

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

30 September 1953

497

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION--Colonel J. H. Price, USAF, Member of the Faculty, ICAF.....	1
SPEAKER--Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Director of the General and Liberal Education Branch, U. S. Office of Education..	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	14

Publication No. L54-31

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Director of General and Liberal Education Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was born in Washington, Georgia, 6 September 1904. He was graduated from Emory University Academy in 1922, and received a B.S. degree from University of Virginia in 1928; M.S., 1931, and was a student at Princeton 1931-33. He was principal of Sardis Georgia High School 1924-25 and at Thomson, Georgia, 1925-26; instructor in history, Shenandoah Valley Academy, Winchester, Virginia, 1928-29; instructor in history, University of Virginia, 1929-31; Proctor fellow, Princeton, 1931-33; educational adviser, Division of C.C.C. Camp Education; U. S. Office of Education, 1934-38; assistant director 1938-40; associate director 1940-42; specialist in higher education, Division of Higher Education, 1942-45; assistant director, Division of Central Services, 1945-48; executive assistant to U. S. Commissioner of Education, 1948-50; and Director of his Branch since 1950. He is a fellow of the American Geographic Society; member, American Historical Association; and Phi Beta Kappa.

## THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

30 September 1953

COLONEL PRICE: General Greeley and gentlemen: The emphasis placed upon the school systems, both public and private, throughout our country indicates the important place that education is given in the development of our people, individually and collectively.

This morning Mr. Ralph Flynt, Director of the General and Liberal Education Branch of the U. S. Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will discuss with us the policies and programs of the Federal Government in education. Mr. Flynt.

MR. FLYNT: General Greeley, Colonel Price, and gentlemen: It is a pleasure to meet with you. I can almost say "again," although I don't see so many familiar faces. A year ago I had the privilege of meeting with part of this group. We had quite a lively time indeed and I look forward today to the same sort of experience.

Before we get down to seeing if we can evoke some trends in the Federal Government's policies in education, I think we ought to take just a moment to get something of a backdrop concerning the American system of education. So let us take just a minute to outline a few things that we might keep in mind as we proceed with our discussion.

I think these are some of the questions that perhaps we ought to carry in mind: I don't want to seem to be backing up too far, but I think we must have some of these things before we can really see where the Federal Government fits into this total picture.

First, what is the meaning of education in American life? That is a question that I think we want to explore rather fully. Second, what sort of structure have we devised in the United States to carry out our educational objectives? Third, what are some of the numerical dimensions of this program? How many people are there? What are the expected numbers? What does it cover? Where are we falling short? Fourth, who is carrying this burden? How long can they carry it? How is it distributed? And, finally, what are some of the trends for the future?

Now, just briefly on this question of, What is the meaning of education in American life? I think we can make one rather dogmatic statement, but one that will hold; that is, the American people have adopted education as an instrument of national policy to a greater degree than any other contemporary nation. And that includes the

Japanese and the Russians, although they do utilize education as an enormous weapon in national policy. I don't think we need to dwell on that very long. But just a few things to illustrate that.

In the first place we are trying to educate a larger percentage of our population than any other modern nation. We are putting more of the American people in school than any other contemporary western European country. You might say that we have almost seized on education as a solution for all our problems. I think you might almost expect that, because, when we began less than three centuries ago, we didn't take the western European models as our basis. We had to create our skills in our own way. We didn't bring them with us. The system that we produced to train our leadership we had to plan in our own way. We have done it by putting our faith in education. You can probably think of more illustrations of that than I have given, but I won't dwell on it further.

Second, we have a unique structure in this country. No other country in the Western World is operating its educational program on the scope and with the structure that we have. The Constitution of the United States preserves education as a function of the States. It is one of those things that we expect our 48 States to do. All other contemporary systems have a more centralized program than we have.

We have divided control over this program. The Federal Government has certain responsibilities, which we will discuss. The administrative control has been left in the local communities. It is an amazing phenomenon. I think we need to keep in mind that we have a very peculiar structure through which we expect to carry out our objectives.

Let us just get a few of the dimensions of this program. This small table will give you some idea of the scope and size of the program and something of the growth. It will be used later to discuss the problem of how we draw from our population greater skills and greater performance.

Let us look just briefly at this table on page 3. In these elementary schools are children of ages 5 to 13. In 1950 we had about 22 million of them. Only four years later we had 26.9 million and by 1960 we will have about 33 million. In 10 years they have grown by about 11 million.

You have worked with manpower data and you know that the principal reason for this higher intake is the increased birth rate.

## ENROLLMENTS

(Public and nonpublic schools)

	1950	1954	1960
Elementary schools	22,201,505	26,931,300	33,000,000
Secondary schools	6,427,042	7,302,700	9,400,000
High school graduates	1,200,000	1,356,000	1,760,000
Higher education <u>a/</u>	2,456,000	2,216,000	2,834,000
First degrees	433,000	279,000	316,000

a/ Fall enrollment

In the secondary schools, which are attended by boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 17, we started with about 6.4 million in 1950. That number went up to some over 7.3 million in 1954--that is not going up very rapidly--but by 1960 we will have a total of about 9.4 million in the secondary schools.

There is something that does not show in this table. The figure of 1,356,000 high-school graduates in 1954 represents about 59 percent of the 17-year-olds in that year. The number enrolled in secondary schools covering the age group 14-17 was 7,302,000 in 1954, which represents about 80 percent of that age group. If the present rate of increase continues, approximately 82 percent of our people in the age group 14-17 will be enrolled in secondary schools by 1960.

Now let us go to the question of graduation. In 1950 we had 1,200,000 high school graduates. In 1954 it was 1,356,000, and by 1960 we will have 1,760,000. Note that the number is not going up very rapidly.

Let us take higher education. We had 2,456,000 in the fall of 1950. Enrollment was about 2,216,000 in the fall of 1954 (estimated) and will climb up to an estimated 2,835,000 by the fall of 1960.

Let us take first the degrees. To use a colloquial expression, that is the pay off. These are the people who do the high-level technical and professional work of the Nation. Many of the jobs in highly skilled crafts can be done by people with noncollegiate skills, but these are where our doctors, scientists, Army officers, and the like come from. They come from this very small number. That is all we have to work with.

We are dealing here in 1954 with people who were born between 1930 and 1934. There were about 434,000 first degrees conferred in 1950. That number had dropped to 304,900 by 1953 but we expect it to climb to 316,000 by 1960.

We have used the decade of 1950-1960 because it is during this period that we do two things. We begin to take the enormous intake from the high birth rate of the war and postwar years. We must staff our program at great expense, time, and trouble in order to take care of them. At the same time, at the other end we are confronted with the product of the low birth rate of the early thirties.

These numbers seem to stand in remarkable contrast. But out of the 27 million now in elementary schools, we may expect, if the current holding power of our educational institutions continues, to be back to what we might call normalcy in our trend of manpower by 1960.

We have about 2,216,000 in the fall of 1953 in our higher education institutions. We will have to get along with what we have available in the way of teachers. In terms of education that indicates one of our greatest needs. We will have to train teachers for these large numbers, while at the same time at the other end of the scale we will have to live with this very small production.

Let me give you a few more figures that will help you get the dimensions. Let us consider the staff that it takes to run this system and what it costs.

There are about 1.2 million people engaged in operating the American educational program. About 1 million of those are faculty members in the public and private elementary and secondary schools. About 200,000 of them help to carry on the program of higher education.

Let us get a few dollars down. That is the American way of measuring. The elementary and secondary school program costs us a total of about 8.4 billion dollars a year. That amount is divided roughly into approximately 6.7 billion dollars for current operating expenses--salaries, cost of operation, and so on, and 1.7 billion dollars capital outlay. Our higher education program costs us about 2.5 billion dollars a year, of which the sum of some over 2 billion dollars is current operating expenses and the amount of 475 million dollars is capital outlay. There you have almost 11 billion dollars and almost 1.2 million people that we have to use to operate this program.

The annual replacements are the other side. This year (1953-54) we have 1.6 million new pupils in the elementary schools. It will take 53,000 teachers to staff that increase alone. In addition, we

should have 65,000 teachers for replacements for death, retirement, and other things. With only 46,000 new elementary teachers graduating, there is a shortage of 72,000 elementary teachers. On the other hand there is a surplus of 13,000 secondary school teachers.

Now, this program is largely financed by State and local taxation. The principal source of revenue for the schools, both elementary and secondary, is ad valorem taxes on real estate. We are spending 1.5 billion dollars out of this for new school buildings a year. We have just recently completed a survey in cooperation in the States, at a cost of 6 million dollars, which indicates that it will take 14 billion dollars to bring the school buildings and structures of the United States up to present needs only; and that it will take at least 3.5 billion dollars a year continuously for another 20 years to bring them up to probable future need. So you can see some of the problems that the birth rate imposes upon our program.

The ability of the States to pay for this program varies very greatly. The average current expenditure of the public elementary and secondary schools is about 225 dollars per pupil. Mississippi, which is at the bottom of the scale, spends 93 dollars per pupil, while New York, which is at the top, is spending 328 dollars.

But let us compare that with the income figures for 1952. Mississippi has an average per capita income of only 818 dollars, while New York has an average per capita income of 2,038 dollars. Mississippi has 266 children per thousand population, while New York has only 170. When we talk about equalization of educational opportunities, let us keep that in mind.

Now, just a quick point or two to carry in your mind. One of our greatest national problems is the question of the utilization of our scarce manpower. That is something that affects the military as well as the civilian. How are we going to get our new doctors and our other professional people? Where are we going to get the people to run our departments? Let me give you just a little summary of that.

In the first place we are not getting our rural youth trained. In the second place we are not getting our women trained, particularly at the secondary level. Women persist in this group better than men. More girls graduate from high school than boys. But only about one-third of the girls go to college. Only about half as many graduate from college as boys.

Another large block of the population from whom we are not getting our best is the Negro population. There are perhaps on the order of one-third of that body, about 15 million people, who are not found in these higher education figures in anything like the number in the other fields, or like what their numbers would indicate.

Another loss is the slippage in holding this number in the secondary schools. The difference between the percentage of the age groups and the percentage enrolled is found mostly in the boys and girls in the ages 16, 17, and 18. After the compulsory school attendance ends, which is normally about the age of 16, there is a very sharp drop. We are currently getting in the colleges a bit over 45 percent of the graduates of the high schools. But we are falling short about 23 percent of the graduates of the high schools. We are missing a considerable share, perhaps one-half, of the top third of the graduating classes, who do not have the money to go to college.

I have pointed out to you that the major burden of this enormous enterprise from the standpoint of budget, financing, and administration falls on the States and local communities. But I think the main thing I want to consider this morning is what the Federal Government is going to do about this, if anything. What has it done? What ought it to do about it? I have two outlines on "Federal Educational Programs" that I think will serve as a basis for our main discussion this morning (see pages 7 and 8).

I would like you to look first at the outline, page 7, which has the title of "Programs of Assistance to School Systems, Institutions, or Individuals." The second outline, page 8, is entitled "Programs for Training Federal Personnel or to Support a Direct Federal Purpose."

I want to go back for a moment and refer again to the statement I made earlier, that the constitutional provision for education in the United States dates back to 1789, at which time we did not provide the Federal Government with a direct mandate to operate the school systems. That was reserved to the States.

Historically, however, the central government of the United States has had an interest in education. That was shown first by the Survey Ordinance, passed in 1785, and then by the Northwest Ordinance, passed in 1787, in which provision was made for education in the new states that were carved out of that territory by setting aside sections in each township.

The central government--that was, of course, the Articles of Confederation--afterward our present Constitution was framed and our present form of government inaugurated in 1789, the Federal Government has always taken some form of interest in education.

This is not a breakdown such as is usually used. It is somewhat arbitrary. As indicated, I am trying to show by this that the Federal Government has two fairly discrete purposes in the things it has done for education. I will let you see for yourselves later on, if you wish, if you can evoke some principles from the first outline. I like to think of our discussion as centering largely on this outline.

Programs of Assistance to School Systems, Institutions, or Individuals

1. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
  - Land-Grant College Acts.
  - National Vocational Education Acts.
  - School Assistance Programs.
  - Research and Service Programs.
  - Vocational Rehabilitation Program.
  - Surplus Property Utilization Program.
  - Research Grants and Fellowship Program in Health Professions.
2. Veterans Administration:
  - Veterans Readjustment Assistance Acts  
(P.L. 346 and P.L. 550).
  - Veterans Vocational Rehabilitation Acts  
(P.L. 16 and P.L. 894).
3. Department of Agriculture:
  - Agricultural Extension Service.
  - Agricultural Research and Experimental Program.
  - School Lunch Program.
4. Department of State and Foreign Operations Administration:
  - Educational Exchange Program.
  - Occupied Areas Program.
  - Technical Assistance Program.
5. Department of Labor:
  - Apprenticeship Program.

Programs for Training of Federal Personnel or to Support a Direct Federal Purpose

1. Department of Defense:
  - Service Academies and Advanced and Graduate Schools.
  - Reserve Officer Training.
  - General and Specialized Service Training.
  - U.S.A.F.I.
  - Military Research.
2. Atomic Energy Commission:
  - Research and Fellowship Program.
3. National Science Foundation:
  - Research and Fellowship Program.
4. Department of State:
  - Training of Foreign Service Personnel.
5. Department of Commerce:
  - Merchant Marine Academy and Maritime Schools.
6. Department of Treasury:
  - Coast Guard Academy and Schools.

I don't know whether I or anyone else can say that this is the Federal policy on education. But there are the Federal programs of education, the ones in which the Federal Government has always been interested to a degree. If these programs illustrate various things, then I think we will have to draw our own principles.

Let us take a look at a few of those and see if there is anything we can make out of these. I have put our own department first, because we largely have to do with the major programs which assist school systems in the States. And in looking at this let us keep in mind the original statement--that the American people have adopted education as an instrument of national policy. They have always had a special interest in education. Let us see if we can find in these programs something that illustrates that point.

Here is a program under the Land-Grant College Act, passed in 1862. It created a unique system of education in the United States. That program was evolved because of complaints about the academic character of higher education at the time. There are 67 institutions that received funds under the Land-Grant College Act. That act has been amended a number of times, and as late as 1935. These schools still receive small sums of money, about 5 million dollars a year, from our office for resident instruction in seven main subjects, which are named in the original act.

There is a case where the Federal Government was dissatisfied with the educational system of the country. They felt that there was no way that the agricultural youth and the industrial youth could be educated. So the Government offered to stimulate the States to create a system of education which would meet that need. The Federal Government does not pay the major part of the cost. It pays only about 1 percent of the total cost of operating those colleges.

Now, under the national vocational education program almost exactly the same thing happened. The first act was passed in 1917 and is now known as the Smith-Hughes Act. The second one was passed in 1946 and is known as the George Barden Act. There is appropriated the sum of 26 million dollars for vocational education in the States. Again, the Federal Government felt that the current educational program was not providing vocational training for youth. It did not propose to set up such a system in the schools. It proposed to furnish the States money, which they were required to match.

Again we have another case of a similar principle to that which we had in the first one. The Federal Government has set out here to stimulate the states to do something, but not to do it themselves. The Federal Government offered to put up half the cost, but the States were required to match this money. More than 35 years have passed

and the States are putting in almost 5 dollars for each dollar from the Federal Government. Our purpose has been achieved. The Federal Government has stimulated the States to spend that money.

Here is a program called "School Assistance Programs." There is another principle involved in this. There are two acts under that-- Public Law 815, which built school buildings in areas where the Federal Government has put up large structures, such as army camps; and Public Law 874, which gives money to operate schools. Included in the second is money to operate schools of the military reserves. Here is a case where the Federal Government has recognized the injury done to local communities through the cutting off of taxable property and has carried out another principle.

Let us go to the next one, which is of an entirely different character--the research and service programs of the Office of Education. This is research, developmental, and consultative work. About 2 million dollars a year is spent on that. It fulfills about the same purpose as the Bureau of Labor Statistics does in the field of labor. It provides data for planning purposes. For a small sum of money it accomplishes a very large and important end.

Now we come to another one of an entirely different character. This is vocational rehabilitation of civilians. The Federal Government spends about 25 million dollars a year on that. The program serves about 250,000 handicapped people. Here we go back to our principle that the Federal Government has an interest in the use of scarce manpower. Here are many people who otherwise could not earn a living, because of handicaps of all sorts.

Here is another program that illustrates again this question of the dedication of the American people to the concept of education. This is the surplus property utilization programs. We had an enormous amount of property left over after the war, and it was felt that some of it could be made to serve the purposes of education. About 500 million dollars worth of this property was given to the schools under this program.

Here is another program on which you may quarrel with my classification. Here is where the Federal Government is spending about 25 million dollars a year for medical research and about 2.5 million dollars for consultative work on health. This illustrates another principle--that the Federal Government wants something done and it sets out to do it this way.

Here is another program that I think we ought to touch on. This is unique. I refer to the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Acts. Traditionally in America, when we have demobilized after a war, these

men who have lost time in the service of the country, lost income, and so forth, we have given them a lump sum payment. In some of the other wars we didn't give them much of anything except mustering-out pay. When we ended World War II, however, we used another principle. This time it was our intention to make up for the time they had lost. We made it up to them, not in money--we don't expect money to do it--but we made it up by sending them back to school.

So at the end of this particular war, in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950, millions of young veterans were sent back to school. I think it is very difficult to overemphasize the importance of this program. Nothing we have ever done in the United States in such a short period has conserved so much manpower and has meant so much to our Nation as this.

Again, here is a comparable program. This is the program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans. We expect that about 50,000 of desirable manpower would have been lost without this.

Let us now go to another type of Federal program--the work done in the field of agriculture. This illustrates the same principle that we had before. The Agricultural Extension Service has something like 30 million dollars. The Agricultural Research and Experimental Program has something like 56 million dollars.

This is an old program. It has been running for generations. It is what has made American agriculture the most scientific in the world. It is what has increased our productivity and made it possible for us to use fewer and fewer people to produce more and more food.

Here is something that illustrates again the dedication of the American people to education. This is the school lunch program. When we found that we were having surplus agricultural products that couldn't be sold, we started giving them to the schools. The Federal Government is appropriating 83 million dollars a year to buy hot lunches for children in the elementary and secondary schools. That is something that is not publicized. You probably have never seen anything in the papers about that. We might have destroyed these surplus foods, but we didn't. We moved over into the field of education with them.

I have said that the American people have adopted education as a national policy to a greater extent than any other nation. When we started drawing up programs of trying to strengthen our allies, we did several things. Of course, we gave them military assistance and we gave them the Marshall Plan. But we did some other things. We started bringing students from over there to be educated in our institutions. We started bringing the Japanese and German leaders over

here to study in our institutions, believing that they would learn the democratic way of life quicker than any other way.

This program here is a program of exporting technical assistance to backward nations. Again our faith in education as an instrument of national policy has been shown. This is another program where we are helping people.

Next is the apprenticeship program. The Federal Government has apparently felt that through the training of apprentices the basic purposes of the various departments can best be carried out. The graduate schools develop educational plans through which they give general apprentice training. I am unable to estimate the extent of that program. I haven't had sufficient contact with it. But it gives training in electronics, radio, and so forth. We hear constant complaints that we are training these people, and they immediately go out and become radio and television repairmen in civilian life. But, obviously, the primary purpose of this is to train men for the military services.

Much fundamental research is being done in this program, under the leadership of the Atomic Energy Commission. Again, most of that is basic research, to be used by the military.

Here are some more things that the Federal Government has set up. You may quarrel with the classification of this as against some of the others. But, at any rate, it shows that when the Federal Government has wanted some specific result, it has turned to education to produce that result. If we want scientists, we appropriate money to produce scientists.

I don't know if you can evoke from this presentation any consistent policy of the Federal Government in terms of solving this problem of scarce manpower, and the utilization at the highest level of the manpower in whatever numbers it may be available. But, at any rate, I think this will show to you that historically and contemporaneously the Federal Government has an interest in education, and that this interest is usually specialized.

It may be categorized under two headings. When the Federal Government sees some great lack in the educational program of the Nation that is going to hurt the Nation, it steps in to fulfill and make up that lack. The other is that if the Federal Government has some specific purpose which it must achieve, again it will turn to education to do that.

I think you will observe also that the Federal Government is not undertaking to carry any very great part of the load that the

States and local communities must carry in meeting their educational obligations. That is a debatable question. It is a moot question, among citizens, as to whether the Federal Government should do it. It is charged with emotion. I won't spend any great amount of time on that.

What are some of the trends for the future? Let me see if I can leave some estimate of the situation with you for you to base your questions on.

We might look over the bills introduced in the Congress. They would probably amount to 18 or 20 inches when you stack them up. They have all sorts of special purposes to be served. I would like to pick out three that seem to have points that can be discussed. I will give them in order and then say a word about each.

The first is general Federal aid for current institutions. That proposal has been before our Congress for the last 30 years. In the 80th Congress a proposal of that character passed the Senate, and it got quite far along, as you know. It was the subject of heated debate.

The second program is a comprehensive program to assist the States in building school buildings. Three to five hundred million dollars would be appropriated. No bill like that has ever passed the House, but the 82nd Congress did appropriate 3 million dollars to make a nationwide survey to serve later as the basis of a bill. No bill has been forthcoming as yet. Both of these would be revolutionary as Federal policy. Nothing like this has ever been done in the past.

There is another one of that kind that has been introduced in every Congress. That is the national scholarship program. That would be at the higher education level, and it would reach about 250,000 to 300,000 now that would not otherwise get to attend college. This proposal was presented by the previous Administration as request legislation to the 82nd Congress. No hearings were held. It has never passed out of the committee.

I will say one last word about the Office of Education. It was, of course, established originally as a statistical bureau. Only recently has it begun to grow, as the Federal Government has stepped in and assumed more leadership. Our policy is something like this:

First, we propose to carry forward research which will provide the basis for States and local communities for their planning in every area of education.

Second, we propose as professional people to measure the effectiveness of our program and attempt to bring to the Administration and the Congress some picture of where we are falling short, and whether or not the Federal Government should take action. We have done that in the past, within the framework of Federal policy. We are professional people and can only define the problems that are involved. What the final policy will be will have to be decided by the Department heads, by the Executive, and finally by the Congress. But we are very clear that the Federal Government in the present-day United States must look forward to playing some part in this program.

I have called your attention to the inequalities that exist, such as that between Mississippi and New York, in the field of education. We don't know any way in the long run by which these inequalities can be erased without some form of Federal participation. We cannot say what that ought to be. There are a wide variety of ways in which it could be done.

We have a highly mobile population. We must realize that these 266 boys and girls out in Mississippi are not all going to work in Mississippi. They are going to New York and Michigan, to other parts of the country. These States with a low income and a high number of children per thousand are exporting states. The others are importing states.

I hope I have brought out a few points that may be controversial and about which I can be questioned. If I can answer them, I will be glad to do so.

COLONEL PRICE: Gentlemen, Mr. Flynt is ready for your questions.

QUESTION: Mr. Flynt, I don't subscribe to this particular theory, but some people seem to be afraid that Federal aid to the school system is tantamount to Federal control. They do have somewhat of a case in point when they point out that military education is compulsory at the land-grant colleges. I wonder if you would care to comment on that.

MR. FLYNT: Yes. That is one of the arguments that have been used. I would like to say two things about it.

The first is that it is the statement of an opinion. It doesn't have to be that way. You can write a bill that makes it impossible for the Federal Government to control education. Second, I think we can point to some examples to prove that it doesn't have to be true, and in most cases hasn't been true.

The Land-Grant College Act was passed to spend money for setting up higher learning in certain things in which the Government was

interested at that time, including military training. So when Congress passed that act, it included a minimum of things that the Federal Government wanted done. It wanted institutions established for the education of youth in agriculture and in industrial subjects. It wanted six subjects to be taught in those lines, and the seventh was military training.

Now, the reason for that was that we were in a war. The act was passed in 1852. It was signed by Abraham Lincoln in the middle of the war. We were desperately short of colleges to act as the basis for officer training at that time. But it is a long way from the Federal Government basically prescribing what it wants taught and exerting control of the institution.

There has been no Federal control. There is none at these 67 colleges now. They include some of the biggest universities and colleges in the country--the University of Illinois, Minnesota, California. I can just imagine our trying to tell the president of the University of California what to do. He automatically gets his money and he spends it. The money is sent out and that is all the Federal Government has to do with it. The secretary of the department signs the warrant for the money, the colleges and universities get it, and that is all.

There is some control over the way they spend this money, but Congress wrote that in the basic act. The Office of Education didn't create that by regulation. Congress passed the basic act with that control in it, and they don't want to change it.

So my answer to that question is that it doesn't necessarily follow that it would be true, and it is not true in most of the cases. It is true only if people want it that way. I think you can write an act setting up a formula for the Federal Government to follow which will make it impossible. Once that has been accomplished, I am sure the State departments of education are entirely able to hold up their end. I doubt if the Office of Education would be able to encroach on them, even if it wanted to. We were born and brought up with the same philosophy on education as that of the educational institutions, and we have no desire to do their job.

QUESTION: Would you care to comment on the effect of the education by industry on the quality of the population of the country?

MR. FLYNT: You are referring to the in-service training programs within industry?

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. FLYNT: There is no question but that the engineering program in the universities or the vocational education programs provide only threshold training. The specific training for particular jobs in industry has to be done by industry. There isn't any question about that. The various industries take their workers in hand and train them for their specific tasks.

The transferability of the training is another consideration. That is why we would rather train engineers in the United States in engineering schools where they cover a broad field, where they get a wide variety of subjects. If an engineer is trained for a specific task in industry and he leaves that industry, he is not of greatest use elsewhere.

For specific tasks there is no question but that training programs within industry are necessary. But we have not trained any large body of men in this country within industry, as is done in some other countries. I don't think the American people wanted it done that way. They have gone in the opposite direction.

QUESTION: You have indicated that the numbers enrolled in higher education don't meet the requirements of the Nation even though 25 percent of the high school graduates are receiving first degrees, which I think is fairly high. I have two questions. First, who is responsible for determining the ideal number that the United States requires? Second, who is responsible for the coordination of the various programs in all of the various departments?

MR. FLYNT: The question of whether or not these numbers are meeting the needs is determined, not by any one science, but simply by computation. Let us take engineers as an example. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there have been in the last five years openings each year for about 35,000 engineers in the United States. We could have employed 35,000 engineers in this country if they had been available. But we didn't have them. We produced, as I recall, about 52,000 graduate engineers in 1950, but they were boys that entered training in 1946. I don't know that we can say with all the complications involved that anybody is responsible for determining whether that number is adequate or not. It is just a question of matching what we determine by nose count with what is being produced.

The same thing is true in education. We need 53,000 new teachers a year just to match the additional classrooms built. That will take one out of every five college graduates eligible. We cannot get one out of five.

I think we can arrive at that simply by totaling up what each aspect of the national program could absorb and matching it with what we have. It is an intellectual problem.

As to who is responsible for coordinating these programs, the Executive Office of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, is the nearest thing to that authority to coordinate. But I think you will recognize that some of these programs have such an impact and have such enormous special interest groups behind them that the Federal Government is not in much of a position to coordinate them.

For example, we operate a considerable vocational agricultural education program. Some people think it ought to be in the Department of Agriculture, and some disagree and say that this program ought to be in the Office of Education. But it is politically impracticable to do it. There is not much way to do that in our country.

It is the job of the executive branch of the Government to give you a categorical answer.

QUESTION: Do you anticipate any great increase in these higher education figures due to the current trend toward the abolition of segregation?

MR. FLYNT: Yes, I do.

I might point out that I didn't take the next decade, 1960-1970 into consideration in these figures, because it is going to be this decade from 1950-1960 that is going to produce the leaders that we are going to use in the next 25 years. There will be a very sharp upturn after 1960, because the children born in 1942 will begin to enter college in 1960. During the 70's this will go up very rapidly as a result of this.

We could probably have a 40 to 50 percent increase in the Negro enrollment in the colleges. That is a large body of the population percentagewise, without regard to whether they are of the same ability.

QUESTION: A perusal of your figures on the blackboard indicates to me that one of the most serious breakdowns in our educational system lies in our secondary schools, first, because they don't attract a larger percentage from the elementary schools; and, second, because they don't graduate enough of the people whom they do attract. There must be a lot of reasons for that. I know that you probably have been making studies on this and I should like to hear a few of those reasons.

MR. FLYNT: That is the critical point of most educational problems and discussions of the current day. It lies just at the focal point that you indicate.

First, I think you need to recall that in the United States we have accepted wholly and completely the concept of the generalized

secondary school. We have only one category of educational institutions above the elementary school. In other countries--England, Germany, France--there is a division into about three categories at age 11 or 12. The pupils are given an examination at that time, and they are divided up into those who are going to educational institutions like Oxford and Cambridge--the academic and scientific lines--and those who are going into vocational lines. Then those who are going into vocational lines are further divided up.

That has been entirely in opposition to the philosophy of the American people and American educators. We take pride in our comprehensive high schools, where we hold together all classes of people--the rich and the poor, the brilliant and the less brilliant. We are inclined to believe that this is one source of our strength. It has always been a terrific problem to design a curriculum to meet that sort of program.

We have to recall one other thing, that is, the American high school is the lineal descendant of the colonial Latin schools and of the 19th century academy, which had very definite social overtones. Gentlemen received their education in a Latin school or academy.

In the late 19th century the college education became more fashionable. We got more of our gentlemen from the colleges. The American high school and academy became largely college preparatory institutions. They still retain that second overtone very heavily. Almost any high school principal will tell you how many of his girls and boys got to college and how many graduated. They don't like to emphasize what they did otherwise.

So, again, we have never been able to break loose from this cultural interest in education in the secondary schools. Even the agricultural school curricula are heavily influenced by the college entrance requirements.

Let us see where we stand on these secondary schools. It divides up something like this: About 45 percent of the graduates go to college, about 20 percent go into the skilled trades and into special vocational schools, and about 35 percent terminate their education there.

We have had numerous studies made in the large cities and in rural areas. I think that is a fair indication that we are not getting the secondary school curriculum which is of value to the generalized type of student. For the boy who knows that he wants to be an electrician or an automobile mechanic, who knows what he wants to study in college, we have our program pretty well set up. We have a good program. It gives him what he needs. But for the boy or girl

who doesn't know exactly what he or she wants to do--who will probably drive a baker's truck, wait behind the counter in a 10-cent store, be a salesperson, who is going to find his way there, as many people do--the general program that those people take is, as I said, heavily oriented for those who go to college. Their I.Q. is usually on the order of 105, 110, or 115. They are not interested in English literature and that sort of thing. They want something closer to their life problems, and that we haven't been able to give them.

Just one last thing. One of the most important curriculum movements in American secondary education is actually in the direction of trying to develop a secondary school curriculum which is suited to the needs of this group.

QUESTION: I have two questions. First, do your enrollment figures include the private and the parochial schools? Second, what is the trend in this country in those schools?

MR. FLYNT: This is about the way it is divided: About 90 percent of the elementary and secondary school pupils are in the public schools and about 10 percent are in private schools. Of that 10 percent about 2 percent are in the Protestant and nonsectarian schools, and about 8 percent in the Catholic parochial school system.

QUESTION: What is your opinion on the possible adverse effect, or the effect, on general education of universal military training?

MR. FLYNT: That is one I would like to duck.

As you may have observed, educators are strongly divided on the question of universal military training. One body of educators believes strongly that it should be adopted. Another body of educators has been equally convinced that it should not be adopted.

Most of the people who have been opposed to it have given as their reason an argument something like this: In the absence of a present danger, it is a waste of manpower to send people through military training. They will very quickly lose these skills and within a few years will be unavailable without a very expensive reserve system, which we apparently have never come anywhere close to adopting.

Most educators, I think, if convinced that the danger was great, would want to do it. Obviously, we have done it in war, and very well. But I guess they haven't been convinced as yet.

QUESTION: Back in the thirties the Federal Government carried on extensive education under the WPA. Is that program still in effect? If it is, who is handling it now?

MR. FLYNT: Adult education for the older adults was carried on by WPA. For the younger adults it was carried on by the NYA. All those programs that were financed by Federal funds are no longer carried on. No aspects of any of them are alive in terms of Federal participation. A very few of those programs have been picked up by the States and carried forward. But the WPA program was carried on under adverse conditions and is very difficult in peacetime.

QUESTION: Television has been discussed in the papers and by educators as a method of education. It seems to me that there is quite a high potential for alleviating some of your 60,000 teacher shortage that is coming about. Would you care to discuss that?

MR. FLYNT: Yes. I think educators are almost as one with the view that television offers one of the most important possibilities to supplement many of our teacher shortages. It is particularly valuable for adult education.

This is what has happened: The Federal Communications Commission, about two years ago against the opposition of the commercial people and of almost everyone, has set aside 242 channels in the whole United States for educational purposes. There is in almost every major metropolitan area now one ultrahigh frequency or very high frequency channel available for education. So 242 channels pretty well blanket the United States.

Obviously, that is extremely expensive. It takes something on the order of 275,000 dollars to build a minimum station, and almost as much to run it. Obviously, many of the educational systems and institutions would be unable to carry on such a program. However, so convinced are our leaders of the need for such that they are making almost heroic efforts to bring it about.

For example, the Ford Foundation is spending a huge sum for that purpose. It is spending 5 million dollars on such a program. I think that will go a long way toward providing the basic programs for these people. They are also assisting the local funds by matching them up to 50 percent.

Many stations are on the way as rapidly as they can possibly move. I believe we are within five years of seeing most of these channels picked up, and that we will see one of the most vital new adult educational programs that we have ever had in this country carried on through television. We expect great things to come of it.

QUESTION: Is there any tie-in between the Department of Labor's apprenticeship training and the secondary school systems of the United States?

MR. FLYNT: Yes. In the apprenticeship program the actual job of training is done in the plants in industry, whereas the related training is done in the vocational schools. It is divided between plant training and vocational school training.

QUESTION: The National Vocational Education Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, has a provision for Federal contribution toward the cost of giving night school courses in vocational subjects. How does this act work?

MR. FLYNT: The National Vocational Education Acts make provisions for part-time and evening school in agriculture, home economics, trade and industries.

QUESTION: Coming back to this question of education by television, what is the basis of your observation there in view of the evidently limited use of the much less expensive mode of communication--radio broadcasting?

MR. FLYNT: Of course, television has another dimension. The psychological effect of the other dimension is very important. Radio can do almost anything that television can do, but it lacks the third dimension.

QUESTION: I was thinking primarily of the cost aspect.

MR. FLYNT: You are quite right. Education by FM radio is fairly effective. However, in spite of the staggering cost of television, we believe that we have had enough experience with it to think that that additional method of education is going to come forward in strong measure.

COLONEL PRICE: Mr. Flynt, I wish to express the appreciation of the college for your very instructive lecture and discussion this morning.

(3 Dec 1953--750)S/sgb