C461

EDUCATION AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

4 December 1958

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION--Colonel P. B. Klein, USAF, Member of the Faculty, ICAF 1

SPEAKER--Dr. Herold C. Hunt, Eliot Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University .. 2

GENERAL DISCUSSION 13

NOTICE

This is a transcript of material presented to the resident students at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Members of the College may quote it only in student reports or publications for use within the College. Other persons may not quote or extract for publication, reproduce, or otherwise copy this material without specific permission from the author and from the Commandant, ICAF, in each case.

Publication No. L59-71

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

Dr. Herold C. Hunt, Eliot Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, was born at Northville, Michigan 9 February 1902. He received his A.B. degree, cum Laude, University of Michigan 1923 and his M.A. degree from this same institution in 1927. He received his Doctorate of Education from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1940. Dr. Hunt has had wide experience both in teaching and in the administration of public schools, and has been in his present position since 1953 except for two years (1955-57) when he served as Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Dr. Hunt has been active in the promotion of Boy Scout activities; has served as a member, Advisory Committee on Cultural Information, United States Information Agency; and as a member of the Board of Trustees, Council for Advancement of Secondary Education. He has participated at the National level in the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and is past Chairman, American Council on Education. Dr. Hunt was a member of the U. S. Delegation, UNESCO Conference, New Delhi, India in 1956, and was also one of the U. S. Delegation, Office of Education to visit schools of Soviet Union, USSR in 1958. (For a more detailed background see "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who in American Education," "Leaders in American Education," and "International Who's Who."

EDUCATION AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

4 December 1958

COLONEL KLEIN: Gentlemen: For three weeks now, just exactly to today, as a matter of fact, we have been taking a good, close look at the world's human resources, in finding out where the people of the world are concentrated and what kind of people are where, and what makes them behave as they do. We have been making this study in an effort to try to determine the relationship between human resources and a thing called national security.

In other words, we have been searching for the conversion factor that converts human resources into manpower, into something usable, and this connotes something associated with national security.

We have looked into the cultural aspects of human resources, the ethnic origins of the people, some of their social and environmental backgrounds, and have learned that all these things have an effect on what makes people people, what makes them behave as they do.

This morning we want to turn our attention to another very vital facet of the human resources picture, and that is the one of training and education. More specifically, we want to look at the education of our people right here in this country of our own. Are our educational institutions compatible with the age that we find ourselves living in now? Are we having problems in our educational processes? Are we educating our people as we should to be more useful citizens? All of these are interesting topics for speculation. We must surely be running into problems. We read about problems in our educational system in the paper every day.

To discuss some of these facets of our educational system this morning, we have Dr. Herold C. Hunt, the Eliot Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, with us here this morning as our guest speaker. You have all seen his biographical sketch and have undoubtedly noted that he has had a very distinguished career for over 20 years in the educational field, in the teaching field, and in the educational administrative field.

He is going to talk to us this morning on "Education and our National Security." We are indeed fortunate to have him here this morning.

Dr. Hunt, it is an extremely great pleasure for me to introduce you to this class and to welcome you to the College. Dr. Hunt.

DR. HUNT: Admiral Clark, Colonel Klein, Members and Guests of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces: It was a wise man who once observed that high thinking, without hard thinking, leads to sentimentality; that hard thinking, without high thinking, leads to cynicism; but that high thinking, with hard thinking, leads to sound thinking.

This morning I hope that we may charge ourselves with the responsibility of some high thinking, some hard thinking, hopeful of some sound thinking on this intriguing subject of "Education and our National Security." That it is included in the program agenda of the Industrial College is a reflection of its importance, and that I am privileged to make this presentation this morning is indeed an opportunity of which I am most appreciative.

Two years before the adoption of our Federal Constitution, our Founding Fathers, struggling with the problems of disunity that characterized our early history in the days of the Articles of Confederation, enunciated a philosophy of government for the great Northwest Territory which subsequently has become an underlying principle for the American people. I refer to Article III of the Ordinance of 1787, which suggests that religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education, shall forever be encouraged.

With that as a fundamental statement, a philosophy of government, a great principle of the American people, to which the Nation subsequently has been committed, it is somewhat surprising that, in our Federal Constitution, no mention is made of the term, education. In referring to the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, in the well-known Bill of Rights, we are, of course, made aware that powers that are not specifically delegated to the Government are residual within the States, and, since 1789, when the United States became a republic, the Congress has observed, jealously, responsibilities inherent upon territories applying for admission to statehood in the field of the support of public education. So, were we to trace the early constitutions of those territories applying for admission subsequent to 1789, we would find frequently a reiteration of the principle enunciated in the Ordinance of 1787.

So, at the outset this morning, I would suggest to you that, historically, traditionally, and legally, education is a State responsibility. Once the States had given indication of their legal acceptance of responsibility, they were quick to delegate that responsibility to school districts which were created. And so, in the history of education in the United States, as we relate that historical perspective to public education, we are aware of the full impact of local responsibility. Education has been accepted as a benchmark of our great American Republic.

To that program more than one-fourth of the population of the United States is committed in terms of personal involvement. Only recently a book under the title, "One-Fourth of a Nation," was published. It is suggestive of the impact of numbers within the educational structure of that program. Roughly, today, there are 32 million girls and boys enrolled in the elementary schools of our Nation, public, independent, private, and parochial; some 8.5 million young men and young women enrolled in our secondary schools nationwide; and approximately 3.5 million young men and young women enrolled in our colleges and universities. These segments of our population number in excess of 44 million and constitute, according to the last estimate of the Bureau of the Census, more than one-fourth of the estimated 175 million who comprise the population of the United States.

Education and the National Security: What kind of a program is necessary to utilize to the full the potential represented in this tremendous segment of our population? There are many facets to that program. It is a many-dimensioned educational structured creativity. I should like to suggest what I think are some of those dimensions this morning as we think in terms of the opportunity and the challenge inherent within the subject of this presentation.

What kind of an education is necessary for national security? In the first place, it seems to me that paramount today on all educational levels is an education that will promote an awareness of the world of which we are a part. During the time that it was my good fortune to serve as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I had the opportunity of serving as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization at its biennial conference meeting just two years ago this very time in New Delhi, India. The four and one-half weeks that we were privileged to spend in that interesting country, the opportunity that was afforded me to visit with Ministers of

Health and Education of the the nations of the world which were a part of that travel experience, permitted a closer identification with some of the problems of the world.

As a former teacher of the social studies, as a high school principal, as a superintendent of schools, as a university professor, and as one always interested in the current social scene, I thought I knew something of the world of which I was a part. I was somewhat unprepared, gentlemen, for the revelations that greeted me as a result of those worldwide contacts. It was only when I had the opportunity of establishing close and somewhat intimate relations with the delegates from 72 nations that made up the membership of that biennial UNESCO conference that I was aware of some of these problems--that one-third of the population of the world goes to bed hungry every night; that over 700 million adults in our world can neither read nor write; and, what to me is even more staggering and more sobering, that more than one-half of the young people of elementary and school age in the world--and they number in excess of 250 million--have no educational facilities of any kind--teachers, buildings, equipment. They are not participating in any kind of an educational program.

When I speak of the need for an education that will promote an awareness of the world of which we are a part, I am further mindful of other dimensions of that assignment: The fact that this is a very rapidly expanding world in terms of population; an awareness we should have that the population of the world is increasing at the rate of 125,000 every single 24 hours, making possible the projection of the demographers that, by the year 2000, less than a half-century away, the population of the world, currently estimated at 2.75 billions, will probably be in excess of 6 billion; and the realization that a nation such as India, which we were privileged to cover in many capacities, in terms of extended trips, with a population of over 400 million, where life expectancy is only 30 years of age, where 85 percent of the population is illiterate, where the annual average income is under $50 a year, gives us some indication of the problems that attach to growing populations.

Or, were we to look farther to the north, we would look upon what "Time" last week referred to as the Sleeping Giant of China, which Napoleon has suggested it would be well to let sleep, for, when it awakes, it will create new and tremendous problems. With a population of more than 600 million China will, in a relatively short period of time, probably exceed a billion.

Another dimension is the realization that we are living in a world where one-third of the population, since 1945, has been committed to the tenets of socialism, where another third of the population of the world, of which we are but a segment, is committed to the tenets of the democracies, and where, in the battle for the possession of men's minds, the concern is for the uncommitted one-third of the population of the world.

It is a constricting world. That realization came to me as a layman when, after a month in the Soviet Union, earlier this year, we boarded the Russian TU 104A and flew nonstop to Brussels, that we might spend a weekend at the World's Fair, a trip that covered 1,700 miles, which we made in a period of hardly more than 3 hours. It was a revelation that we are living in a world that is more of a neighborhood and a community than was the neighborhood and the community in which some of us lived as boys. It was a realization that we are living in a tremendously competitive world, where basic competitions today are being reflected among two great powers--a prophecy that was enunciated more than 100 years ago by a keen observer of the world's historical scene, Alexis de Tocqueville, who observed that it was destined that the two great powers of the world would be the United States and Russia, and that power would come to these nations by virtue of liberty in the United States and serfdom in Russia.

It was a realization that we are living in a world where today there is a tremendously competitive production schedule. It greeted us everywhere during our month's stay in the Soviet Union, privileged as we were to cover more than 7,000 miles, visiting eight cities, seeing schools on all levels in operation, visiting plants, mills, factories, getting into collective farms, talking with the man and the woman on the street, to the extent of our ability to communicate. It was a realization that everywhere production was the theme of the planned economy of the Soviet Union. Slogans everywhere stared us in the face as we saw, on dairy farms, collective farms, or in the steel plants, the output for last year, the quota for this year, and the production schedules for 1960. Then, although the slogan was interpreted to us variously in different parts of the Soviet Union, everywhere the implication was the same, and commonly it was expressed in the idea of taking and overtaking America, of equalling and excelling America, of reaching and surpassing America.

So, subsequently, since our return, I have not been surprised to see Khrushchev indicating that the production quotas scheduled for 1965 call

C4F.C

for 60, 70, and 75 percent greater production of goods and all commodities than those of the present time, and are going to be brought about as a result of taking young men and young women from schools and institutions of higher learning. Evaluation of the program of education in the Soviet Union probably could best be accounted for by the utilization of three words, which I believe characterize Soviet education--commitment, motivation, and regimentation. The commitment channels into education somewhere between 10 and 15 percent of the national economy of the Soviet peoples. It makes education free up to the age of 45 and affords 80 percent of the young men and young women who are admitted to institutions of higher learning a monthly stipend in excess of the cost of room and board. It finds an accomplishment achievement in less than one-half century of time since the October 1917 revolution of an illiteracy rate of 80 percent converted into a literacy rate of 75 to 80 percent. Operations Bootstrap, I presume, might well describe the educational endeavor in the Soviet Union.

The commitment is tied in with motivation. Motivation in turn is tied in with this tremendous concern to excel the United States and to become, within the next 15 years, foremost among the world powers in terms of productivity and distribution of world goods. This was everywhere apparent in the materials made available to the millions and millions of visitors to the Brussels World's Fair of this past summer.

The motivation finds full reflection on the part of girls and boys and the young men and the young women, who see in the opportunity a chance for privileges that would otherwise be denied them, and which apparently has caused Khrushchev and the men in the Kremlin to take a second look at the universality of Soviet education. And probably the decision has long been reached that it will be much more selective a process than it has been in the years immediately past.

The regimentation is difficult to describe. It is probably best described by sharing with you one or two observations. One observation brought us a quick appreciation of the fact that there are no lefthanded children in the Soviet Union, because they are not permitted to use their left hands. We asked a school director one day, after we had observed two or three days and had seen no one writing with the left hand, "What about your lefthanded children?" Very categorically came the assertion, "There are no lefthanded children in the Soviet Union." We have some 11 percent of our boys and girls who use their left hands in the United

States, but not so in the cult for the common man which Marx proclaimed some years ago and which has received further support from Lenin and Stalin.

It is a regimentation that requires the use of pen and ink beginning with the tenth day of the first year of school. We did not see a single pencil in any of the classrooms of the Soviet Union.

Commitment, motivation, and regimentation are geared to a planned economy with the objectivity of supremacy among the peoples of the world and a concern for the uncommitted third of the peoples of the world.

This, gentlemen, is what I have in part in mind, when I speak in terms of education and our national security of an educational program that is geared to the realization of the world of which we are a part.

Another dimension that I would attach to education today if it is to be geared to our national security would be an education that is concerned with the promotion of a reaffirmation of faith in those ideas and those ideals that gave rise to the creation of our American Republic.

Frequently, since our return from the Soviet Union, I have been asked to compare education in the United States of America and in the USSR. My quick and very frank and candid answer is that conditions which cannot be compared are obviously not comparable, and that the end result of the education process in these two nations is at the extreme poles, with that polarity represented in terms of the Russian education which is geared to producing an individual who is the chattel of the state, whose response is in terms of occupation and every other endeavor to that planned economy, as contrasted to an educational objectivity in the United States which is geared to the recognition of the importance of the human individual and which places a premium on the originality and the creativeness and the resourcefulness of the individual.

The educational schemes of the two nations are so vastly different that they cannot be compared. That is what undergirds my conviction of the need for this reaffirmation of faith in these ideas and these ideals that gave rise to the creation of our American Republic. We turn to the memorabilia of our great Americana in all of its various forces and facets. We turn, of course, to those significant documents--the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, our Federal Constitution, and the philosophy of our great national anthem. We turn to the writings of

our great presidential statesmen--Mr. Washington's Farewell Address, Mr. Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address. We turn to a too-seldom read little essay of Woodrow Wilson--"The Road Away from Revolution." We find reflected in those documents the concern for the supreme importance of human personality, the equality of opportunity, equality before the law, the universality of education, to which no nation has been more committed than the United States of America, Mr. Lincoln's apt concept of government of and by and for the people and our concept of government under God.

It is these things, it seems to me, gentlemen, that our education program must seek to recreate and reactivate and rededicate, if you please, in the lives of every new generation--the fact that freedom is not free, that it has been bought and paid for in the United States and that that price is the price that continuously must be met in terms of dedication and, if necessary, denial.

Education and our national security--we look to the schools as the great benchmark of our American Republic, and, along with it an appreciation of the world of which we are a part. The privilege that is contained within the essence of that which we call Americanism I would have as a still other dimension of education for national security--a concern for the continuance of a healthy economy.

Two systems of political economy are being tested in the markets of the world today, a system that denies the actuality and the reality of private enterprise and free initiative, and that system which, I think, helpfully served to undergird a daring experiment in political science. When our Founding Fathers gave to us the Federal Constitution, it was implemented by their concern for private enterprise and a free economy. Two contrasting theories are being tested today. Greatness has accrued to us as a state and as a nation under our system of economy. We exist in a ratio of 1 to 16 with the peoples of the world; we occupy less than 7 percent of all the landed area of the globe; and yet, by virtue of private enterprise and free initiative, the right to pioneer and to be creative over the years, we have reached a pinnacle of productivity where we are responsible for the production and the distribution of almost 50 percent of the total output of the world's goods--almost 50 percent--34 percent of the railroads, for example, some 50 percent of the radios, 60 percent of the telephones, 72 percent of the automobiles, and upwards of 80 percent of the television sets. This is a commercial achievement unique in the annals of world productivity.

We must, in a program of education geared to the maintenance of our national security bring about an awareness of the need for maintaining a sound and a healthy national economy.

Another dimension that I would ascribe the education geared to meeting the needs of national security would be a concern for undergirding home and family relationships with the full implication of moral and spiritual values. And here again contrasting ideologies are being tested. To me it was a revelation trying to find a house of worship in which to worship during a Sunday in Moscow. Ultimately there came to us the opportunity to attend an old Baptist Church where 600 people, probably 65 to 75 years of age, upon the average, crowded into an edifice that was capable of accommodating hardly more than 300 or 400. It necessitated sitting on laps and crowding the aisles and corridors and looking in through the open windows. The opportunity later to visit with the minister through an interpreter gave to us the realization that he was echoing the party line. Much more typical was the fact that on street after street the old Russian Cathedrals had been converted into museums, Antichristian museums, dedicated to establishing the proof that there is no such thing as Christianity. There is an expression that finds reflection in a little interpretation that hangs under almost every great painting that has a religious motif. The interpretation, as translated to us, is "This is in accordance with the Christian legend."

Since our return from the Soviet Union the 40th university has been established, designated, and called the University of Atheism. One wonders, when one sees the commitment of the Russian people to Lenin and Stalin and Marx as their gods, how a nation that is lacking the spiritual qualities can hope ultimately to achieve the objectives which its leaders have enunciated.

So, certainly strong, with any dimensions of concern for education on the national security, must be the realization of the importance of undergirding our faith in the basic sociological establishment of the home, the family, and then those character-building experiences that enhance that relationship.

These, in general, would be the dimensions that I would ascribe to an adequate program of education on elementary, secondary, college, and university levels, geared into the realization of the relationship between

education and the national security. How are we meeting that challenge today and what are the problems that are confronting education? They are the problems that are confronting our political, our social, and our economic institutions. They are problems that grow from numbers--the fact that the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of 8,000 every 24 hours, which brings into our schools every year 1.25 million more young people than the year before. Back at the turn of the century the population of the United States was 75 million. We had less than 500,000 girls and boys enrolled in all of our secondary institutions. Today our population is 175 million. In our high schools last September 8.5 million young people registered.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School has predicted that by the year 1970 the college and university enrollments in the United States will more than double. A present estimated enrollment of 3.5 million in institutions of higher learning will probably, within the next 10 years, grow to somewhere between 6 and 7 million. This is a situation, of course, that finds reflection in a growing awareness of the inadequacy of personnel and physical need. This is expressed in the realization that we need annually 100,000 more men and women for positions in our elementary schools, and our secondary schools, than, currently, our colleges are turning out. In fact, the study entitled "Teachers for Tomorrow" suggests that for the next 10 years, if we could have in our schools and colleges one-half of all of each year's college graduating classes, it would be only sufficient to meet the educational needs of our institutions. It has been estimated that unmet building needs on the school and college level total somewhere between $10 and $15 billion.

To that program the Government has given recognition. I refer, of course, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958. To you, as participants of this program of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, it should be more than an interesting comment on my part that it is my belief, having seen some service as a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the halls of the Congress, that the fact that there was attached to that Education Act the title National Defense Education Act of 1958 was largely responsible for its passage. It was the identification of education with the national defense, in my opinion, that secured the necessary votes and that brought about the assurance of the Presidential signature, bringing the act into reality last September 2.

Time will not permit a familiarity with that act this morning. Suffice, then, for the purposes of this presentation, to indicate that it carries with

it 10 titles. The titles are widely divergent and expressive of the country's concern for education in a scientific age. You would expect to find, therefore, and you will find, provision for testing of girls and boys between the seventh and the ninth grade levels, so that out of that testing can come an earlier detection of the able pupil. With that testing comes provision for programs in science, in mathematics, and in language. And with that detection comes provision for the extension of other educational opportunities, all spelled out in terms of an original appropriation of some $40 million, and an ultimate potential of the four years in which the act will become operative of just under $1 billion.

This, to me, gentlemen, is one of the most significant breakthroughs in American education, and, peculiarly, it seems to me, it is tied in with our concern for the morning, because the Congress has recognized in this space age, an age in which atomics and electronics are unfolding simultaneously, that there must be a concern for this in terms of the educational achievements of the people.

The fact that 200,000 of our most gifted girls and boys who are in the upper quartile of their graduating classes on the high school level do not go on to college is a sad commentary and a sad realization of the profligacy that attaches to human resources in the United States. Studies esitmate that 100,000 lack the motivation to go on to school and that the additional 100,000 lack the financial resources. So included within the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is the provision for loan scholarships which in turn will in part--50 percent--be forgiven if the people qualifying for those scholarships elect to go into public school training for a period of five years. In addition to that, one title provides for fellowships--$1,000 the first year, $1,500 for each of the succeeding three years.

It seems clear, to me at least, that from the enunciation, even as briefly as time has necessitated this morning, of the provisions of the National Defense Education Act it gives us an indication of the close relationship between education and the national security as envisioned by the Congress of the United States. It would be my hope, therefore--and I speak as a layman and one whose professional career has consistently been identified with education--that you, in your leadership roles would be instrumental in bringing about in those communities to which you are assigned a full awareness of the importance of education and, particularly its relation to the national security.

One goes back and one rereads the convincing statements of our great leaders to sense the importance of education to the total concept that has for more than 170 years characterized the American scene. You will recall how Mr. Washington admonished the American people to promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. Jefferson, in writing to Madison in the early days of our Republic, said, "Educate and inform the whole mass of people. It is the only sure guarantee for the preservation of our liberties." It was the same Thomas Jefferson who said, "If a nation expects to remain free and ignorant in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." Abraham Lincoln said, "The most important business in which a people may engage is that of popular education." James A. Garfield, one of our American schoolmaster Presidents, declared that next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice may long prevail. And Herbert Hoover said, when he was in the White House, "Close the doors of the American schools for one generation and you will set back civilization for a thousand years."

To me it is tremendously significant that on the agenda of these programs would be the Industrial College's concern for education and our national security. Education has contributed much to the greatness that we enjoy as a people and as a nation. In appreciation of that contribution, and in prophecy of what education would mean to a free people, a great man gave to a great people a great song a little more than 100 years ago. That man, Samuel Francis Smith, the author of "America," into the familiar four stanzas of this great national hymn of ours--because such surely it is--in appreciation of the contribution of American education and in prophecy of its relationship to our greatness as a people and as a nation, and to our national security--appended two little known but tremendously significant stanzas. You will find them on file along with the original in the Library of Congress. A little more than a century ago this great man wrote into that song words that to me are more significant today than in the day in which they were first written. Said Samuel Francis Smith:

"Our glorious land today, neath education's sway,
Soars upward still.
Its halls of learning fair, whose bounties all may share,
Behold them everywhere
On vale and hill.

They safeguard, Liberty, our schools shall ever be,
Our Nation's pride.
No tyrant hand shall smite, while within circling might
All here are taught the right
With truth allied."

Thank you.

COLONEL KLEIN: Dr. Hunt is ready for your questions.

QUESTION: Doctor, the plan of giving examinations is very interesting. As I understand it, the Russians have done this at the end of their 10-year course. They channel their students into higher education levels, such as our colleges and universities, or send them to technical schools. Would you please comment on our possibilities of establishing on a greater order technical schools in the United States?

DR. HUNT: In an initial comment on the question, I would have to indicate forcibly that there is little, if any, comparison between the examination process in the Soviet Union and that in the United States. We had with us as a member of our delegation Henry Chauncey, President of the Educational Testing Service, who was particularly concerned with the examination process. The Russian teachers and the school directors with whom we talked admitted the perfunctoriness of the Russian examination scheme. It occurs, as you have indicated, at the conclusion of the 10th year, and likewise at the 7th year. We did not discover that there was much relationship between that and admission to universities and institutions of higher learning. We discovered that all of the young people applying for admission to the technicums, the institutes, the academies, or the universities are required to take both a written and an oral examination.

However, I am appreciative of your question, because it permits on my part the observation of a unique aspect of the Russian educational system--the development of the technicum. The nearest that we have to that in the United States is the vocational school and our junior or community colleges. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 has as one of its titles, Encouragement for the Establishment of Area Vocational Schools, a title that I was delighted to see. It is my belief that the junior college, the community college, and the vocational school on a level above the 12th grade are destined to play a much more important role in American education than previously.

If it is true that our college enrollment is to be doubled within the next 10 to 15 years, it stands to reason that the local school district is going to have to do much more than it has done to meet the needs beyond the 12th year. I would predict, therefore, that the extremely popular junior college movement, first established in Joliet, Illinois, in 1902, and adapted particularly to the needs of the west coast, especially California, will become increasingly an educational institution with greater and greater visibility.

The Russians are concerned with the practical aspects of education to the extent that people who assist in professional skills, such as those who have to assist the doctor, the dentist, the engineer in the various categories of engineering, are not trained for four or five or six years beyond the high school. To meet many of those needs a two-year program, reflected in the training of the technicum, suffices. So we saw technicums for electrical engineering, we saw technicums for different phases of medicine and of dentistry, and the like.

It would be my belief that the junior college, the community college, and the area vocational school in the next 10 years are destined to play an extremely and increasingly important role in American education.

QUESTION: Doctor, starting next year, more and more officers of the Armed Forces will be approaching retirement age. That will be roughly only 53 to 55 years of age. Speaking of, starting around 1970, the enrollment of people in colleges being doubled, I assume, therefore, that the ratio of growth of those coming through high school will be the same. Is there any plan afoot, say, to screen the officers who are retiring, to see if you can use some of them? Perhaps you may not want to take from this body of people to become teachers, but I should think that there would be quite a few specialists that you could use. And it would be a good time to start now. Are there any plans afoot toward that?

DR. HUNT: Colonel, I think that plan has been afoot for some length of time. Increasingly, institutions, especially institutions on the higher educational levels, are utilizing the services of specialists who come out of the Armed Forces of the United States. I would subscribe to that, particularly, on the levels of institutions of higher rank, because there is a knowledgeableness and there is a sophistication in those young people that are more peculiarly attuned to the skills that are represented in the competencies to which you refer than the young people of lesser age.

That, of course, leads us almost invariably into the old argument about the need for special training for success in teaching, and, on that, as a university professor of education, I am certain you would expect that I would articulate, that I would be verbal. I would hope, therefore, colonel, that there would be, on the part of those whose competencies you call attention to, a willingness to move into an institution, such as the Graduate School of Education, and take a course or two as a refresher experience, so that the techniques that reflect modern educational practice could be fully understood and appreciated by those who would like to identify themselves with education.

I warmly endorse your suggestion. I can tell you that it is being adopted in many communities in the United States. I predict that it will be adopted increasingly in the next decade, because of sheer numbers and needs alone, but I would hope that there would be an understanding on the part of those who represent those competencies of the need for finding out what has happened in the American classroom in the course of the last 25 years, since the time when some of you men were in those classrooms.

QUESTION: Doctor, a controversy has been raging for some years which I don't understand properly. Perhaps you will be so good as to clarify it for me. It is my understanding that church-operated schools have some tax relief, and in California this year there was a referendum to diminish or to cancel out that tax relief. It strikes me that this would only add to the increasingly difficult burden on American educational institutions. If they knock off the tax relief, apparently the schools will close, and then the public schools must take over this load. Will you help me, please?

DR. HUNT: I was pleased when California saw fit to reject that proposal this last month. I would remind this group that 14 percent of the girls and boys of elementary and secondary school ages in the United States attend schools other than public schools. The public schools are not and will not in the foreseeable future that I know of be in a condition to absorb the young people whose numbers are so large and who are currently enrolled in private, parochial, independent schools.

It is true that tax relief is accorded those institutions, and historically and traditionally that has been effected by the laws of our land. I would hope that that would continue. The Constitution, of course, prohibits any

interference with religious practice, and, to the extent that education reflects religious practice, it is the opportunity and the right of an American citizen to elect for his child the educational experience which he wishes that child to have.

I have long held that there is so much to be done in education and the objectives are so vast that the need, therefore, for cooperation is so great that we can ill afford the luxury of arguing among ourselves as to who should do the job. The very fact that we have private, independent, and parochial schools is, I believe, indicative of our strength as a people and as a nation.

There is, I think, unity in diversity. There is not uniformity, and that we do not want. Parenthetically, I would add that there are 52,000 different public school districts in the United States. You men who are the products of many of those school districts know that they reflect an individuality and an originality of their own in terms of the educational program.

I think that is sound, and it is my belief that private, parochial, and independent schools help to contribute to this diversity and hence to the creativeness that is a part of the total educational structure.

QUESTION: Doctor, we have heard it expressed that perhaps the Russians are digging their own grave in communism by increasing education, that, as people get smarter, maybe in the long run they will not accept communism. Will you comment on that?

DR. HUNT: That was a question to which Mr. Llewellyn Thompson, our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Dr. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, the Cultural Attache of our Embassy in Moscow, and I applied ourselves for a period of almost an hour the day before we left Moscow. When we made our preliminary social call on the Minister of Education for the Republic of Russia--interestingly enough, there is not a Minister of Education for the Soviet Union as it relates to the counterpart of our elementary and secondary education--there is for higher education--we sought to obtain for our Cultural Attache of our American Embassy the privilege of accompanying us on our tour of the Soviet Union. We had previously secured from the Kremlin permission to visit three cities that are off limits for tourists. We visited, for example, Kazan in the Tartar Republic, Sverdlovsk, in the Russian Urals, literally in Siberia, where the late Czar and his family were exiled and liquidated, and Minsk, in the

Republic of Byelorussia. These cities are off bounds, and we were particularly interested that our Embassy be represented. It was a foregone conclusion that, on our return to Moscow, we would share with Mr. Thompson and his staff the full import of what knowledge we were able to ascertain.

One question that was directed to our attention by Mr. Thompson--because no one in the Embassy had been in the cities or had visited the parts of the Soviet Union that we were privileged to visit--in our discussion of the apparent attempt, at that time, to universalize education in the Soviet Union--was in connection with whether or not that in turn would lead to a dissatisfaction with the tenets of socialism. Apparently there are conditions that prevail in the Soviet Union, obviously, that are quite different from those in the United States, and Mr. Thompson and reporters attached to our various press, radio, and television services told us that much of the information they gather they pick up at cocktail parties, where Khrushchev and others from the Kremlin mingle in a very fraternal fashion, and where, just as likely as not, some pronouncement is made, or some observation that gives reflection to educational practice.

Mr. Thompson said that only a week before he had heard Khrushchev discuss the fact that probably they were educating too many lawyers in the Soviet Union, and felt, too, that probably the reason for the Hungarian Revolution could be laid at the doors of the intellectuals. Khrushchev stressed the conviction that maybe the Soviet Union should take a sharp look at the educational practice. It seems to me, then, that we can put together three or four of these reasons--a new production schedule, obviously, and the fact that facilities beyond the 10th year of school are inadequate to meet the growing demands of Russian youth, because education is a privileged occupation, as I have pointed out earlier, in terms of stipends and the conditions. Everyone wants to go to the University of Moscow. Those of you in this group who have been privileged to spend a half-day or a day there, as we were, will understand why. The building cost upwards of $500 million; it has 6,000 dormitory rooms as beautiful as any Hilton-Statler equipped hotel rooms in the United States--suites with a bath in between, facilities for blocks of units in terms of auditorium, swimming pool, gymnasium, library, social lounge, and the like. Education is very popular. More and more Russian youth want to go to the university, and they find that they can't build facilities fast enough.

I notice that George Allen, our Director of the U. S. Information Agency, said in a talk just the other day that he attached to this new pronouncement of Khrushchev a limitation of education--the fact that they were going to grant an education beyond the 10-year school to only those young people who were politically safe. So it would be my belief that the point that you raised is a very very legitimate concern of the Soviet Union and its leadership.

Now I would make one other observation. That is, of course, you have to have education in order to bring a full awareness of the tenets of Marx, which Stalin and Lenin have supported. In practically all of the schools in the Soviet Union we would find this quotation: "Without teaching there is no knowledge; without knowledge there is no communism." So you see you still have to undergird the political process sufficiently so that the Russian people will be trained up to a certain intellectual level, so they will understand what Marx meant when he evolved his concept of the common man. Beyond that comes the danger point, and it is within that danger point that I suspect Khrushchev and his associates are looking very critically at the present time.

I am inclined to think, therefore, that Khrushchev is seizing upon the new production schedules to deny educational opportunities to a large group that otherwise would have had them.

QUESTION: Dr. Hunt, the Rockefeller Brothers' Study on education recently forecast that expenditures for education would increase from about $14 billion annually to something in the neighborhood of $30 billion by about 1970. I am sure you are aware of that. Do you see the Federal Government shouldering the major part of this increased burden? If so, do you see any dangers to the local freedoms which we have enjoyed?

DR. HUNT: Yes, I think it is inevitable that the Federal Government is going to have to assume a greater degree of financial responsibility than it has in the past. The very fact that we now have on the law books the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is, I believe, a forerunner of things to come. Now, I presume that we could spend the rest of the afternoon arguing the advantages and the disadvantages of Federal involvement in education. You gentlemen will remember that I dealt earlier in my presentation with the concept of the historical and the legal and the traditional relationship of education to the local community and to the State. That concept is still in good force, and I would be among those who would aline themselves with the conviction that the nearer we can keep the schools

to the people the better those schools are, provided the people have the ability to support that education.

I needn't point out to this group that the character and the content of education in the United States is largely determined by where you were born. Having grown up in Michigan, where there is a great divergence of resource behind each child, in the great mining-industry areas of some years ago, there was wealth almost beyond imagination that supported each child, while across the street, almost literally, in another school district barren of these mineral deposits, there would be a paucity of resource that denied the child really what you might refer to as a foundational program.

There is one other aspect of this question that I wish to mention and consider very carefully before you articulate too eloquently your convictions on this. Within the last third of a century, something has happened to the tax dollar of the United States. If you will go back--and I want to identify this only historically in terms of years and not with administrations, I hasten to add--about a third of a century you will find that the Federal Government had well below 50 cents of the total tax dollar contributed by the American people on all levels of taxation. The last study that I saw assigned to the Federal Government 76 cents out of every 100 cents in the tax dollar.

It is the conviction, therefore, of mayors of municipalities and governors of States that, to the extent the Federal Government is arrogating to itself and usurping the tax power, it carries with it a degree of responsibility of channeling some of this money back to the States for the support of education. It is my belief, therefore, that, if the present tax situation continues--and I am not an economist, I hasten to add--increasingly the States and localities are going to have to look to Federal support. How we can get that without control is, of course, the big problem.

Written into the National Defense Education Act is a paragraph that says, "Nothing is to be construed in this act that will permit the Federal Government to interfere in any way with the educational program of the local district or of the State." To the extent that that can be supported, it seems to me, will the strength of the act depend.

To answer your question specifically, it would be my belief that in the next decade or two decades we will see an extension of the National Defense Education Act and the underwriting of more and more of the

programs on the part of the Federal Government. To the extent that that can be done without Federal control will, I think, depend in large measure the concern of the American people, who, through their school committees and school boards, should watch the process very carefully.

QUESTION: Dr. Hunt, we have heard from visitors here that there may be some question as to the caliber of our product. Have you any views on the relative severity of the disciplines of our school systems versus the Russian school systems, sir?

DR. HUNT: Really, it is a two-prong question. One has to do with the product and the other, by implication, suggests that discipline contributes to the product. I am not going to debate that point at all. Let me comment on both prongs of the question. The United States, peculiarly, among the nations of the world, has been committed to the universality of free public education. I tried to show you by statistics that education has become in the course of the last quarter of a century less and less of a selective process. Let me just recall the figure of 500,000 girls and boys in all of the high schools in 1900 and 8.5 million this fall. The population of the United States was just a little more than doubling during the period of time when the population of the high schools was increasing about 17 times--thereabouts.

Now, then, it stands to reason that our concern for education for all carries with it a realization that all cannot be subject to the same type of educational program. That in part may again account for this veering of course in the Soviet Union, because of the fact that they have attempted to provide an educational program for all, a universal, common educational program. The only elective that a child has in the Russian schools comes at the beginning of the sixth year, when the child is 12 years of age. He must then elect a foreign language as his second language. For this group let me indicate that 45 percent elect to take English. There are 41,000 teachers of English in the Russian schools, and more than 10 million Russian girls and boys are learning to speak English, as contrasted with 10,000 American girls and boys who are learning to speak Russian in the United States.

As to that educational program in Russia, there is no question that there is strict discipline attached to it and you men would recognize it as such. A child, upon being addressed by the teacher, of course, immediately stands, and he is not permitted to be seated again until the teacher

has given such permission. He carries in his pocket a record book, which he must carry with him at all times, and which he must show only to his teacher or the person in authority. In that book, the daily record of achievement is indicated. In addition to that, the child, as soon as he is old enough to do so, must commit to memory 20 rules by which his conduct in and out of the classroom is really circumscribed. Those 20 rules of conduct care for a child's total relationship with all others with whom he comes in contact.

So I would have to say, yes, there is a greater degree of discipline attached to the Soviet schools than there is in the United States. Now then, I would ask, and I don't mean to make this a rhetorical question, but I would challenge you with the significance of that observation: Is that extreme regimentation, the fact that the child is not allowed to use his left hand, that he must use pen and ink, and that he must respond only when he is spoken to, all conducive to a spirit out of which creativity and originality and the like will grow? If I might anticipate a question, you would say, "Well, how do you account for Russian supremacy in science, and so on?" I think there are many answers to that. The Russians were successful in detaining in the Soviet Union a lot of scientific manpower after World War II. I think, furthermore, that any nation whose economy is geared to a monolithic pattern, as is the Soviet Union, if it decides to be first in constructing the manmade earth satellite, or to be the first to make possible jet aviation, it pours its whole economy into such a project.

So it seems to me that, ultimately, the price they are going to pay for that extreme regimentation and that extreme discipline will not be reflected in the type of creative activity which we like to think is characterized in our American education. But, obviously, I am hazarding a very subjective evaluation, and you men may disagree with me thoroughly. I would not covet for our American girls and boys the educational experiences that I saw in the Russian schools.

A whole other area of experience which I do think holds some promise and which in part offsets that discipline is the identification of the Russian youth with the youth pioneer movement. Upon reaching the age of 8 they take an oath, and we were told that 99 and 99/100 of them subscribe to this. They wear a red kerchief and that in turn permits their identification with what is known as the circle movement. In this really extracurricular activity, the Russian girl and boy have an outlet for many of

their exuberances which we find displayed in our classrooms, but which you never find displayed in the Russian classrooms.

So, I guess, in answering your question I would say that I feel personally that too high a premium is placed on discipline in the Russian schools, and, as a result, it would be my belief that the product might be one of more mediocrity than of creativity.

COLONEL KLEIN: Dr. Hunt, our time has been fully expended, and it is time for you to get relief. Thanks for a most inspiring and interesting lecture and discussion period. We certainly enjoyed it.

DR. HUNT: Thank you for the opportunity.

(8 April 1959--4,150)O/de:mr

E 49353