments of federal funds as would equalize educational opportunities most effectively. This bill was introduced by Senator Thomas from Utah and Senator Harrison from Mississippi, but again, nothing came of it.

Recent very liberal increases in appropriations for vocational education have been made under various acts to which Senator George's name is attached. The

appropriations for 1941 totalled $21,483,000, of which $14,483,000 is made under the George-Deen Act, and $7,000,000 for continuing the Smith-Hughes Program.

Senator Capper has sponsored a series of bills providing for the organization and promotion of 4H clubs among rural boys and girls.

Many remember, back in the gloomy, depression misted days of 1930-1932 when youths graduating from high school and college were confronted with the sign "No Help Wanted". Millions of their elders, better trained, physically stronger, and with more experience, were out of work. They wern't wanted. Then in March of 1933, President Roosevelt created the Civilian Conservation Corps to be supervised in the main by various branches of the government--Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor. The Department of Labor was given the job of selecting, through the various relief agencies, young men who were unemployed and whose families were dependent upon charity. The army, assigned to mobilize, equip, transport, and house them, received those men at the rate of 8,500 a day--a mobilization rate exceeding the combined records of the army and navy in World War I.

President Roosevelt speaking to one of the camps said:

"Through you the Nation will graduate a fine group of strong young men, clean living, trained to self-discipline and, above all, willing and proud to work for the joy of working."

The men, upon being accepted for enlistment, agreed to send $20 to $25 of their $30 monthly pay home to dependents. They were given food, clothing, shelter and medical care, and in return they were required to work forty hours each week, practically every minute of it out of doors.

Moreover, the work they did was not just a gesture to their pride on the part of Uncle Sam designed to take the sting out of giving them a dole. On every side were visible the scars caused by past extravagant and wasteful handling of our once vast timber lands, and they quickly saw the newer traces of losses from erosion, forest fires, insects and tree diseases which have cost the Nation more than half a billion dollars a year.

It is to the great credit of the men that the hopelessness engendered by their futile search for jobs was so quickly banished by the realization that they were really needed by the Nation. They fell to work with a will and accomplished results which would have shamed an ordinary army of manual workers.

While sixty classifications of work have been performed by the CCC, the bulk of their efforts has been directed toward fireproofing the Nation's timbered areas and, in addition, protecting the forests and parks from tree-attacking insects, diseases, and other forest menaces. Special emphasis has been placed upon the correction and prevention of soil erosion.

It would be impossible to calculate in dollars the physical, mental, and spiritual values accruing to these men from their work. The real return to the country will come much later when timber production and forest resources, now falling off dangerously, will show a decided increase.

The CCC consolidated with other agencies under the Federal Security Agency in 1939. The Senate appropriated $76,000,000 to carry on 350 camps during 1943, but the house refused to accede by a vote of 230 to 120 and by the end of the year the CCC came to an end by default.

There have been set up under what was known as the Federal Emergency Relief Act and later under the Works Progress Administration and the National Youth Administration several different kinds of educational projects such as: adult education classes, educational work projects of many kinds for unemployed youth and federal aid to needy college students. The establishment of NYA classes

has proved very beneficial not only in meeting an emergency situation but in awakening many "backward" communities to a social consciousness of the value of education.

The NYA schools were set up to employ and further train needy students. Students worked part time and attended classes part time. These NYA schools were mostly vocational and technical and in some instances have been taken over by local and state systems and have been developed into vocational and technical schools of undetermined value to the communities.

There is a bill before Congress, or rather pending in Congress, at the present time. It was introduced into the Senate on February 4, 1943 by Senators Lister Hill, of Alabama, and Elbert Thomas, of Utah, and is listed as S. 637. Another bill, H. R. 2849, was introduced into the House on June 2, 1943 by Representative Robert Ramspeck of Georgia. S. 637 was referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of which Senator Thomas is chairman. H. R. 2849 was referred to the House Committee on Education, of which Graham A. Barden of North Carolina is chairman.

A hearing on S. 637 was held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor April 6-8, 1943. The bill was reported favorably to the Senate and placed

on the legislative calendar on June 18, 1943. It was called up for consideration on the Senate floor on October 12, 1943 and was thoroughly debated for five days. Because of an amendment, sponsored by the opposition and adopted by a small majority, the measure was recommitted to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

The two bills, S. 637 and H. R. 2849 are practically identical, the chief point of difference being the inclusion of a provision in the House bill which gives the state educational authority a right to appeal from the decision of the U. S. Commissioner of Education to the United States district court in cases where he withholds funds for certain reasons or certifies that a state has failed to replace funds which are lost, unlawfully used, or expended in a manner contrary to the provisions of the act.

These two bills were originated as emergency measures and sought to appropriate 300 million dollars for grants-in-aid to the States, two-thirds of which would be used for the payment of teachers' salaries. The principal objection to the bill was that it would impose Federal control upon local school systems despite the fact that the bill's first section explicitly forbade "any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration,

curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction or materials of instruction." But, instead of endeavoring to improve or strengthen this section, opponents of the federal aid measure chose to nullify it by supporting a needless and irrelevant amendment of Senator Langer's forbidding discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the administration of federal funds or of "state funds supplemented thereby."

The title of the bill reads: "To authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools."

A number of Senators who voted for this amendment promptly turned around and voted to have the legislation as a whole recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The question that we should consider is not whether the government should begin to support education, but whether its past and present policies are the wisest ones to pursue. We should not oppose federal interference with education blindly as a matter of principle but try to determine the value and the probable consequences of

present practices and to consider carefully the possible courses for the future.

It is to be hoped that the fight for better educational opportunities will continue. Training, derived from educational sources, has undoubtedly proven to our boys now in combat (as well as those who failed to qualify due to lack of educational preparation--the estimates varying from 200,000 to 750,000 in number) and to the public at large the advantage of an education and the calamitous effect to an individual through the lack of it.

Of course, we all know that our only hope lies in the vision of our Senators and Representatives. We also know or should know that public opinion has as much or more to do with how a Senator or Representative feels and acts than anything else. Cross sections of opinions have been taken throughout the United States as to how individual citizens feel about Federal Aid for Schools and in all instances as many as seven out of ten say they favor federal aid for schools (without federal control) and a more equal opportunity for all.

Why then do we not make our wishes known to our Senators and Representatives? One reason is that we are so busy making a living that we don't take the time; we feel that there are others who should have more interest

in such things and that they should do it; and another reason is that no great amount of pressure has ever been brought to bear by educators and class room teachers. What then can be done about it? Do we need a John Lewis or a William Green to organize forces to bring about educational efficiency all down the line? Do we need concentrated action? It is evident that one letter from the Chairman of the Legislative Committee of each teachers' organization throughout the country is not enough because that has been tried. Would a flood of letters do it? Would a lobbying committee do it?

One very definite answer is that many teachers are apathetic to current issues involving social advancement as contained in better legislation to schools and for schools. There are too many "yes-men and yes-women" in school rooms and in administrative positions. This can be partly, if not wholly, explained by the fact that teachers as a whole are so poorly paid and vigorous, enterprizing, energetic, progressive, and wide awake men and women do not choose teaching as a profession. Until better legislation can be passed, which will provide for better salaries for teachers, this condition will continue to exist. It is not a matter though which affects only the teaching profession; it involves the hundreds

and thousands of children entering and leaving our schools today and is reflected in and through all social and private agencies of which mankind is a part.

CHAPTER II

LAND GRANTS TO SCHOOLS

The organizations and control of the educational systems themselves have been left to the states, the national government merely aiding and encouraging the states by granting educational endowments. These endowments have been unevenly distributed--some states receiving much more than others. The cessions west of the Allegheny Mountains and East of the Mississippi River made by the original states between 1780 and 1802 formed the beginning of the national domain. Later, in 1802, by the Louisiana Purchase, the Oregon boundary treaty settlement of 1846 and the outcome of the war with Mexico this national domain was enlarged.

The Continental Congress in 1785 adopted a system of rectangular land survey by which rectangular townships six miles square were laid out. These townships were further divided into Sections one mile square.

From this form of survey endowment grants have been made. The following statement is attributed to Colonel Timothy Pickering who said in 1783: "all the surplus lands shall be common property of the States and be disposed of for the common good; as for laying out roads, building bridges, establishing schools and academies, and other public uses." Then in 1785 there appeared an ordinance by which "there shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools."[1]

It is interesting to note that in the making and laying out of these land grants in 1787 a New England Company purchased 1,500,000 acres of land on the Ohio and Congress agreed with the purchasers to reserve section 16 for schools and Section 29 for religious purposes. It is evident that many congresses meeting after this date approved of grants for schools, but did not favor the one providing Section 29 for religion.

No land grants to aid schools were provided for in Kentucky, admitted in 1792, or Tennessee, admitted in 1796, but in 1802 Ohio established a precedent which has been followed by all states admitted since and, by which, in 1806, Congress in settling a dispute with Tennessee

---

[1]Monroe, Paul, Cyclopedia of Education, p. 372

provided for the reservation of 640 acres to every six miles square for schools.

Louisiana had received no grant for schools upon her admission in 1821 but, in 1834, the 16th Section was granted to the states "whereever the same had not been sold." Maine, Texas, and West Virginia have no land grants due to the fact that Maine was carved out of Massachusetts, West Virginia from Virginia, and the National Government owned no land in Texas.

Congress, in 1848, when the Oregon Country was surveyed, departed from the previous policy and gave sections 16 and 36 in every township for the benefit of schools. California, upon entering the union in 1850, was the first state to receive these benefits. All states entering the union from that time up to 1896 received two sections. But Utah, which was admitted in 1896, received four sections--2d, 16th, 32d, and 36th. In Arizona and New Mexico the Utah plan was followed. Oklahoma, upon admission in 1907, received the most liberal grant of all--the 16th and 36th sections for schools; the sum of $5,000,000; section 13 for normal schools, agricultural college, and the university; section 33 for charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions.

The total of these grants for common schools is about 81,064,300 acres. But, unfortunately, many of the earlier grants were grossly mismanaged.

Maryland, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Deleware, and Kentucky have tried in vain to get Congress to issue land grants in those states, but this request has never been granted.

In 1850 Michigan petitioned Congress for a grant of 350,000 acres of public land to aid the state to endow a college for the teaching of agriculture, but the grant was refused. In 1858 Michigan renewed the petition and in 1859 a bill making such a grant finally passed both houses of Congress. The bill granted to each state 20,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in Congress to be used in founding a college for instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts. The bill was opposed by the Southern Members and was vetoed by President Buchanan in a message which is an interesting summary of the old objections to such grants. In 1862 a bill drawn on similar lines, except that the grant was raised to 30,000 acres for each member of Congress, and instruction in military science and tactics was added, was passed by Congress and signed by President Lincoln. This bill was known as the famous Morrill Land Act.

The financial returns from these land grants have been disappointing but the educational returns have been very satisfactory. It is in the ten states admitted from 1889 on that the large funds in the future are to be expected. All the states were trying to sell land at the same time causing the market to be swamped and consequently the price of land dropped as low as 35¢ an acre.

Probably no aid given by the National Government for education has ever proved so fruitful as have these grants for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. The agriculture and engineering professions have been developed and the states have been stimulated to make large and rapidly increases to these colleges and to state universities.

Instead of causing the States to lean upon the National Government as feared by President Buchanan, the result has been the opposite. The appropriation has created new life in small and feeble state institutions; has developed new and better ideas in agriculture--such as rotation of crops, soil conservation, proper time and place of planting; and has aided the farmer who supplies the nation's food to become highly efficient.

It is through these agricultural colleges that county Farm Agents are sent out to advise, consult with,

and cooperate with the farmers in the county as to problems involving farming--such as the proper kinds of crops adapted to a particular kind of soil and climate and the proper breeding and handling of all kinds of cattle.

It appears that many felt all along that the distribution of land grants was very unfair as some states profitted greatly and some states received nothing. It was recommended that the funds derived from land grants be evenly distributed among the states. But, in 1836 the long discussed, long talked about distribution was put into effect. After reserving $5,000,000 in the Treasury, the rest of the money was to be evenly distributed according to representation in Congress--payments to be made in four equal quarterly installments. The panic of 1837 occurred and only three payments were ever made. Only about $7,500,000 exists today. The school funds actually received about one-fourth of the distribution and today draws interest on one-half of it.

In 1841 Congress made important specific grants which proved very beneficial to education. In 1849 the Swamp Land Grants to the state of Louisiana, granting all swamp or overflowed lands to the state--the

proceeds to be used in levees and drains--was made. Minnesota and Oregon, in 1860, and California, in 1866, came under this swamp land grant and, after paying for drainage work, have used the residue for education instead of other internal improvements. A total of around 60,000,000 acres of swamp land was granted to the states, about three-fourths of which was devoted to educational purposes.

In 1887 additional grants in the form of money--$15,000 per year "from the proceeds of the sale of public lands"--was made from the National Treasury to each state for the purpose of agriculture experiment stations. In 1905 the amount was increased to $20,000 and this was to be increased $2,000 a year for five years until a maximum of $30,000 was reached after which it should remain at $30,000. No misappropriation of these funds has ever been discovered.

In 1890 the Second Morrell Act was passed. The grant provided for $15,000 a year to each state to be increased $1,000 a year for ten years or until $25,000 was reached. In 1907 Congress further extended this grant until a maximum grant of $50,000 was reached and by 1941 $99,000 was reached.

No grants which the National Government has made to the states for educational purposes have been so well administered and probably no grants have given any

larger returns in the advancement of scientific knowledge or general welfare of the nation. These grants have been handled by the colleges themselves.

Many states did not receive land grants and Maryland, in 1821, drew up a long and detailed statement which it transmitted to Congress and to each state saying that each state in the Union "has an equal right to participate in the benefits of the public lands, the common property of the Union." The Legislatures of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Deleware, and Kentucky endorsed the Maryland petition and sent requests to Congress to make similar grants to all states. Ohio was the only state which opposed the grants.

A Senate Committee on Public Lands was appointed to look into the matter and they reported adversely as they thought that such a move would greatly impede the development of the states in which the land was located. The question has come up from time to time but no settlement has ever been reached.

The idea of devoting a portion of the money derived from the sale of public lands to the cause of education and dividing it equally among the states has been considered also from time to time. From 1817 to 1827 there was an annual surplus of from two to six millions of dollars in the Treasury derived from the sale of school lands and interest thereon.

In 1826 a bill to distribute $5,000,000 among the states was proposed. The bill failed to pass but the idea was cherished. In 1833 Clay introduced a bill providing for the distribution of land revenues but it was vetoed by Jackson. The matter became a political issue and a strong feeling of injustice was felt by the old states. Finally, in 1836, the long talked about distribution was made but, in order to avoid a presidential veto, it was put in the form of "a deposit of money among the states." The results of this allocation have already been given. (After reserving $5,000,000 all money remaining in the Treasury on January 1, 1937 was to be apportioned among the states according to their representation in Congress and in four equal quarterly installments. The panic of 1837 left the treasury empty and only three payments were ever made.)

The deposit was regarded as a distribution and none of the money has ever been called for. Approximately $7,500,000 exists today, the interest on which is devoted to schools. There is an interest charge on $6,405,837.74 in eight states of lost funds raised by taxation and now devoted to public schools. Almost all the deposit not put into school funds was squandered or lost.

The federal government has not limited its aid to schools to land grants only. It has also made outright grants of money. It was in 1802 that Congress set aside from 5 to 15 percent of the proceeds from the sale of United States land for twenty-nine states. Nineteen of these states used a part or all of such money for educational purposes. In 1833 the U. S. Deposit Fund Act distributed $10,000,000 to the states. Some states applied these grants to schools. The Surplus-Revenue Loan Act of 1837 returned around $28,000,000 as "loans" to the states. A part of these funds were applied to education, and the "loans" have not been called for by the federal government.

The Distribution Act of 1841 provided monetary grants from the sale of public lands thus extending the provisions of the act of 1802. The Federal Forest Reserve County Fund Act passed in 1908 set aside 25 percent of the money received from the forest reserve for the states and territories for schools and roads.

An Act known as the Oil and Mineral Leasing Act, passed in 1920, appropriated from 20 to 37½ percent of the proceeds from all federal non-metallic deposits to the public-land states for roads and schools. Apportionments of money provided by the acts of 1908 and

1920, as between roads and schools, were left to the states.

Subvention acts, annual payments to the support of education for specific purposes, such as the Hatch Act, 1877; the Smith-Lever Act, 1914; the Smith-Hughes Act, 1917; and the George Reed Act, 1929, have been the means of supplying aid by the federal government to schools that could not have otherwise existed--the Hatch Act passed to promote scientific investigation and experimentation in local areas of agricultural education; the Smith-Lever Act passed for the diffusion of useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics; The Smith-Hughes Act extended the Smith-Lever Act and provided for training in vocational training; The George-Reed Act simply extended provisions regarding vocational education contained in the Smith-Hughes Act.

It will be seen from a study of these and other facts that these land grants, forest reserve grants, mineral grants, and subvention grants have never been coordinated in any sense under the department of education but have been scattered throughout different bureaus in Washington. The Department of Education coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of the

Interior as it does, has little to do or say about what shall or shall not be done about broad educational policies.

If all facts pertaining to past legislation, together with facts and figures pertaining to all kinds of grants made by the federal government could be accumulated and studied by or under the supervision of a Secretary of Education sitting in the President's Cabinet, coordination, cooperation and more and better equalization of funds and opportunities would result.

CHAPTER III

ABILITY VS. EFFORT

Fundamental elementary and secondary education for all children has been given little consideration by the federal government as can be demonstrated by the fact that from 200,000 to 750,000 boys were "unfit" for national defense because of illiteracy in the draft so far in the present war, despite the fact that the federal government is spending millions of dollars in educational activities such as funds for grants-in-aid, funds for vocational and agricultural education and certain special or emergency education. Yet, many boys and girls, men and women, do not know how to read and write and have to sign their names with a mark.

The pending bills, S. 637 and H. R. 2849, provide for (1) more nearly equalizing educational opportunities in public elementary and secondary schools, and (2) meeting emergencies in financing public elementary and

secondary schools. If these bills pass both houses, it will be a step forward, but there will still exist duplication of expenditures, unequal distribution of other "special" funds; for example, some states are not and will not be able to "match" funds appropriated by the federal government and no use can be made of these funds in certain poor localities.

In many states over 90 percent of the cost of operating public schools is borne by the local units. In some states, however, particularly in the South, state aid amounts to two or three times the amount of local receipts for public schools. Even with this state aid in the south, there still remains inequalities and little uniform educational opportunity. In some sparsely settled regions of the south, children are not permitted, due to distance to schools, to attend any school. And, if compulsory school attendance laws are in existence, frequently they are not enforced.

"In 1940-41 federal funds for education amounted to around 400 million dollars."[1] The elementary and secondary schools enrolled around 25 million pupils and expended around two billion dollars--the cost per capita being

---

[1]Journal of National Education Association, December 1943

around 10¢ per school day per pupil. But, despite this fact, in many areas, some children of school age received nothing and in other areas three or four times the approximated cost per capita. There is no equality of opportunity here and we are not educating for equality of opportunity. In some instances we are not educating at all and in others we are educating for inequality rather than equality.

Let us take as an example certain states. In 1940 Nevada had the highest per capita income which amounted to $1,509 while Mississippi had the lowest--$379. There are many persons in Mississippi with no formal education whatsoever--some who have never been to school, due to the lack of finances to build and support schools within reasonable access.

It should be remembered, however, that certain states within the union have much larger taxpaying capacities or much larger economic resources than others. For instance, anyway one chooses to measure taxpaying ability or economic resources, New York, California, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Illinois have substantially greater ability to support education than the nation as a whole. The states, which irrespective of measuring methods used, have substantially less than average ability to finance education, are Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia,

South Carolina, Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Virginia.

"New York with 69 percent more ability to finance education than the country as a whole, ranks second in effort. It makes six percent less effort to finance education than does the country as a whole and ranks 29.5 among the states in this respect. California stands well above the average both in ability and in effort. Mississippi, with only 32 percent as much ability as the country as a whole, ranks 48 in this respect but makes 31 percent more effort to finance schools than the United States as a whole, and ranks 6.5 among the states in effort. Georgia ranks low both in ability and in effort."[1]

Virginia, for instance, as listed by Norton and Norton, ranks 35 in ability and 47 in effort. Nevada, on the other hand, is listed as being 1 in ability and 48 in effort.

It is shown by all persons who have made studies of tax revenue per unit of educational need and percent of tax resources expended for current costs of education that the poorer states appear to make the greater effort as a whole.

---

[1]Norton & Norton, Wealth, Children and Education, pp. 50, 51

Norton and Norton have attempted to divide the country as a whole into sections and compare the sections as to ability vs. effort in support of education. While it appears that the southern states rank lowest in ability, the states of Mississippi, Oklahoma, and New Mexico fall in the "highest quartile" and Texas, Alabama, North Carolina, and South Carolina fall among the next to the highest quartile or group of twelve states in effort. The New England and Middle Atlantic States, while above average in ability, rate below average in effort. The East North Central States rank high, above average, in effort. The Pacific States also rank above average. The Mountain States outrank all other sections as to effort. The South Atlantic and East South Central States are about "average" in effort. The West South Central States--Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas--are listed as being very low in effort.

According to economists, a state fluctuates as to ability and effort due to the variableness of economic resources and laws governing taxable resources.

It is a healthy sign that if in the states where ability is low the effort is high. It indicates that education is wanted and a need is felt, but the need and wishes cannot be met without more aid.

The aid should come to the elementary and secondary schools. Higher education, colleges and universities, have been far better provided for through the aid of federal grants, land allocations, forest reservations, certain residues from mineral resources, from private philanthropies, from small and large donations of money than have elementary and secondary schools. It does not follow that much good work has been done and will continue to be done by these higher institutions of learning, but the point is that more persons should have the opportunity for at least an elementary and secondary education if they continue to live in and under a democracy.

How can we claim to be a democracy for, of, and by the people? Facts about the unequal opportunities in education show that it is a democracy for, of, and by a few.

Interest in the field of federal aid to schools has grown and continues to grow with each new disclosure as to how much illiteracy exists, how unprepared a large majority of persons are to meet the problems of life physically and mentally, but interest has failed to crystallize into concentrated action.

"Education can be made a force to equalize the condition of men. It is no less true that it may be

a force to create class, race, and sectional distinctions. The evidence indicates clearly that the schools of the United States, which have hitherto been regarded as the bulwark of democracy, may in fact become an instrument for creating those very inequalities they were designed to prevent. If, for a long period of years, each succeeding generation is drawn in disproportionately large numbers from those areas in which economic conditions are poorest, if the population reserves of the Nation continue to be recruited from economically underpriveleged groups, and if the inability of the depressed economic areas and groups to provide proper education for their children is not corrected by aid from areas and groups more prosperous, the effect on American civilization and on representative political institutions may be disastrous."[1]

Many persons are not aware of the wide differences in the scope and quality of public school programs in the several states. While their full significance cannot be expressed in numbers, these differences are undoubtedly reflected to a significant degree by such factors as school expenditure per pupil, average salary paid to teachers, per-pupil value of school property, length of

---

[1]From the Report of the Advisory Committee on Education, 1938

school term and ratio of high-school enrollment to the number of persons of high-school age.

Figures show that in 1939-40 Mississippi spent approximately $24. per pupil enrolled while approximately $135 was spent in the state of New York per pupil. The average salary for all public elementary and secondary school teachers, Principals, and supervisors ranged from $559 in Mississippi to $2,604 in New York.

According to official reports, the value of public elementary and secondary school property per pupil enrolled in 1939-40 ranged from $80 in Tennessee to $526 in New York. The average school term for the nation as a whole was about 175 days. In individual states the term ranged from 146 days in Mississippi to 188 days in Maryland. School terms for rural are most always shorter than in urban sections. For the whole nation the average length of rural school terms was 166 days, as compared with an average term of 181 days in urban schools.

Another inequality to be considered is the number of children enrolled in high schools for each 1,000 who were fourteen to seventeen years old. In Mississippi there were 392 children per 1,000 while in Washington there were 952 per 1,000.

Some feel that inequalities of educational opportunity are not due primarily to differences in interest and effort among the states but a difference in economic ability on one hand and the relative number of children to be educated on the other. It was shown in 1939-40 that South Carolina had 589 children five to seventeen years of age per 1,000 adults aged twenty to sixty-four while California had only 277 children of school age per 1,000 adults. These variations make substantial differences in the amounts of money available per child, even if all states had the same amount of tax resources per adult.

In considering ability vs. effort another thing that should be taken into consideration is the estimated school revenue per child. In estimating "school revenue" six types of taxes are usually studied: personal income tax, real estate tax, business income tax, stock transfer tax, severance tax, and corporation organization tax. In 1935 the estimated school revenues which the states could have raised per child aged five to seventeen by making average effort would have ranged from $12 in Mississippi to $157 in Deleware.

Human beings are in a continuous process of change, in a state of becoming. It has been said that human beings

might be spoken of as "becomings" instead of human "beings". No two persons are alike; each individual has certain unique qualities that distinguish him from other human beings and this quality of uniqueness is what creates a need for a diversified program in our educational system.

The school has to deal in futures whether it will or not. It has the responsibility of promoting health, emotional stability, social adjustment, vocational guidance as well as avocational guidance. The school should teach the child to grow, mentally as well as physically. It is especially necessary that schools have a clear understanding of the health needs of students under their supervision.

George Washington in his Farewell Address urged his countrymen to look upon the promotion of institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge as an object of primary concern. It has long been a principle of American life that adequate educational facilities are essential to the effective operation of democratic government. The validity of this principle has been emphasized as the growing complexity of a dynamic civilization and the interdependence of its factors have brought government into ever widening areas of our life. If the instruction of the American people in every kind of knowledge was essential to the effective operation of democratic

government in the eighteenth century, how much more essential it is at the present time.

The inequalities of opportunity for an education though are the "sore" spots on our so-called democratic way of life. In many sections of the country, one needs only to cross a state border or even a county border to see on one side a well equipped, well staffed school and on the other a broken down school house, poorly equipped and poorly staffed. In one school happy, contented children with a feeling of achievement--in the other a deadening apathy.

Society is to blame for this lack of educational opportunity for all. Whether we want to acknowledge it or not this lack of educational opportunity affects us indirectly if not directly. As Tennyson says: "I am a part of all that I have met." So is it true with ourselves, regardless of how hard we may try to avoid the truth. The quality and character of a people are bound to affect the government, the social organizations, the schools, and all phases of life. If we fail to enlighten and educate our people, then we are not only to blame but we are affected ourselves.

CHAPTER IV

COMPLEXITY OF PRESENT SET-UP

It was found by the National Advisory Committee appointed in May 1929 by the President of the United States for the purpose of determining if possible the extent to which the federal government participated in education that it was practically impossible to give a complete or satisfactory report due to the fact that:

> In some instances the Government controls the particular educational policy and program completely; in others the regional or local authorities have almost exclusive autonomy. Between these two extremes of the exercise of power, every conceivable degree of variation is found. In one enterprize the Federal Government pays all the cost; in another it pays only part of the expense; in still another it contributes nothing at all. In one domain it determines both social and educational purposes; in another the people of the region and their political representatives exercise full control. Here, it provides the buildings,

> there, it does not. Here, it trains the teachers; there, it merely recruits them. So the policies and practices vary.[1]

This Committee also found "a bewildering sense of unnecessary complexity" still remaining. Various governmental departments were found to overlap and show little evidence of cooperation or coordination. For instance, a sub-division of the War Department has jurisdiction over the Philippines and Porto Rico, another over the Panama Canal Zone. Indians in the United States are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and until recently the natives of Alaska came under the supervision of the Office of Education. The Navy Department has authority in American Samoa and Guam while the Virgin Islands are under the Department of the Interior.

It was found that financial aid to the States for research and education in agriculture and rural life and for vocational education of high school grade are operated under three distince agencies--the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

---

[1]National Advisory Committee on Education, Federal Relations to Education, p. 6

> The Federal Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should or should not do in the field of education. Whatever particular policies it seems to be pursuing are often inconsistent with each other, sometimes in conflict. They suggest a haphazard development, therein policies of far-reaching effect have been set up as mere incidents of some special attempt to induce an immediate and particular efficiency. Without a comprehensive, forward-looking, and coherent public policy in regard to education, the present educational situation in Federal Government cannot be greatly improved.[1]

The function of the Federal Government in most instances with regard to education of the citizens of any particular state has been one of cooperation in fostering the education of the people under whose state jurisdiction they reside. In addition to aiding states in this manner, there appear to be six other fields of designated or well-defined federal responsibility:

1. The education of the American Indians.
2. The education of the people of territories.
3. The education of persons in the service of the National Government.
4. Education with regard to the collection and diffusion of scientific research pertaining to education.
5. Education of persons residing on special federal areas--districts lying outside the jurisdiction of a state.
6. Cooperating with other nations intellectually and educationally.

---

[1]Ibid, p. 8

Public school finance can never be conceived independent of the structure and functioning of the economy, government, and financial institutions of which it is a part. Changes in economic life, governmental structure, financial institutions, debt, occur all the time. Due to this fact, it is difficult to work out a permanent and lasting solution of federal aid to schools.

The more one studies our financial system the more complicated it appears. It is almost, if not more, complicated than our public school system.

Federal aid for schools is primarily a device for achieving certain educational objectives. As such, it must be judged on its educational merits, and its case is properly addressed to those who are interested in improving the educational opportunities of the children of the United States. As a financial device, any Federal aid for schools has a significance which extends beyond the field of education. It involves changes, actual and potential, in present methods of raising public funds. Federal aid, therefore, is as much a matter of concern to those who are interested in a better tax system as it is to those who are interested in better schools.

Since tax systems are not ends in themselves but are only the means of financing public services, advocates of improved methods of taxation are, of course, not justified in treating education or any other public function as a mere vehicle of tax reform. They have, however, the right to demand that changes in methods of school finance be chosen with a view of facilitating progress toward a better tax system, in so far as this aim is not incompatible with legitimate educational objectives.

Clarence Heer, in his book Federal Aid and The Tax Problem, summarizes his comments with these statements:

1. From the point of view of all four of the major tests of a good tax system--fiscal adequacy, administrative efficiency, equity, and economic effects--Federal aid for education offers a better method of raising new money for schools than State and local taxation.

2. From the point of view of fiscal adequacy, Federal aid is superior because it places the responsibility for raising new school funds on the level of government which has the widest range of productive tax sources at its disposal and which is in the best position to exploit those sources effectively.

3. From the point of view of administrative efficiency, Federal aid for education is to be preferred because it will permit the needed school revenue to be raised by methods which involve less annoyance and expense to the taxpayer, which present fewer opportunities for tax avoidance and evasion, and which entail relatively lower administrative costs.

4. From the point of view of equity, Federal aid for education represents the more desirable alternative because it will place the responsibility for obtaining additional school revenue on the level of government best fitted to distribute its taxes according to the principle of ability to pay. To the extent that public education is a matter of national concern, Federal aid will make it possible more nearly to equalize the burden of maintaining a national minimum of educational opportunity throughout the country. To the extent that education is a State and local function, Federal aid will provide a means of correcting the inequalities in the present system of school support which result from the extraterritorial shifting of State and local taxes.

5. Finally, from the point of view of economic effects, Federal aid for education offers the better mode of procedure because the Federal Government has far greater freedom than have the States and localities to select fiscal measures appropriate to given economic and social objectives.[1]

All expenditures, public or private, must be referred back to the satisfaction of human wants. The economic efficiency and the quality and quantity of services rendered must be considered. If the Federal Government can produce an education that will satisfy to a large extent the wants of human nature, with an economic efficiency greater than that produced by the individual states, counties or districts, with a quality and quantity of service rendered superior to that now

---

[1]Heer, Clarence, Federal Aid and the Tax Problem, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1939, pp. 86, 87

being rendered, why then do we hesitate to try? We probably lack FAITH. If we lack faith then it may be blamed on our present educational system which should be changed to educate for cooperation, peace, social and economic well-being and legislative reform.

> There are groups which regard any increase in governmental spending, with the possible exception of defense outlays, as an evil; others regard any increased public expenditure as a good. The basic conflict here is an ideological one. The first group regards every increase in governmental activity as a step away from freedom toward collectivism, socialism, or absolutism; the second group regards every increase in public outlays as a step away from anarchistic individualism toward a better social order. Neither position can be proved or disproved; each is a matter of faith.[1]

There are no canons which determine what the federal government can or cannot do as far as education is concerned. Education which includes public health, preventive medicine, protection, defense, and conservation should be a national concern.

"Higher standards and increased demands for public schooling are largely responsible for increases in public school expenditures. Only to the extent that the general public understands these expenditures, retains its faith in public education and values the results of common

---

[1] Burke, Arvid J., Defensible Spending for Public Schools, Columbia Press, New York, 1943, p. 23

schooling will public support be maintained. The educational needs of the United States which have not been met are legion, but they will not be met through the public schools unless the public believes in them. Hence, the most important problem in public school finance is the maintenance of continued confidence in the institutions of public education."[1]

Opponents of both federal financial aid to public schools and a department of education fear the centralization of education and the loss of local and state educational autonomy. This fear may, but need not be realized. If persons within the community take enough interest in education or have civic pride enough to see that their schools are properly run and administered then there need be no fear.

If those fearing federal control along with federal aid will investigate, they will find that when the federal government gave public land to the states for schools, federal control did not follow. Neither did it when the federal government set aside in 1833, 1837, 1841, 1908, 1920, federal funds used for education. Neither did it follow in 1942 when federal aid exceeded

---

[1]Ibid, p. 3

$55,000,000. If federal control follows federal aid, it will be because we want it that way.

If persons within the community do not take enough interest in or have civic or personal pride enough to see that their schools are properly run and administered, then the federal government should see to it that the educational system takes care of the education of such persons or such persons' children until they are educated to the point where they will take pride in and participate in the enlightenment of individuals. Ours is the duty to make inevitable that none come to maturity unprepared for the participation in and the obligations of a democratic citizenship.

Some of us, possibly are going to have to be "rebels". At least, we may be called that. Washington was a "rebel" against the existing government of his early days and would have been hanged had his cause been lost. Jefferson was considered more or less of a "rebel" in his day and was abhorred by the set society of Philadelphia. Now, it would appear, we have caught up with Philadelphia, in being proud of our antagonism to new thinking. We cannot become static. We cannot set our minds against new ideas and take pride in our great rebels of the past. We cannot "without looking like a white-collar Tobacco Road, line

our avenues with statues to heroes and turn out an educational system that ranks among the lowest."[1]

There is one ray of hope and cause for rejoicing among the proponents of "an education for all" policy in this statement: "It is probably a fact, moreover, that the taxpayer comes nearer to getting one hundred cents on the dollar for his expenditures on public education than he manages to secure from any other branch of municipal administration."[2] We should not rejoice too long or too loud, because, if this be true, we have to consider that a majority of municipal employees are paid far in excess of teachers considering the amount of time and money expended in preparation for their position.

Prosperity depends upon education. Where illiteracy abounds business depreciates. Denmark mastered her economic deficiencies through the education of all her youth as well as her adults. This "where illiteracy abounds, business depreciates" can be more fully illustrated in our country as well. Income, bank deposits, rents, retail sales, production and employment are

---

[1]Dowdy, Clifford, Richmond Today, Article in Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 24, 1945

[2]Munro, W. B., Municipal Administration, 1934, p. 459

highest in states where the system of education is good. Educated persons, on the whole, want more, buy more, use more, and produce more. Education can truly be said to be the basis of prosperity and economic power.

It can be seen that, whether we like it or not, the idea of federal aid is growing. In 1929 only about 26 per cent of the total expenditures for schools were federal but by 1940 over 50 percent were federal. Local and state expenditures decreased from about 28 percent in 1926 to only about 23 in 1936. This decrease followed the depression years of 1928-36.

A school budget should be considered balanced when the maximum educational returns are being secured from all funds which are derived for or made available for public education from federal, state, and local resources. So long as the schools contribute to our democratic way of life by returning to the communities boys and girls who contribute of their time, energies, efforts, and morale to the well-being and welfare of the community, state or nation, then they have accomplished their purpose or the purpose for which they should exist.

But, on the other hand, if schools fail to educate in this--shall we call it spiritual side of life?--then they have failed completely. When boys and girls are not

made conscious through our educational system of the fact that where a right exists a corresponding duty exists, then again, our educational system has failed. In a democracy no rights exist without corresponding duties.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CONTROL

There appears to be inbedded in our culture somehow implicit faith in the ability of education to correct the ills of social life. In the surge of social idealism which followed in the wake of the American Revolution, in the nineteenth century "battle for free schools", among liberal educator reformers of the present day, in fact, during every period of American life educational and political theorists have looked upon the school as an instrument for social progress. All--share cropper, slum dweller, city planner, politician, preacher, social worker, factory laborer, men in the service--look to the school for a new day.

But, contrary to the comforting faith that the school will somehow remake the society, the history of American social institutions suggests that education is largely an effect of important change, not its cause.

On the other hand, it is impossible to separate the school from the culture in which it flourishes, for the school is an integral part of the social structure.

There are those who feel and say that schools can and will remake our society because they feel and say that if our youth are trained properly this training will extend their thinking and acting into their daily living.

We all know that the school is only one agent of public service. The school has assumed and is assuming more responsibility for the teaching and training of the young and its success can be measured only by the quality of what it attempts to produce. If a school trains for citizenship, it is bound to extend over into these other fields of social control.

The home, the church, the legislative bodies, the many organizations--mens' clubs, womens' clubs, boys' and girls' clubs, labor organizations, political organizations, parochial organizations--all contribute in some way and each has its influence on society. The one that outweighs the other in influence cannot be named accurately because there is no exact way to tabulate results of human behavior, thinking, and acting. In pioneer life in our country there seems to be little

doubt that the home could be named as the source from which most influence originated, but in our complex indistrialized life where many of the duties and responsibilities once performed by the home have been assumed by or thrust upon other agencies, the home probably ranks with instead of above other character forming agencies in a great many cases.

Our schools are, in spite of their imperfections, relatively free from class stratification. An attempt is being made to offer to the student the kind of education based on the individual, the local, and the national need, and not upon the assumption that membership in a social or economic class or group limits personal opportunity for education.

Any person may aspire to the type of education which his ability, interest, and need influence him to seek. The actual limitations which operate, in fact, are not entirely due to the school system but to the imperfections of the economic and social conditions surrounding a particular individual.

It is to be noticed that extracurricular activities are patterned after adult society in many ways. The lines of social class are drawn in club memberships. School politics, in fact, are somewhat akin to the

political machinations of the local community. In general, extracurricular success may be gained by methods learned not in the classroom but by observation of the adult world outside the school.

Under no circumstances should local interest and control be destroyed in the administration of the public schools. We probably have a more typical "folk school" than any other nation except Denmark due to the fact that public schools are operated by counties and districts under the state and federal government. This "folk school" spirit should not be destroyed. Moneys allocated to a state by the federal government should be distributed under the direction of a State Superintendent, but with the advice and consent from local and county authorities. Localities should be allowed to decide the type of educational courses offered. These things should not be handled by or decided by someone in a distant locality.

So, it is not to the schools alone that we should look for "a better day", but to the home, the church, the legislative body which make the laws governing our schools, the economists, the people themselves who influence the making of laws and who are supposed to say what economies are to be practiced.

If it could be said that all students passed through our educational system, then more blame or credit could be given the schools. But there are so many who do not have the opportunity or who do not avail themselves of the opportunity of a formal education and, of course, the schools cannot be responsible for such persons. Federal reports have stated that nearly 5,000,000 children out of 30,000,000 children of school age are not even enrolled in school and that of those enrolled nearly 5,000,000 more are not in attendance.

Another factor that enters into the problem of education and social control is the fact that teachers on the whole are paid such ridiculously low salaries. We cannot hope to secure persons who are ambitious, aggressive, with a hope for the future, for teaching positions because the salaries paid to a large majority of teachers are not sufficient to meet the present standards of living. A teacher is supposed, first of all, to be educated in a four year college--which takes money; second, a teacher is supposed to make a good appearance and dress well--which takes money; thirdly, a teacher is supposed to travel so she can bring to her students information not gained from books and also broaden her own horizon--which takes money; fourthly,

a teacher is supposed to attend classes in order to renew her certificate and keep up with new theories and practices in her profession--which takes money.

Following are some of the figures released by the 78th Congress--the Committee on Education and Labor. During the school year 1942-43 there were over 189,000 public-school teachers new to their positions as contrasted with a turn-over in normal years of 93,000. This turn-over ran as high as 40 percent in 5 states and 25 percent in 27 states. The states in which the turn-over is greatest now pay and have paid for years the lowest salaries to teachers and have the least taxpaying ability to support schools. During the school year just closed (1943-44) there were 13,000 vacant positions in elementary and secondary schools. A total of 65,000 teachers actually left the teaching field during this year. To replace these qualified teachers the states issued a total of 37,000 emergency certificates.

Data from many states and numerous local school systems were presented to the committee showing in many instances the most intolerable shifting and loss of teaching personnel. There are hundreds of thousands of children who never know from one day to the next who their teachers will be when they arrive at school.

It seems obvious that this leaving and transferring of teachers, if not checked, threatens the serious crippling, if not the actual collapse, of a large number of our schools. It is equally obvious that the schools cannot continue to furnish the vital war services expected of them if this migration of competent personnel is allowed to continue.

The chief factor in the loss of teachers in the public schools is the inadequacies of teachers' salaries. Around 40 teachers out of 100 are being paid less than $1,200 annually, and about 8 in every 100 are being paid less than $600 annually. At least 10,000 teachers receive less than $300 annually.

The average annual salary of all teachers, principles, and supervisors in the public schools in 1942 was $1,500 while for rural teachers the average was only about $900. These salaries can be compared with the average annual salaries of federal government employees, excluding military personnel, which is $1,926 and employees in manufacturing industries, including wage earners and salaried workers, which is $2,043.

For several years the minimum annual salary of a beginning professional employee of the federal government has been $2,000. The annual wage of the lowest classification of federal employees has been $1,200. Recently

Congress has provided approximately a 20 percent increase in these amounts.

For the Nation as a whole, the United States Army Induction Board reports that in the period May through December 1942, 28 men per 1,000 called up for induction into the Army were rejected because they had not attained a fourth-grade education. These men were otherwise qualified for military service. The rate of rejection per 1,000 men ran from none in Wyoming to 136.32 in Georgia. The rate for white men ran as high as 107.11 in Tennessee and for Negro men as high as 256.29 in Georgia.

With respect to the equalization of educational opportunity, the American people apparently learned little from their experience in the last war. In 1919 the American Academy of Sciences reported that an examination of 1,500,000 men in the draft of the First World War revealed that 25.3 percent could not read a newspaper or write a letter home.

It would appear that illiteracy and near-illiteracy are the products of educational neglect in past years and must be stopped at their source. That can be done only by giving educational opportunity to "all the children of all the people" of America.

States differ greatly in nature and amounts of economic resources and increasing federal taxation would affect poorer states disproportionately and that is one of the main reasons for federal aid to schools based on the number of school age children.

The causes of inequalities lie in our faulty economic situation, poor tax systems, bad methods of distributing state aid, and confused district organizations. It can be seen how, economics, legislation, education or lack of education are interwoven and interdependent and how important it is to attempt to raise our standard of public education because it affects us all socially and economically.

We all know that this Nation can afford to educate its people if it so chooses. Research and experimentation is always necessary in any field that does not remain static or decay. Breadth of vision, imagination, understanding, vigilance, inventiveness and managerial competence will be required, but without education none of these have ever been in existence, can be in existence or will be in existence.

CHAPTER VI

VIRGINIA AS AN EXAMPLE--OF WHAT?

Equality of responsibility for the general welfare, each according to his capacity, in peace and in war, is the basic premise upon which a democracy should exist. Let us suppose then that capacities have not been developed in say one fourth of the population to the extent that they are able to contribute anything to the general welfare of the state or nation. Suppose that there are 750,000 young men unqualified because of the lack of an education or lack of unequal opportunity to assume their part of the responsibility of this war. Suppose too that out of the number of our young qualified men who go into the war that between two or three millions never return. They represent men who by army standards were able and would have been able, had they returned, to contribute greatly to the general welfare of our society. This

leaves a disproportionately number of illiterate, unqualified men to steer the policies of our Nation. Some persons are disqualified to vote because of illiteracy, but that does not alter the fact that they are with us. These persons have to "exist" and there is no law whereby we can eradicate them but they are a drain on the economic and social life of a nation.

Do we ever stop to think that by preparation through education of each person in society to assume his place in society through equality of responsibility regardless of race, national origin, creed, or position will raise the standard of our living and thinking to a point where each one's personal needs is at a minimum.

What responsibility has the federal government in helping to educate the children of our nation? The future of our government depends upon the ability and loyalty of those who are children and youth today. Are we going to allow a generation of uneducated illiterates to determine the policies of our nation after the war?

Unless the national government, through our Congress, can be persuaded to come to the aid of education, it appears that conditions after the war will be much worse than now.

> Fundamentally and always the crux of progress lies in the quality of the people working together for their own economic, social, and spiritual salvation. Education lies at the heart of the problem.
>
> Education is the only sure road to self-respect and freedom. The complications of present day culture demand that those who live in it must keep abreast of it, not only that they may survive individually but that they may not retard the advancement of the group through their inability to cooperate.
>
> Economic progress without education is inconceivable. In the last analysis the people must be capable of self-help.[1]

Let us cite some facts and figures with regard to the educational system of the oldest state in the Union--Virginia.

Some studies have been made by various organizations, clubs, research divisions, by tax experts, by departments of education, by chambers of commerce and others interested in facts and figures relative to education in Virginia. The results of these findings have aroused interest and comment and too little action in Virginia.

It was found by the Research Division of the National Education Association of the United States that Virginia suffered a net loss of from 3% to 9% through migration between 1930-40. The current expenditure per pupil in 1939-40 was slightly over $40. The cost per pupil

---

[1]Report of the Southern Rural Life Conference, The School and the Changing Pattern of Country Life, Nashville, Tennessee, 1943, pp. 17, 18.

expended in New York was around $135 for the same period. This research showed Virginia as ranking 40 in the 48 states.

The average salary paid public-school teachers, supervisors, and principals, 1939-40, in Virginia was around $800 while New York paid $2,604. Virginia ranked 37 in this respect. The value of school property per pupil ranges from $80 in Tennessee to $526 in New York. Virginia ranks 32d or with the ten lowest states in the Union with regard to value of school property. The number enrolled in public high schools for each 1,000 persons aged 14 to 17 in Virginia is slightly over 500 while the state of Washington has around 950 as compared with Mississippi with slightly under 400.

On the other hand, Virginia has around 475 children aged 5 to 17 for each 1,000 adults aged 20 to 64 while South Carolina has nearly 600 and California only 250. This shows quite clearly what has long been evident--that Virginia is not making as great an effort to support schools as are many other states. Virginia was spending for education only 2.09 percent of her aggregate income while the average expenditure for the nation was 2.57 percent.

Virginia was sixth from the top in percent of children 5-17 not in any school in 1940. Virginia ranked tenth in the percentage of adults twenty-five years of age and over who have never attended school. She ranked eighth in the percentage of adults twenty-five years of age and over who have completed less than five years of schooling. Virginia has a shockingly high rank in illiteracy as has been shown and will continue to be shown unless something is done.

An extract from the Virginia Journal of Education for April 1945 states:

"Recent nation-wide study simply adds further evidence to the following already-established facts:

1. Virginia's expenditure for education have been lower than those of other states, except a few of the poorer Southern states.

2. Virginia's expenditure for education has been smaller in proportion to her ability than that of any state of comparable income or comparable educational expenditure.

3. Expenditures for education in Virginia have not been nearly sufficient to provide even reasonably satisfactory educational opportunities for all.

4. In Virginia as in other states there is a close correlation between expenditures for education and educational attainment.

If, as a recent study of the United States Chamber of Commerce indicated, education is an investment in people, why has Virginia chosen to make such a comparatively small investment in her people?"

It was partly due to these alarming figures that the General Assembly of Virginia on February 3, 1944 adopted a resolution appointing a commission to make a study of the public school system of Virginia.

Considering the fact that the General Assembly stated that "the members of the commission shall not receive any compensation for their services but shall be reimbursed for the actual expenses incurred in performing such duties" a very worth-while report was submitted to the Governor. Meetings for discussion of such topics as teacher training were held throughout the state, fifteen research committees were authorized, the State Board of Education was invited to meet with the Commission, the public was given an opportunity to register opinions at meetings held throughout the state and following is a short resume of the findings:

"1. The people of Virginia manifest widespread dissatisfaction with the present standing of the public schools of the State.

2. The rather general feeling exists that in their management and operation the public schools are now too far removed from the people, and that steps should be taken to make the public school system more democratic.

3. The criticism is heard throughout the State that the public schools are not doing a satisfactorily thorough job toward training the pupils in the fundamental or tool subjects or what is commonly known as "the three r's."

4. There is a strong popular demand that vocational education be given a larger place in the public education system of the State.

5. The opinion prevails widely that the public school teaching profession, largely because of the relatively poor salaries paid, is not attracting its proper share of the superior talent of the State relative to business, manufacturing, government, and other professions.

6. Real concern was shown with regard to the development of a more adequate program of health education and physical fitness throughout the entire public school system.

7. It is almost universally stated that the homes of the State, as a rule, are not adequately backing and reinforcing the work of the schools toward educating their children.

8. Another widespread complaint is to the effect that the present method of distributing State funds among the localities does not operate effectively to equalize educational opportunities between the rural and the urban, or the poorer and wealthier localities.

9. From almost every corner of the State comes the recommendation that the compulsory education laws be more strictly and uniformly enforced.

10. Unmistakably, the hearings revealed that not only are the people of Virginia insistent that better schools be provided as a primary concern of the State, but that they are willing to pay for them through increased taxes, even to the extent of submitting to the unpopular sales tax if resort to that form of financing be necessary."[1]

---

[1]Report of the Virginia Education Commission, The Virginia Public School System, Division of Purchase and Printing, Richmond, Virginia, 1944

From the Commission's report we find that there is a difference of total cost of education per pupil of from $72.63 in Arlington County to $26.37 in Buchanan. There is a difference in average annual salaries of teachers varying from $1,516 in Arlington county to $624 in Buckingham.

The true value of locally taxable wealth varied from $23,779 in Arlington County to $2,420 in Cumberland County. The effort or amount received for education from local sources varied from .0106 in Henrico to .0025 in Fauquier. The total cost of pupils in cities varied from $94.72 per pupil in Richmond to $25.83 in Beuna Vista. Average annual salaries in cities varied from $1,730 in Richmond to $914 in Beuna Vista. Ability or true value of locally taxable wealth varied from $26,908 in Williamsburg to $5,031 in Beuna Vista. Lynchburg rated first in effort with .0079 and Williamsburg last with .0022.

These figures show very little correlation between ability and effort. They show that some of the children in Virginia are receiving an opportunity for an education three and one half times as great as others in the same state; they show that some teachers are being paid almost three times as much as others in the same state; they

show that the total cost of education per pupil varies almost three to one in certain sections of the State.

Following the awakening of interest in education in many circles, The Virginia State Chamber of Commerce undertook, in 1943, to make a study of the conditions pertaining to education in Virginia. It took into account two considerations: (1) the recognition that education affects the general welfare more intimately than any other state or local activity, and (2) the statistical evidence of the low rank of Virginia among the states in nearly all factors used as a measure of effort and achievement in education. It was felt that improvement of education called for a better understanding and for fuller cooperation on the part of the business and professional people in the state.

To carry on the study the chamber of commerce engaged Dr. Francis G. Lankford, Jr., of the department of education of the University of Virginia. A committee of laymen was selected from over the state who represented both geographical, business and professional diversity. An advisory committee of educators was also appointed and altogether they represented what the chamber of commerce considered a fairly accurate cross section of opinion as to what the schools were like as they were and what improvements, if any, needed to be made.

From this study many important facts were revealed but strangely or not, it reiterated what the National Research Division had pointed out and what the Virginia Education Commission reported in 1944 that Virginia is very low in her educational standards when compared with most other states in the union. It was found also that Virginia is not supporting public education to the extent that her ability indicates.

If our schools do not measure up to our expectations who is to blame? It is not the fault of the Department of Education nor the General Assembly alone. The people of Virginia can have the kind of schools they want and they probably do have the kind they want--even though all indications are that they are very low on any scale which one chooses to measure them.

The Sales Executives Club of Richmond, Virginia, appointed a committee in June 1943 to make a detailed study of Virginia's educational system in the belief that business should assume greater responsibility in cooperating with educators to promote a broader educational program in the Commonwealth.

In this report it is stated that "Fundamentally, the first step is adequate funds; second, efficient administration; third, competent teaching personnel; and fourth,

modern physical facilities." The facts and figures in this report correspond to those given in all other reports, but the significant thing is that a civic minded business club is interested enough in matters related to education to investigate, criticize, and suggest ways and means of improvement. This is a vitalizing sign for education provided anything is done about it. To know that something is wrong with an educational system and to make no effort to correct those deficiencies is probably worse than to be ignorant that they exist.

Wouldn't it be possible for civic minded clubs and organizations to adopt a theme Federal or State Aid for Returning Veterans or some similar subject for the coming year? An interest in and enlightening facts about education should be the outcome--whether opposed to or in favor of federal aid.

Let us hope that something will happen to move the citizenry out of the lethargy into which they have fallen!

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

In conclusion, the following is a list of suggestions which could be followed in establishing a uniform school system throughout the United States:

1. That the Department of Education of the United States be headed by a Secretary of Education who will serve on the President's Cabinet.

2. That an International University be established in or near Washington.

3. That the Department of Education establish a system of exchange students and teachers to foreign countries so that a better understanding and knowledge of each other may exist.

4. That we educate for citizenship.

5. That a high standard for teachers be set and salaries sufficiently large to justify high standards be paid teachers.

6. That a State Superintendent be elected by a board appointed by the Governor of each state who will administer the educational policies of his state.

7. That each state be allowed to use the funds allocated to it by the federal government without dictation from the federal government as to how the money is to be spent so long as certain requirements are met.

8. That each state receive a sum of money the amount to be determined by the number of school-age children sufficient to educate every child under its jurisdiction.

9. That one year of compulsory military training to include physical and mental health be included.

10. That a system of federal taxation for the support of public schools be created.

Each of the ten points above have been discussed except 2 and 9. When we think of the establishment of an International University in or near Washington, D. C., of course, we shall probably hear arguments that it is unconstitutional and that we would be setting a precedent. West Point and Annapolis are under the jurisdiction of federal agencies and no precedent would have to be set. President Madison, John Quincy Adams, and Senator George F. Edmonds have favored a National University as have various committees reporting in 1893, 1894, 1896, and 1921, but Congress has always failed to pass or act upon such recommendations.

College Presidents, statesmen, ecclesiastics and many professional men have expressed themselves as being in

favor of a National or International University where only students of higher learning and research could attend. Subjects bearing on International Relations, law, and trade should be included. Languages should be taught and any other subjects that supply a need that is not being met now in other institutions of learning could be included. Students from other nations should be allowed and encouraged to attend this school. Such a school would make for better understanding and a better feeling in world wide affairs.

The reason that such a school should be in or near Washington is that the students would have access to the Library of Congress, the National Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, the Medical Museum, the Patent Office, the Corcoran Art Gallery, the various bureau laboratories, observatories, and the Geological Survey.

A year of compulsory military training should be included in the set-up of all secondary schools. As most schools are set up now military training is included but not compulsory to the school activities. Military training teaches discipline of the mind as well as of the body. It instills, or should instill, a give-and-take

attitude. Some students and some adults have the "take attitude" but have never been taught or have never developed the "give attitude" that is necessary in the successful functioning of a democracy.

In order for a democracy to thrive and survive it is necessary for each person to contribute something constructive in the way of time and effort for the betterment of the social order.

In addition to the foregoing summary, the following is a list of proponents in favor of federal aid:

1. That it is a necessary expansion of the function of the federal government.
2. That it is Constitutional.
3. That precedents exist in appropriations such as those for land-grant colleges and vocational education.
4. That the federal government has an inescapable interest in public education based upon
   (a) necessary training for citizenship
   (b) the mobility of the population
   (c) the bestowing of citizenship on Negroes
5. That federal aid is necessary for lessening the differences in educational opportunity due to
   (a) differences among the states in wealth, income, and taxpaying ability
   (b) in the extent of absentee ownership of natural resources and industries
   (c) in the proportionate number of educable children

6. That Federal aid is compatible with the American economic system in general.

7. That it is compatible with the basic principle of democratic government that wealth should be taxed where found and services distributed where needed.

8. That federal influence over education through existing programs is greater than would occur through direct aid to the states.

9. That existing surplus funds of the states are temporary and are not generally available for the support of public schools and if available, steered into other channels.[1]

In the establishment of any system of education whether local, state, or federal, we should be conscious and should attempt to make youth conscious of the question: What am I going to do with these things? We should endeavor to make generous minded, loyal citizens, as well as money earners. We should attempt to make the earnest, generous minded, loyal citizen an intellectually honest man, so that he will go forth into the world to look at the problems of the locality, the state, and the Nation and the world with a clear determination not to be fooled and not to fool others; to see to it that this generous-minded, loyal, and intellectually honest citizen shall have pride in his

[1]The above proponents taken from a reprint of the Journal of the National Education Association, December 1943

work, so that the things which he builds, whether they be small or great, whether they be material constructions or thoughts and plans, shall be creations worthy in themselves and not tricks or makeshifts to meet a momentary situation. Because of technilogical advance and scientific inventions, our mode and manner of living have been changed and we now find demand not only for the scientific subjects, which contended for recognition in the old classical curriculum, but also for commercial courses, industrial courses, and manual training courses. Working with ideas alone does not get quite as far down into the roots of man's nature as working with inanimate things.

Educated men who are educated try to apply intelligence and knowledge to the improvement of life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Youth Commission, Youth and the Future, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1942.

Biscoe, Alvin B., Sources of New Revenue in Virginia, Prepared for and published by VEA, 1939.

Burke, Arvid J., Defensible Spending for Public Schools, Columbia University Press, New York, 1943.

Cubberly, Ellwood P., Public Education in the United States, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1934.

Cubberly, Ellwood P., Public Education in the United States, Readings, The Riverside Press, New York, 1934.

Cyr, Burke, and Mort, Paying for our Public Schools, International Textbook Co., Scranton, Pa., 1938.

Doughton, Isaac, Modern Public Education, Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935.

Edwards, Newton, Equal Educational Opportunity for Youth American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1939.

Hamrin and Erickson, Guidance in the Secondary School, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1939.

Heer, Clarence, Federal Aid and the Tax Problem, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1939.

Ickes, Harold L., Back to Work, (the story of PWA) The Macmillan Company, 1935.

Johnsen, J. E., Federal Aid to Education, (The Reference Shelf, Vol. IX., The H. W. Wilson Company, N. Y., 1933.

Kilpatrick, Wm. Heard, Education for a Changing Civilization, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.

Monroe, Paul, Cyclopedia of Education, MacMillan Company, New York, 1918.

Munroe, James Phinney, The Educational Ideal, D. C. Heath and Company, Norwood Press, Norwood, Mass., 1895.

Norton and Norton, Wealth, Children and Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1937.

Rugg, Harold, Now is the Moment, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, N. Y., 1943.

State Board of Education, Manual of Administration for the High Schools of Virginia, Division of Purchase and Printing, Richmond, Virginia, 1942.

BULLETINS AND PERIODICALS

Brokow, D., Youth's Evaluation of Present Day Educational Offerings, Tex. Outl. 25: 8-10, S '41, Excerpts.

Chase, Francis S., Wanted: A Fair Chance for Virginia Boys and Girls, VEA Journal, January 1944.

Chase, Francis S., A Cause for Concern, VEA Journal December 1943.

Covert, Timon, Federal Grants for Education, U. S. Department of Interior, U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1935.

Marston, R. B., S-181 Guarantees State and Local Control of Education, NEA publication (no date)

Morphet, Edgar L., How Can We Avoid Federal Control of Education, Reprinted from NEA Journal, October 1943.

National Advisory Committee, Federal Relations to Education, Washington, D. C., October 31.

National Education Association, Federal Aid for Education, (Review of Pertinent Facts) Washington, D. C., June 1942.

National Education Association, Why the Federal Government Must Help, Division of Research, NEA., Washington, D. C., March 1945.

National Education Association, Research Bulletin, Vol. XVII, No. 4, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D. C., September 1940.

Richmond Times Dispatch, Richmond Today, June 24, 1945. (Article by Clifford S. Dowdey)

Richmond Sales Executives Club, Report of Educational System of Virginia, (Extracts from,--no date)

Senate Report No. 323 - 78th Congress, 1st session Federal Assistance to the States in More Adequately Financing Public Education., S. Pub. 323, 78 - 1 -- 1 June 1943.

Virginia Education Commission, Report of, Virginia Public School System, Division of Purchasing and Printing, Richmond, Virginia, 1944.

Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Opportunities for the Improvement of High School Education in Virginia, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Virginia, March 1944.

VITA

I, Madge Arbogast Henderson, was born at Arbovale, West Virginia, on August 1, 1896. In 1910 I took and passed an examination for a grade school diploma. In 1912 I was issued a State Certificate to teach in West Virgnia after having passed the State Board of Education examination. I attended Greenbrier Normal School, Marshall College, and the College of William and Mary, from which college I received a B. S. Degree in 1937. I also received a diploma from Massey Business College, Richmond, Virginia, in 1918.