FOCAL POINTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

BY

DOUGLAS EUGENE MURRAY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education degree
in the Department of Education
Montana State College
June, 1962

THESIS
P378
M962
cop.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Problem	2
	Proposals of Investigation	2
	Procedures Used in Investigation	3
	Limitations of Scope and Purpose	4
	Definition of Terms	4
II.	RELIGION AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION	6
	Separation of Church and State	6
	Separation of Church and State in Education	12
III.	LAND GRANTS AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION	21
	Early Land Grants in the United States	22
	Morrill Act of 1862	28
	Developments in Land Grants for Education After the Morrill Act of 1862	32
IV.	GRANTS-IN-AID AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION	34
	The Hatch Act for Agricultural Experiment Stations	35
	Second Morrill Act of 1890	40
	The Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts	42
	The George Acts for Vocational Education	48
V.	NATIONAL WELFARE AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION	52
	Origins and Early Development	52
	Relief Measures of the 1930's	56
	Present Issues	63

Chapter Page

VI. NATIONAL DEFENSE AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION. 70

Early Aspects. 70
Development and Growth 71
Present Aspects. 79

VII. SUMMARY. 87

BIBLIOGRAPHY 89

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the field of education many problems exist. Also, in the past, education has faced many difficult problems in the United States. In the United States education has found a solution to most of the problems that it has faced in the past and is making progress toward solving some of its present problems. But of all the problems education in the United States has faced in the past and present, none has proven as difficult or persistent as the issue of federal aid to education.

Federal aid to education has been a problem in the past. Butts and Cremin state:

> Scarcely had independence been assured when a flood of pamphlets, articles, and essays began to set forth new theories of educational control . . . it should embrace a complete system . . . under national control and nationally supported . . . The traditions of religion and decentralized control were too strong . . .[1]

Federal aid to education is a crucial issue at the present and may continue to be an important issue in the future. One authority writes, "Federal policy toward education has become a topic of utmost concern to both educator and citizen."[2] That federal aid to education is a major problem cannot be doubted. If federal aid to education is a problem then

---

[1]Butts, R. Freeman, and Cremin, Lawrence, A., A History of Education in American Culture, pp. 366-367.

[2]Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education, p. 3.

a means of approaching it as a problem is also worthy of consideration. A statement of this problem is now in order.

Statement of Problem

The problem undertaken in this investigation was to examine, analyze, and draw conclusions about the focal points in the development of federal aid to education. Religion, land grants, grants-in-aid, national welfare, and national defense were selected as the key focal points in the development of the program of federal aid to education.

Proposals of Investigation

In order to approach the problem of federal aid to education, an investigation, analysis, and evaluation of all pertinent facts concerned with federal aid to education was essential. Furthermore, the basis for such analysis and evaluation was the major points in the development of federal aid to education. The investigation served to combine these two aims.

Many studies have been made, past and present, concerning the development of federal aid to education and its progress. One of the major fallacies in these studies has been that too much emphasis has been placed on particular aspects of the problem and too little emphasis on the general aspects of the problem. A synthesis or consolidation of the major aspects of this problem has also been a serious deficiency. The practice has been to select a specific segment of the problem, treat it as the major consideration, and then attempt to create a total picture of

federal aid to education. These pragmatic approaches have not been adequate approaches to the problem of federal aid to education. The appropriate way to approach the problem was to examine, analyze, and synthesize all major aspects involved and to present them in a broad, logical and comprehensive manner. The following section of this chapter presents the procedural approach used in this investigation.

Procedure Used in Investigation

As the major activities involved in this paper were to examine, analyze, and summarize data, the historical approach seemed a logical and reasonable method, as brought out by Hillway:

> Basically, documentary research consists of putting together in a logical way the evidence derived from papers and records, and from that evidence forming conclusions which either establish facts hitherto unknown or offer some generalizations with respect to past or present events, motives, characteristics, and thoughts.[3]

A review of literature was conducted to provide the data for this investigation. The material was examined, analyzed, and conclusions were drawn as a result of the examination and analysis. The materials used in this investigation were appraised externally to see if they were relevant and useful and internally to see if they were accurate and logical.[4] It is always imperative that material be studied to ascertain its accuracy and worth or false conclusions could result. The following section of the

---

[3]Hillway, Titus, Introduction to Research, p. 130.

[4]Ibid., p. 152.

introduction will consider the limitations on the scope and purpose of this investigation.

Limitations of Scope and Purpose

The scope of the investigation has been limited to federal aid to education in the United States. Although this may be implied in the previous parts of the chapter, it has not been specifically stated.

It was not the intention of the investigation to limit the paper to an argument for or against federal aid to education. Such a limitation would result in a serious lack of the objectivity necessary to analyze and examine research materials.

Finally, a serious limitation in source material was found. Primary source material was found to be inadequate. Because of practical considerations, namely availability, secondary source material was relied on heavily. The criterion used in selection of source material was to use the best possible source material available. The final consideration undertaken in this chapter was a definition of terms.

Definition of Terms

Federal aid was a term that needed to be defined for the purpose of clarity. In this investigation the term federal aid was used to denote that support both direct and indirect given to education by the federal government.

Since much of the research depended on the use of the term "focal point", this term needed precise definition. Focal point was used to

designate a separate, major, concept around which the federal government built its program of aid to education.

As the term "public education" was used in a definite, specific sense, this term was defined according to its restricted use. Public education, as used in this investigation, denoted only public, tax-supported education. The term "education" was also used frequently throughout the investigation. The term "education" was used to designate the broader, general implications of the word education. As used in the investigation it designated both public and non-public education. Because of the two terms and the different meanings attached to them, a definition of the terms "education" and "public education" was a necessity.

The following chapters were each devoted to one of the focal points selected for this investigation, which were, religion, land grants, grants-in-aid, national welfare, and national defense, except the seventh chapter which was used exclusively for the purpose of summarization. In the following chapter the focal point of religion was investigated.

CHAPTER II

RELIGION AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Any examination of the issues involved in religion as a focal point of federal aid to education must start with the basic issues and concepts concerned with the separation of church and state. When these have been delineated, the implications of separation of church and state as seen in state-supported and federal-supported education can be discussed. The first part of this chapter was assigned to examine and analyze the broad, general aspects of separation of church and state while the second part was devoted to an investigation of a narrower aspect of separation, namely, separation of church and state in the area of education. The chapter ended with a brief analysis and summarization of the implications that separation of church and state have for federal aid to education.

Separation of Church and State

During the early struggle over separation of church and state, the concept of public education had not yet become a part of the national conscience. No provisions were made for the federal government to assume any specific responsibility for education. Thus, the issue of separation of church and state had no bearing on federal aid to education. However, as the United States began to formulate a concept of public education for all, the relationship of church and state became a critical issue in determining the method of financing universal education. The early schools,

both public and private, were church-related or oriented. Education was regarded as a function of the church to serve the needs of the church. When the purpose of public education was redefined and assumed practical and democratic aims, the earlier concept of education being closely related to religion was no longer compatible with the philosophy of the American people dealing with public education.[1] As the government, both federal and local, began to assume financial responsibility for schools, this incompatibility caused strong opposition to extending this support to sectarian schools.

Due to the Tenth Amendment, this battle for limiting public support was waged at the state and local levels; but the battle soon encompassed the federal as well as state and local levels. Thus, the issue of separation of church and state became basic to the controversies concerning public education and its support. Separating of church and state was, and still is, one of the primary issues in federal aid to education.[2] If this issue could be resolved one of the major problems of federal aid to education would be solved. It is nearly universally agreed that separation of church and state is a well established principle in the United States. The problem is that no agreement exists as to just where this separation starts and ends or how to apply the prin-

---

[1]Cubberley, Elwood P., Public Education in the United States, pp. 171-173.

[2]Butts, R. Freeman, The American Tradition in Religion and Education, p. 174.

ciple of separation of church and state to practice in the field of education.[3] Moreover, neither the states nor the federal governments have treated this issue in a consistent manner.

Because of the importance of this issue over separation of church and state, a careful examination was made. The early Roman Catholic Church developed the theory of unity of church and state. As the various Protestant groups were founded and broke away from their parent churches, they used this same theory to attach themselves to the newly, emergent, national states.[4] This was a practical move, as these newly founded religions needed the power of the national states to support their break with the parent churches. For example, in many German states, the Lutheran Church was established as the state-supported religion while in England, the Anglican Church was established as the civil-supported religion. This ancient tradition of unity of church and state was transplanted to the early English-American colonies by the colonists who settled the land.

Four distinct possibilities had to be considered in studying separation of church and state. These possibilities were "no established religion and no free exercise of freedom of religion", "single establishment with no exercise of freedom of religion", "single or multiple establishment of religion and free exercise of religion", and "no establishment of religion or religions and complete freedom of religion." Although

---

[3]Ibid., pp. 137-178.

[4]Stokes, Anson Phelps, Church and State in the United States, V. 1., p. 86.

colonial America followed closely the precedent of European unity of church and state, the trend in the United States has been from a complete union of church and state to a complete separation of church and state.[5]

In the beginning, the English colonies in America established various religions as their state-supported religion. The Anglican Church was established as the civil-supported religion in Virginia by the original charter granted to the London Company in 1606.[6] The results of this establishment were that the civil authority enforced conformity, levied a tax to support the established religion, enforced attendance at church services, and punished non-conformity by law. Other examples of the single established, state-supported religion can be found in the English colonies in America. Thus, the tradition of church and state unity was carried to America from the old world. The concept of complete separation of church and state also came to America from the old world with the dissenter groups which came to America from Europe. Before the concept of complete separation of church and state became accepted in the United States, other developments took place.

The practice which soon became dominant in several English-American colonies was that of a single establishment of religion, but with a certain degree of toleration for other religions. By 1699 in Virginia

---

[5]Butts, op. cit., p. 9.

[6]Stokes, op. cit., V. 1., p. 163.

dissenter groups were allowed to hold public worship.[7] The Anglican Church was still the civil-supported religion and as such received financial support from the state. In many of the other English-American colonies a different type of established religion was attempted.

The prevalent practice in many English-American colonies was to have a multiple establishment of religions, thus having two or more religions which were state-supported religions. Maryland serves as an illustration of this type of establishment. The Maryland Constitution of 1776 provided that every man should worship God as he saw fit, but that the state might levy an equitable tax for the support of Christian religion.[8] Thus, the meaning of "established religion" took on new connotations.

Established religion came to mean multiple-established religions with all established religions being state-supported religions. This type of establishment of religion still did not provide complete separation of church and state or complete religious freedom. As long as a state was able to grant support, that state could also decide to which religion or religions to grant support. This being the case, no real religious freedom was possible.

The logical step and solution to the problem of religious freedom was complete separation of church and state; in which no religion would

---

[7]Butts, op. cit., p. 32.

[8]Thorpe, F. N., The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws, p. 1689.

be state supported. By 1791, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maryland were the only states with established religions and these were all multiple establishments of religion.[9] The national government was to achieve complete separation of church and state in 1791 with the formal ratification of the United States Constitution and its series of first amendments.

The United States Constitution has only one small phrase devoted to religion. The last phrase of Article VI states: "but no religious test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."[10] Thus the Constitution of the United States did not solve the issue of separation of church and state on the national level. However, in the First Amendment a more effective enactment was accomplished. As finally ratified, the First Amendment reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, . . ."[11] The last step in the complete separation of church and state came with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution was one of a series of constitutional amendments which were to safeguard the civil liberties of the Negroes freed by the Civil War. However, due to judi-

---

[9]Butts, op. cit., pp. 42, 62.

[10]Smith, Morton James, and Murphy, Paul L., (eds.), Liberty and Justice A Historical Record of American Constitutional Development, p. 67.

[11]Ibid., p. 83.

cial interpretation by the courts, this amendment has come to be a restriction on the states to prevent them from infringing the civil liberties granted by the "Federal Bill of Rights." In this manner, the First Amendment was made applicable to the states as well as the federal government.[12] The Fourteenth Amendment was influential in helping solve the issue of separation of church and state in the United States.

The previously mentioned amendments to the United States Constitution made possible the public school system in the United States, for until the issue of separation of church and state was settled, the public school system could neither be created nor supported. However, these amendments to the United States Constitution did not solve the problem of federal aid to education, but they did have an important influence on its development. Many years of struggle were still required to create a public education system free from religious domination and embodying the principles of separation of church and state.

Separation of Church and State in Education

In the English colonies of America, no separation of church and state existed in the area of education. The churches were the main purveyors of education. The colonial schools in the English-American colonies had as their motivating factor an intense interest in religion. This religious interest which predominated these early colonial schools

---

[12]Butts, op. cit., p. 104.

can be traced to the "Protestant Revolt" from the Roman Catholic Church. The Protestant groups replaced the authority of the church with that of the Bible. Therefore, the ability of each church member to read and understand the Scriptures became essential.[13] This demand for education to achieve religious literacy came to the English-American colonies from Europe by way of the Protestant groups which came to America to settle. This dominance of religious purpose in colonial schools was particularly strong in New England. The dominance of religious purpose in education can be seen in the selection of textbooks. Early texts included the Psalter, Testament, and Bible. Nevertheless, the public school system that was to serve as the parent for the future public education systems in the United States was evolved from these church dominated schools in New England.

The first incident in the accomplishment of public education was the partial disintegration of the unity of the New England town. Every New England town was a small theocratic state in the early colonial period. Each town was made up of two towns: the religious town and the civil town. The religious town, which controlled religious affairs, and the civil town, which controlled roads, bridges, and taxes were so closely related that they were the same.[14] When public schools were set up by the state legislatures, they were placed under the civil town as involving

---

[13]Cubberley, op. cit., p. 13.

[14]Ibid., pp. 44-45.

taxes and public service instead of under the religious town. This practice seemed of little consequence at the time because of the close connections between the civil and religious towns. However, with the disintegration of the unity of these New England towns, the schools were retained by the civil town and not passed over to the religious town's control. This concept of public schools being institutions of the civil authorities was the concept other states later adopted in instituting their school systems. This precedent helped establish the principle that public-supported schools were to be controlled by the civil authorities.

In 1785, a second event took place which was to have an important bearing on separation of church and state in public education. This event was the passage of the Land Ordinance of 1785.[15] This enactment provided for the distribution of public land in the "Northwest Territory". The bill originally proposed that two sections of each township be set aside, one for the support of the ministry and one for the support of public schools. In the legislative action that transpired, the section for the support of the ministry was defeated.[16] The importance of this law for public education cannot be overestimated, as stated by Cubberley: "These gifts by Congress . . . created a sentiment for state-supported school systems . . . and did much to enable states to found state-supported

---

[15]Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education, p. 25. This name will be used to designate this act throughout the rest of the paper.

[16]Butts, op. cit., p. 70.

school systems instead of copying the parochial or charity schools of the older states to the East."[17] This law set a precedent that was to continue throughout the settlement of all western public lands in the United States. This enactment also served as a strong precedent in federal aid to public education. In this same general period another development at the national level was to have an influence on federal aid to education. This development was the Tenth Amendment.

With the ratification of the Tenth Amendment, the issue of separation of church and state in education was reserved to the states for decision. The Tenth Amendment did not specifically deal with education, but it still was to have a profound influence on the way federal aid to education developed. As ratified, the Tenth Amendment reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."[18] From this amendment the "doctrine of reserved powers of the states" was derived. According to this doctrine, since the control over education was not delegated to the federal government and was not prohibited to the states, it was reserved to the states. Thus, the issue of separation of church and state in public education was debated at the state level.

This question of decision as to the control and support of public

---

[17]Cubberley, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

[18]Smith and Murphy, op. cit., p. 83.

education was important because the United States was moving toward an ideal of free, public education for all persons within its confines. The factors leading up to public education were philanthropical, social, political, and economic in nature. Many issues were involved in the struggle to establish free, public education and one of the basic issues was the idea that public funds were to be used only for public schools and not for sectarian schools.

The principle of using public funds for only public schools was well established by 1860. Before the triumph of public education, public funds were given to both sectarian and public schools. New York City furnished an illustration of this fact and the results of this policy. The distribution of public funds for education became a battle between the several religious schools, the sectarian schools and the public schools, and both public and sectarian schools and the civil authorities. The final result was that the New York Legislature initiated action to settle these continual disputes. After 1843, no public funds were to be used or granted to any school in which a sectarian doctrine was taught or professed.[19] This was a typical example, and in many cases the complete denial of public funds for sectarian schools paralleled the example given. Complete denial of public funds for sectarian schools was arrived at after it became obvious that no other means of distributing public funds would be satisfactory. Thus far, the state level was the area of conflict

---

[19]Cubberley, op. cit., p. 178.

over separation of church and state in public education, but the federal government was soon to become embroiled in this conflict.

As the federal government began to give aid to public education, it fell heir to many of the issues which had plagued the states in regard to separation of church and state in public education. Shortly after the Civil War and the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862,[20] the federal government became concerned over the use of federal funds for schools other than public schools. In 1876, the Federal Congress passed a resolution that all states entering the Union after 1876 would have to provide a clause for the establishment of free public schools free from all sectarian influences.[21] Congress wanted to make sure that no federal funds were used for sectarian schools. Certain parties even proposed that a federal amendment to the Constitution be passed to prohibit the use of federal funds for sectarian schools. By the end of the nineteenth century, the principle of separation of church and state in public education was commonly accepted.

As in any basic issue, a variation exists between the established principle and the application of the principle. This inconsistency was due, not to a lessened belief in the principles of separation of church and state in matters of education, but to the fact that little agreement existed as to the exact boundaries of church and state in this area of

---

[20]Axt, op. cit., p. 29. Title to be used for this act in the paper.

[21]Thorpe, op. cit., p. 2974.

public education. So, the issue of separation of church and state in public education still exists today. However, due to recent changes the situations in which the issue is found have changed.

Such innovations as the school lunch program, bus transportation, and medical care for school children had no precedents in the past. Some authorities claimed that these new situations called for new answers, while other authorities claimed the situation made no difference and that the basic issue was still separation of church and state in public education. The federal government is concerned over this issue at the present.

The federal government desires to give aid and its benefits to all school children, but wants to do it without violating the time-honored tradition of separation of church and state. The issue of direct federal aid to sectarian schools seems settled because of the long traditions of not using federal aid for sectarian schools, and therefore this issue seems to offer no problems. A new theory for aid to sectarian school children has arisen. This new theory states that sectarian school children should be given "auxiliary services" just as the public school children are.[22] The proponents of this theory claim that aid would not be given to the sectarian schools but to the individual student. Furthermore, these proponents also state that if all school children, including sectarian students, are not given these benefits, a serious case of

---

[22]Butts, op. cit., p. 147.

discrimination would exist against the sectarian school students. The opponents of this new theory claim that this accusation is untrue. The opponents argue that parents are not forced to send their children to sectarian schools but do so voluntarily, and as the benefits of the public schools are open to all who choose to use them no discrimination exists.[23] This modern theory of indirect aid to sectarian school children will be considered more thoroughly in Chapter 5.

The broad issue involved in religion as a focal point in federal aid to education is the issue of separation of church and state. The issues of separation of church and state are old and their origins in the United States can be traced back to Europe. This basic issue has significance for federal aid because with the advent of the concept of public education and the close relationship of churches and schools in the United States, the issue of separation of church and state spread to public education. This issue of separation was particularly significant to the use of public funds for the support of education. With the beginning of federal aid to public education the issues involved became a problem in federal aid to education. Although the basic issue is separation of church and state the issue of primary concern has shifted to a narrower aspect of this issue, that is, separation of church and state in public education.

In its program of aid to public education the federal government

---

[23]Ibid., p. 148.

has used several different financial means. The first method of granting aid to public education was a series of land grants. The land-grant method of federal aid to public education formed the basis for the second focal point in this investigation.

CHAPTER III

LAND GRANTS AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The granting of land was originated as a means of educational support long before the advent of public education in the United States. This method of supporting education dates back to ancient times when land was the primary means of wealth and money making. Governments in the past granted lands to churches and monasteries which supported many educational activities with the money derived from these grants of land.[1] Land grants in the United States played an important part in federal aid to public education.

The practice of granting land to support education can be traced from Europe to the early English colonies in America. Also a common practice in the colonies of America was the granting of land for the support of churches.[2] Herein lies the connection between land grants and the issue of separation of church and state in public education. The churches, which were the main dispensers of education, were not willing to give up land grants as a means of support. After the battle for separation of church and state was won, the practice of land grants for education continued, but the land grants were made solely for the support

---

[1]Orfield, Matthias Nordberg, Federal Land Grants to the United States with Special References to Minnesota, p. 7.

[2]Ross, Earle D., Democracy's College, the Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage, p. 3.

of public education. Land-grant education originated early in American education and was very important. Massachusetts offers the best example of land grants for the support of colonial education.

Land grants were the first means of federal aid to public education and continued to be the major source of such aid for many years. These land grants set precedents for further federal aid to public education and encouraged the creation of state-supported school systems. In its origins American education owes its financing to land grants.[3] However, even before the enactment of any national land grants for the support of public education, many precedents were set by the English colonies from which the United States was to emerge.

Early Land Grants in the United States

The policy of supporting education by land grants was established early in the English colonies in America. Because of the abundance of land, the practice of granting land for education and other public enterprises was common in the English colonies of North America. Such well-known educational institutions as Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, Dartmouth, and Princeton were granted land for their establishment and maintenance.[4] With the advent of independence and the evolution of a central government, the central government began a policy of granting

---

[3] Ibid., p. 3.

[4] Eddy, Danforth Edward, Jr., Colleges of Our Land and Time The Land-Grant Idea in American Education, p. 2.

land for the support of public education. The first national land grant for public education was made in 1785. This grant of land was made for elementary education in the Northwest Territory under the Land Ordinance of 1785.[5]

In the United States no other single enactment was to have the amount of influence on education that the Land Ordinance of 1785 had. This enactment has been heralded as the founding stone of American education, the first evidence of federal aid to education, a precedent for separation of church and state in public education, and many other things. This ordinance has been an important factor in American education, but it was not a brilliant innovation of far-sighted visionaries in 1785, as many authorities have claimed. The previous inquiries in this chapter have pointed out that land grants were a common means of financing education and were a rule rather than an exception in the support of education. The Land Ordinance of 1785 had several purposes, but its primary purposes were not the granting of land for education or the granting of federal aid for education.

The primary purposes of this ordinance were two in number. First, this ordinance provided for an orderly and systematic division of that land North of the Ohio River and East of the Mississippi River. Second, the ordinance provided for the sale of public lands by which the central government could pay its debts and finance its own maintenance. Various

---

[5]See footnote 15, Chapter 2.

facts support the former contentions and a brief inquiry into them is illuminating on the purpose of this ordinance.

The first contention was that the Land Ordinance of 1785 had as one of its primary purposes the purpose of land division. As land made up the chief source of income and wealth in the early United States, all matters dealing with land, such as its division and holding, were very important to land holders.[6] Most citizens were land holders of one type or another and thus were interested in an effective land division system. The colonies in North America had many conflicts over land division and titles because of the "indiscriminate method" of settling and surveying land. The "indiscriminate method" of land settling was merely to find unoccupied land, settle on it, and use natural boundaries such as rivers, trees, or rocks, which were subject to frequent destruction or natural changes. Thus, there was serious interest in providing a national land policy for the disposal of western lands which would remedy the serious defects in land division experienced by the older states to the East.[7] The National government realized that a national land policy that could guarantee secure and accurate land titles would go far in helping the sale of public lands, which in turn would put money in the bankrupt national treasury. Because the national land policy set up under the Land Ordinance of 1785 proved effective in the handling of land division and

---

[6]Barch, Oscar Theodore Jr., and Lefler, Hugh Talmage, Colonial America, p. 312.

[7]Ibid., pp. 318, 704.

titles, it was retained and became the standard procedure for the distribution of all public lands. If it had proven ineffective, there can be little doubt that it would have been replaced by a different land ordinance.

The second contention voiced in regard to the Land Ordinance of 1785 was that the state of finances of the national government demanded a source of revenue to meet its debts and to provide money for operation. At this time, the United States was composed of thirteen states grouped together loosely by a national government, the Confederation Congress. The country had just emerged from the Revolutionary War and the cost of the war had completely devastated the economy of the country.[8] The financial conditions of the national government demanded immediate attention. The abundant land to the West offered a solution to this financial condition. One of the main purposes of the Land Ordinance of 1785 was to make solvent a debt-ridden country.[9] In addition to these two contentions, several other influences were present in the enactment of the Land Ordinance of 1785. These influences were the political views of the times and the traditional educational practices of the New England people.

Political implications were decidedly present in the enactment of the Land Ordinance of 1785. Several factors tend to show a lack of

---

[8]Ibid., p. 701.

[9]Butts, R. Freeman, and Cremin, Lawrence A., A History of Education in American Culture, p. 245.

primary interests of an educative nature. The political leaders of the time were well educated to be sure, but they were educated in the traditional manner. The traditional manner of education was that of a privately endowed or religiously endowed institution.

The two political factions at this time were opposite in their beliefs about education. The "Federalists" were mainly interested in a strong central government but not particularly interested in education for the ordinary citizen. The "Anti-Federalists" were opposed to a strong central government but favored education for the common man and were unwilling to pay for a system of education with the price of national control over education. Thus, one faction was uninterested and the other faction refused to pay the political price needed to achieve a system of public education for the common man.[10]

The full implications of these political views came out in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and, as a result, no mention of education is found in the United States Constitution. This matter of control over education was and still is an important issue in federal aid to public education. Although the national government had slight interest in financing public education, interested parties did exist and were responsible for the inclusion in the Land Ordinance of 1785 of the provision which set aside a section of each township in the Northwest Territory for educative purposes. These interested parties were personages from New

---

[10]Butts, R. Freeman, A Cultural History of Western Education, pp. 316-317.

England who were not only interested in buying public land but were steeped in the traditions of public education and the land-grant method of supporting education.

The major influence in getting sections of land set aside for the support of public education in the Northwest Territory was a group of serious-minded New England land buyers. It was in New England that the strong precedents and traditions of land grants for education had arisen in the United States.[11] The national government was interested in selling land and listened to the demands of the land companies which wanted to buy land in the Northwest Territory. One of the demands of these land companies was the setting aside of land for the support of public schools. The national government accepted this demand and allotted section 16 of every township for the support of public schools. These early grants of land were not restricted to the lower schools, but also included grants to endow universities.

A precedent in land grants for universities closely paralleled that of land grants for common public schools and culminated as a national policy during the Ohio Company's purchase of lands in the West in 1787.[12] With the establishment of these precedents, the national government continued to grant lands for educational purposes. All the subsequent states to enter the Union were given similar grants for the support of

---

[11]Orfield, op. cit., p. 37.

[12]Ibid., p. 39.

public schools. Another type of land grants was given for the support of public schools.

The salt-spring land grants furnished a deviation type of land grants as compared to land grants provided by the Land Ordinance of 1785. These land grants are little known in the field of education because, although they were granted from the early beginnings of the national land policy the federal government did not require them to be used in the support of common schools until 1889.[13] In many states where no salt springs existed compensatory grants were given to equalize land grants for all states.

Eighty years after the passage of the Land Ordinance of 1785, another land act was passed which was to have an equally great influence on the development of federal aid to public education. This development was the Morrill Act of 1862.[14] It differed in its point of emphasis as compared to the Land Ordinance of 1785. Whereas the Land Ordinance of 1785 was for the support of common public schools, the Morrill Act of 1862 was for the support of higher education.

Morrill Act of 1862

The Morrill Act of 1862 was not the first grant of lands from the central government to the states for the purpose of higher education, as

---

[13] Ibid., p. 39.

[14] Axt, op. cit., p. 37. Title used to designate this act throughout this investigation.

shown by the previous material covered in this chapter. Before the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 almost four million acres of land had been granted by the federal government for the support of higher education.[15] The Morrill Act of 1862 was more of a culmination or crystallization of the precedents and opinions that were established or held before it was passed than an innovation, although the purpose of this act varied from that of other land grants. This does not mean that the Morrill Act of 1862 was insignificant in the field of federal aid to public education, because this act was an important link in the chain of developing federal aid to public education. The final results of Morrill's bill could hardly have been envisioned by Morrill himself.

It has been contended by James[16] that Morrill was not the originator of the land-grant college idea, but this contention has been disproven by Parker.[17] Morrill's first attempt to pass a land-grant college bill for agricultural colleges failed in 1857. The Morrill Act of 1862 was the culmination of five years of struggle and it was this act that the investigation was concerned with as it represented the final version of the struggle for land grants to support agricultural colleges.

Several major differences can be seen in these land grants as

---

[15]Eddy, op. cit., p. 23.

[16]James, Edmond J., The Origin of the Land Grant Acts of 1862, The So-Called First Morrill Act, p. 7.

[17]Parker, William Belmont, The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill, pp. 122-123.

compared to previous land grants. One was the extent of the restrictions placed on the states if they accepted the land grants. A second major difference in these grants was the qualifications about the type of education that was to be supported by these land grants. The provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862 clearly show this deviation from the earlier land grants by the federal government for the support of education. First, 90 per cent of the money derived from the sale of the land grants was to be invested in stocks not bearing less than five per cent interest. The interest from this invested capital was to be specifically devoted to the support of at least one institution of higher education, whose leading objectives would be agricultural arts, mechanical arts, and military tactics.[18] A provision was also included which denied these grants to those states in rebellion against the Union. Provision was also made for a simple method of national supervision in the form of annual financial reports to Congress.[19] The provisions clearly reflect the influence of the American Civil War. It was apparent that if the southern states had still been represented in Congress, this land-grant act might not have passed. The question of control over public education might have arisen to cast doubt on the constitutionality of this act as it had in the bill of a similar nature, in 1857, which was defeated.[20] These were the major

---

[18]Eddy, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

[19]Orfield, op. cit., pp. 122-123.

[20]Eddy, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862.

The motives and forces behind this act were many and varied. In many quarters there was a growing concern over the waste of public lands, and a need was felt for action to stop this wastage and to put the land to a more constructive use. Agriculturalists were interested in establishing institutions whose primary objectives would be agricultural training and to provide a practical education for large numbers of young people. The agricultural colleges already in existence were weak and ineffective, while most other colleges were devoted to a liberal arts curriculum. Finally, politics played a part in the purpose of the Morrill Act of 1862. Morrill, being a good Republican Party member undoubtedly realized that his party needed the support of the agricultural electorate if it were to stay in power.[21] Ross concludes that Morrill attempted to synthesize all the plans or purposes which had been suggested in this area for the previous two decades.[22] Although this act took some skillful handling to get through Congress, it did not create an immediate influence on education, for the American Civil War was at its height.

The significance of the Morrill Act of 1862 for the principle of federal aid and American education cannot be doubted. This act helped equalize educational opportunity among the states, its vocational-orientation forced American education to become more practical-minded,

---

[21] Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[22] Ross, op. cit., p. 46.

and it resulted in the founding of 69 institutions of higher education in less than 60 years.[23] In the area of federal aid to public education, the Morrill Act of 1862 furthered the precedent of separation of church and state in public education, furthered the precedent of federal aid to public education, and established a new precedent of placing restrictions on federal grants, thus giving the federal government more control over how these grants were to be used. After the Morrill Act of 1862, no significant or major land-grant legislation was passed which dealt with public education but further developments in land-grants for public education did take place.

Developments in Land Grants for Education After the Morrill Act of 1862

The trend since the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 was one of continued grants of land for education. The grants set up by Morrill's Act in 1862 were continued and in 1866, all new states were made eligible for grants under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862.[24] The land grants for public education established by the Land Ordinance of 1785 were continued and expanded until four sections of each township, instead of the original one section, were designated for the support of common public schools. The emphasis was on a continuation and expansion of the former land-grant legislation by the granting of land for education to

---

[23]Eddy, op. cit., p. 45.

[24]Orfield, op. cit., p. 45.

the new states as they entered the Union.

Several factors were to decrease the amount for the support of public education. The first factor was the rapid disappearance of suitable land for land grants. Second, because of this lack of land, the use of money grants was introduced.

Certain generalizations can be made from the data of this chapter. First, land grants were an old and tried means of supporting education long before the advent of federal aid to education in the United States. These grants of land were the founding stone of American education and continue to support public education through their permanent funds. The issues of separation of church and state were partially settled by these land grants as they were specifically granted for public education. Finally, as these grants of land for the support of public education continued to be made, the federal government began to restrict the uses in which these grants could be used. With these land grants the issue of control, a very important issue arose. As the federal government finally lacked suitable land for land grants, money grants came into being. These money grants formed the basis for the next focal point of this investigation.

CHAPTER IV

GRANTS-IN-AID AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

With the evolution of grants-in-aid the old concept of land grants gradually died out. The first grants-in-aid did not differ significantly from the old land-grant pattern and the transition from land grants to grants-in-aid for the support of public education was gradual and can be easily traced. The first of these grants, the Hatch Act[1] and the second Morrill Act of 1890,[2] were to supplement the Morrill Act of 1862 which, for a number of reasons, was not proving effective.[3] The enactment of the Smith-Lever Act[4] in 1914, which established the Extension Service on a national basis, completed the transition from the land grants to modern grants-in-aid. This new concept of federal aid to public education was expanded and refined by the Smith-Hughes Act,[5] the George-Reed Act,[6] the

---

[1]Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and the Financing of Higher Education, p. 50. This title will be used to designate this act throughout the investigation.

[2]Ibid., p. 57. Title used for this act in the investigation.

[3]Ibid., p. 52.

[4]Ibid., p. 66. Title used for this act in the investigation.

[5]Ibid., p. 66. Title used for this act in the investigation.

[6]Roberts, Roy W., Vocational and Practical Arts Education History, Development, and Principles, p. 143. Used to identify and title this act.

George-Ellzey Act,[7] the George-Deen Act,[8] and the George-Barden Act.[9] Each act was examined in light of its origins, provisions, and implications for federal aid to public education, as reported in the following sections.

The Hatch Act for Agricultural Experiment Stations

The Hatch Act, in 1887, was the starting point for modern grants-in-aid for the support of public education from the federal government. However, two misconceptions about this act are prevalent. The Hatch Act was not the first example of federal money grants which were used for educational purposes. While the Hatch Act was the first concrete example of a money grant specifically for public education from the federal government, it was not the first money grant to be used for supporting education. The first money grant from the federal government which some states used for the support of education was an enactment in 1837 which provided for the distribution of the surplus money accumulated in the United States Treasury.[10] As little restriction was placed on the purposes for which this surplus money was to be used, some states used it for education purposes. This grant differed from the Hatch Act because

---

[7]Ibid., p. 144. Used to identify and title this act.

[8]Ibid., p. 145. Used to identify and title this act.

[9]Ibid., p. 146. Used to identify and title this act.

[10]Watkins, Kermit, Economic Implications of State Grants-in-Aid, p. 8.

under the Hatch Act the grant was specifically for educative purposes. Second, the Hatch Act originally called for grants of land, the proceeds of which were to be used for the establishment and maintenance of agricultural experiment stations. In this manner the Hatch Act was similar to the land-grant acts; but, after 1888, the funds were appropriated in the budget for the Department of Agriculture and completely divorced from the land question.[11] The concept of land grants was to be retained for a few years, but it was only a lip-service to tradition, as the federal grants to public education were in reality money grants.

The need for agricultural experiment stations or some suitable substitute was recognized long before the passage of the Hatch Act. One reason for the passage of this act was the obvious fact that the agricultural colleges established by the Morrill Act of 1862 were proving ineffective. The teachers in these colleges began to realize that they had no scientific basis for the development of proper agricultural courses. With the realization and acceptance of this fact came the agitation for agricultural experiment stations.[12] The farmers, agriculturalists, educators, and reformers who had supported the establishment of the agricultural colleges were disappointed over the progress and usefulness of these institutions. The agricultural colleges could not furnish information about

---

[11]True, Charles Alfred, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, pp. 127, 208-210.

[12]Proceedings of a Conference on the Relation of the Federal Government to Education.

farming techniques which the agricultural interests so badly needed if farming was to progress. Several states had founded agricultural experiment stations prior to the Hatch Act but realized that more money and a better administration were needed. As the original land-grant colleges of agriculture were financed by federal grants, it was natural that the federal government be asked to aid in the establishment and maintenance of the proposed agricultural experiment stations. Thus, the need for these agricultural experiment stations and the agitation to establish them existed long before the enactment of the Hatch Act.

An additional motive for the Hatch Act was present. This motive was to be found in the problematic area of control over education and its facilities. In 1882, a proposal was made in Congress which would have established a national system of agricultural experiment stations under national control. Because of the unfavorable response with which the state and local groups greeted this proposal, it was dropped and the proposal by Hatch took its place.[13] Again, as in the past, the states won out in the area of control over public education and its facilities, which the federal government helped finance by grants in aid. The states were restricted to a certain extent in this matter of control, as will be seen as the provisions of the Hatch Act are examined.

The Hatch Act provided for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations at each of the colleges established under the Morrill

---

[13]Axt, op. cit., p. 51.

Act of 1862. Each state was to receive an annual grant of $15,000 per year to defray the costs of operating these experiment stations. The act also empowered the U. S. Commissioner of Agriculture to supervise the program and to make suggestions about the type of research to be undertaken.[14] Although these were merely supervisory powers, they represented a break with the past policy of placing all matters of control in the hands of the states. Finally, the Act stipulated that the results of the research undertaken by these stations should be published periodically and widely disseminated to those people who would be benefited. These were the provisions of the Hatch Act.

To find the true importance of this act, its implications for the development of federal aid to public education must be analyzed. The implications of the Hatch Act for federal aid to public education were of considerable importance. This act founded the federal policy of using outright money grants for public education; although these funds were not for instructional purposes. The Hatch Act provided the means for uplifting and improving the land-grant colleges, and, as such, proved to be an important factor in the continuance of these colleges.[15] If the land-grant colleges had died, the developing program of federal aid to public education would have been dealt a serious setback. This enactment not only helped continue the precedent of federal aid to areas of public education,

---

[14]Eddy, Edward Danforth Jr., Colleges of Our Land and Time The Land-Grant Idea in American Education, p. 52.

[15]Axt, op. cit., p. 52.

but it expanded and made more effective that federal aid already given under the Morrill Act of 1862.

Also, these agricultural experiment stations set up by the Hatch Act provided the scientific basis upon which adequate courses in the agricultural colleges were established. The results of experiments by these stations demonstrated the usefulness of applying practical education and science to agriculture. Thus, the agricultural experiment stations played a major part in convincing people of the need for practical education as opposed to only the older, classical, liberal arts type of education. In this manner, the Hatch Act provided the impetus that carried American public education into the field of practical, vocational, education. With the arousal of interest in vocational education, the federal government was given the opportunity of granting aid for the support of public education.

In addition to the above implications, one more important implication needs to be analyzed. Although the federal government had only supervisory powers, the Hatch Act did stipulate that the funds were to be used for agricultural experiment stations. The importance of this fact was that the control powers of the federal government and the restrictive clause proved ineffective.[16] Thus the federal government was forced to look for a more effective means of control over grants-in-aid. The Second Morrill Act of 1890 accomplished this, in some respects.

---

[16]Ross, Earle D., Democracy's College the Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage, p. 141.

Second Morrill Act of 1890

The Second Morrill Act was in many ways a culmination of the movement started by the Morrill Act of 1862. With the passage of this act in 1890, the land-grant colleges established by the Act of 1862 were made a permanent and lasting part of American higher education.[17] The basic state-federal framework of the land-grant colleges was completed by the Second Morrill Act and it is basically the structure which they retain today. Although this basic structure of the land-grant colleges was not changed by this act, the former state-federal relationship was altered. The provisions of the Second Morrill Act clearly reflect this alteration of state-federal relationships in the area of control over the federal grants.

The provisions of the Second Morrill Act called for $15,000 per annum and this was to be increased until $25,000 per annum was reached. These grants were to be made to each state for the purpose of providing additional funds for the operation of the land-grant colleges. Similar to the Hatch Act, this act called for grants of land the proceeds of which were to go to the land-grant colleges. It was thus similar to the other land-grant acts but was only a gesture toward the old policy; because, by 1900 the funds were appropriated funds.[18] Also the Second Morrill Act provided for the control and use of the funds that were

---

[17] Ibid., p. 179.

[18] Axt, op. cit., p. 56.

granted. Those states which failed to meet the qualifications and restrictions of this act could be denied their annual grant. The Second Morrill Act clearly stated the courses to be taught and demanded an annual report on the activities of the land-grant colleges. This was a decided change from the outright gifts of the former grants the federal government gave to the states for the support of public education.

The main purpose behind the Second Morrill Act was to provide additional funds for the land-grant colleges. Because of the need for additional funds for these colleges, some states channeled the funds granted by the Hatch Act into the land-grant colleges instead of establishing and operating experiment stations, as specified by the Hatch Act.[19] Political implications were not lacking as a purpose behind the passage of the Second Morrill Act. The late 1880's and the early 1890's was the peak of the agrarian movements in the nineteenth century and it was obvious that Congress wanted to placate the agrarian elements in the United States. An additional purpose of the Second Morrill Act was to strengthen federal control over the grants provided to the states. While this may not have been the primary purpose, it certainly was to have great implications for federal aid to public education.

Because of the dissatisfaction with the handling of the funds granted by the Hatch Act, the federal government was looking for a means of strengthening its control over its grants to education. Thus, the

---

[19]Ross, op. cit., p. 141.

provisions of the Second Morrill Act were to give the federal government a greater amount of control over the funds appropriated for the support of public education and the uses for which these funds could be used. The withholding of funds was authorized if the requirements of the act were not met by the states.[20] This control measure set a new trend in the development of federal aid to public education and changed a basic state-federal relationship in the matter of control over federal grants to public education. This trend was to be continued and developed more fully with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917.

The Smith-Lever and the Smith-Hughes Acts

Although these two acts were concerned with the support of two different aspects of public education the provisions were so similar in nature that they were examined and analyzed together. Both of these acts came about to serve specific purposes, and these purposes are the main difference between them. The Smith-Lever Act established national recognition and aid for educational extension service while the Smith-Hughes Act provided federal aid for vocational education in the public secondary schools.

Interestingly, similar to the land-grant acts, the movement for extension service and vocational education was the result of local and

---

[20]MacDonald, Austin F., Federal Aid A Study of the American Subsidy System, p. 23.

regional pressure groups instead of a primary interest on the part of the national government in education.[21] Also, these acts in part, were the result of increasing federal attention to the practical and professional as opposed to the older concept of liberal arts education. The passage of these two acts furthered the precedents of grants-in-aid to public education from the federal government. The Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts established a new principle in federal aid to public education. This new principle was that of state-matching funds to help implement the federal funds granted by these two enactments.

The origins of the agricultural extension service idea was examined first. The origins of the extension service idea can be traced back to the early private, agricultural societies and farmer institutes of the nineteenth century. In the decade from 1880 to 1890, the farmer institutes were established on a firm, permanent basis in many states; while in other states, they were also attached to the land-grant colleges.

By the early 1890's, some states were appropriating funds for the support of these farmer institutes.[22] The land-grant college movement had started with the idea of educating the farmer's son but moved to include the farmer himself as a suitable person to include in education. Even before 1900, an active interest in agricultural extension work

---

[21]Axt, op. cit., p. 63.

[22]True, op. cit., pp. 14-21.

existed and a certain amount of extension work was being done.

In the early 1900's, an event occurred that was to have a profound influence on the agricultural extension service movement. This event was the ravages of the weevil on the cotton crops in the Southern United States. In order to combat this problem, the U. S. Department of Agriculture set up model demonstration farms to teach improved methods of cotton farming.[23] As this proved an ineffective remedy to the problem an attempt was made to reach the individual farmers by the use of federal agents who were to supervise and demonstrate the use of new farming methods. This proved an effective method of handling the problem and was soon on a wide basis.

Several additional facts about agricultural extension work prior to the passage of the Smith-Lever Act deserve mention. First, the idea arose that agricultural extension work was a necessary extension to the activities of the land-grant colleges.[24] Second, as the land-grant colleges became firmly established, they not only recognized the value of agricultural extension work but were able to take a major part in its development. This helped establish that agricultural extension work should be part of the federal program of aid to public education.

By the time of the enactment of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, the demand for a federally-supported agricultural extension service had

---

[23]MacDonald, op. cit., p. 52.

[24]Axt, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

solidified. This was attested by the fact that no fewer than 32 bills were introduced between 1900-1914 and, at the time of passage 16 bills were pending for federal aid to agricultural extension work.[25]

The Smith-Lever Act did not create the extension service, but it did give federal recognition and aid to the concept and system which, to a large extent, was already in existence. The Smith-Lever Act also gave structure and central administration to the extension service system. This law provided federal funds for an agricultural extension service which was to be carried on by the land-grant colleges, in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture. A permanent fund of money was established which was to reach $4,100,000 by 1923 and from this fund, each state would receive an annual grant of $10,000. Additional amounts could be prorated on the basis of rural population but would be granted only if states matched the funds on a dollar-to-dollar basis. The Smith-Lever Act also provided that grants were not to be made before a plan of state expenditures was approved by the Federal Extension Service, a federal agency established by this act. This federal agency had the power to deny grants if conformity to the act was not forthcoming from the states.[26] These were the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act. The origins of federal aid for vocational education are found in the last half of the nineteenth century, as were the origins of federal aid for

---

[25]Eddy, op. cit., p. 140.

[26]Brunner, Edmund de S., and Yang, E. Hsin Pas, Rural America and the Extension Service, pp. 13-15.

the extension service movement.

Interest in vocational education was aroused in the last half of the nineteenth century because many young adults were quitting school, and lacking any training, were unsuitable for many occupations. One of the reasons for this lack of training was the breakdown of the apprenticeship system under the onslaught of rapid industrialization and mechanization in American industry. No substitute appeared to take the place of the inadequate apprentice system. With the coming of the twentieth century, a general interest in vocational education developed. A realization that the secondary schools were not meeting the needs of young people on the preparation for occupational jobs arose.[27] Special-interest groups in particular supported the movement for vocational education in the secondary schools.

The growing organization and power of the labor movement was influential in bringing about federal aid for vocational education. The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, the American Federation of Labor, and other labor organizations pressed for the passage of a bill that would provide federal aid for vocational education in the public secondary schools. As both the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts were for special-interest groups, the legislative action suggested that the farm and labor interests cooperate to pass both the Smith-Lever

---

[27]MacDonald, op. cit., p. 156.

[28]Axt, op. cit., p. 71.

and the Smith-Hughes Acts.[28] The provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act were considered next.

The provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act called for the establishment of a program of vocational education at the secondary school level. The federal government would provide funds in a matching basis. The Smith-Hughes Act set up the Federal Board of Vocational Education and called for the creation of state boards for vocational education. The expenditures of all funds was to be in accordance with an annual plan drawn up by the state boards and approved by the Federal Board of Vocational Education. Also, the federal authorities were to inspect the work and expenditures of each state to see if they conformed to the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act. Federal funds were to be used only for instruction in vocational subjects and for the training of teachers in these subjects. If compliance with the act was not made or the minimum standards not met, the federal funds would be denied.[29] These were the basic provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The implications of the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts for federal aid to public education are evident. The federal government, by these acts, took the final steps in the establishment of its modern program of grants-in-aid. No longer was federal aid to public education to be an outright gift for states to use as they pleased, but the aid was granted only when states measured up to specific standards, used the

---

[29]Walch, J. Weston, Complete Handbook on Federal Aid to Education, pp. 8-10.

monies in specific ways, and matched the federal funds granted. Federal control over the types of education provided for in these two acts was expanded and, though this control has not interfered with state actions to a great extent, the power to do so is there if state conformity is not forthcoming. Similar to other types of federal aid to education, the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts dealt with practical education, education for large numbers of people, and were influenced by factors other than purely educational ones. These two acts set the norm for most subsequent grants-in-aid, not only in the field of education, but in other fields as well.

A short investigation of the further expansion of federal aid to vocational education was undertaken next. The George Acts were an expansion and refinement of the Smith-Hughes Act.[30] Only the deviations from the Smith-Hughes Act were examined.

The George Acts for Vocational Education

The George Acts consisted of a series of four related acts. They were the George-Reed Act, the George-Ellzey Act, the George-Deen Act, and the George-Barden Act.

The first of this series of acts was the George-Reed Act of 1929. The primary purpose of this act was to provide additional funds over and above those provided by the Smith-Hughes Act. The aid provided by the

---

[30]Butts, R. Freeman, and Cremin, Lawrence A., A History of Education in American Culture, p. 581.

George-Reed Act was to increase until it reached $2,500,000 per year. The George-Reed Act differed from the Smith-Hughes Act in two ways. First, the distribution of funds was changed so a more equitable and sound distribution of funds could be accomplished. Second, and of major importance, was the provision that these grants were authorization for appropriations and not a direct appropriation of funds.[31]

The second of the George Acts was the George-Ellzey Act. The George-Ellzey Act was passed for the purpose of continuing the funds provided for vocational education under the George-Reed Act. The George-Ellzey Act was an authorization to appropriate $3,000,000 annually for three years for the aid of vocational education in the public secondary schools. It was similar in its provisions to the Smith-Hughes and the George-Reed Acts.[32]

The third act in this series was the George-Deen Act of 1937. With the coming expiration of the George-Ellzey Act, additional funds were needed for the support of vocational education. The George-Deen Act provided for a substantial increase in federal funds in a continuing basis. Distributive education was added to the federally-supported program of vocational education.[33] Because of the effects of the economic depression provisions were made to rescind the matching-dollar requirements until

---

[31]Roberts, op. cit., p. 144.

[32]Prosser, Charles A. and Quigley, Thomas H., Vocational Education in a Democracy, p. 438.

[33]Roberts, op. cit., p. 145.

1946.

The last act in this series was the George-Barden Act of 1946. In general, the George-Barden Act was merely an extension and expansion of the George-Deen Act. However, the George-Barden Act differed in one respect from the three previous acts of this series. Whereas the previous acts had been authorizations for funds this act, the George-Barden Act, called only for a continuing authorization of funds. This meant that Congress, as it saw fit, might or might not make appropriations for which it had made a prior authorization.[34] This was a further restriction in control by the federal government on its grants-in-aid for the support of public education. Although other grants-in-aid could be cited, the grants-in-aid examined in this chapter were chosen as the most representative of the growth and development of the principles involved in federal grants-in-aid for public education.

The implications of federal grants-in-aid for public education are diverse and significant. First, federal aid to public education was modernized by the change from land grants to grants-in-aid. The old land-grant system of aid had been very inefficient whereas the money grants could be carefully planned and accounted for and were easier to handle.

Second, with the complete transition to grants-in-aid came the principle of matching funds. This put the state and federal governments

---

[34]Prosser and Quigley, op. cit., pp. 438-439.

on a cooperative basis in the support of public education.

Third, the federal government began to exert more and more control over the funds it granted for the support of public education. This did not mean that the federal government increased its control over education as such, but only over the monies it granted. However, this control over its grants did increase its control over education in those special areas supported by federal aid. Thus, although federal control over public education has increased in some areas of public education, its control has not increased in all areas of public education.

This problem of federal control over public education was considered more fully in the following chapter which deals with national welfare as a focal point in the development of federal aid to education.

CHAPTER V

NATIONAL WELFARE AS A FOCAL POINT OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

A concept of national welfare is not exclusive to a democracy but has meaning wherever a national state has arisen. This investigation dealt with only one particular concept of national welfare: that concept of national welfare developed by democracy in the United States. An inquiry into the origins of this concept of national welfare in the United States was undertaken with particular reference to the implications of federal aid to education.

Origins and Early Development

One of the basic determinants of the American educational system is the basic socio-political philosophy underlying democracy in the United States. A concise statement of this philosophy is found in the Declaration of Independence, which states:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.[1]

Another equally important statement is found in Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Several implications of this state-

---

[1]Smith, James Morton, and Murphy, Paul F. (eds.), Liberty and Justice, A Historical Record of American Constitutional Development, p. 47.

ment for national welfare are evident. The U. S. Constitution states, "The Congress shall have the Power to . . . provide for the common Defence and general welfare of the United States, . . ."[2] From this phrase the "general welfare clause" which the federal government has relied on to enable it to grant aid to education, as well as to other areas, was developed. This clause was not used to solicit federal aid for public education until the latter half of the nineteenth century. The passage of the Tenth Amendment was interpreted to mean that education was reserved to the states, and many years passed before the "general welfare clause" was interpreted by the courts as being related to public education. Also a concept of public education was yet to be evolved.

Although in the early nineteenth century no general concept of a public education system existed, many of the prominent leaders of this era recognized the importance of education to a democratic form of government. Jefferson expressed a recognition of the importance of education for democracy more frequently and effectively than any other person. Jefferson wrote, "I hope the education of the common people will be attended, convinced that on this good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty."[3] Nevertheless, nothing was said about education in the United States Constitution. In view of the times, this was not surprising. At this time public control

---

[2]Ibid., p. 63.

[3]Cubberley, Elwood P., Public Education in the United States, p. 63.

of education was impossible since the established policy was for the home, church, and private school to provide education.[4] However, the New England area was developing some degree of public control over education, but this was an exception rather than the rule. With the passage of the Tenth Amendment the matter of education seemed to be relegated to the states. Forces soon were at work to change this situation.

The demand for free, state-supported, and state-controlled education came after the extension of political suffrage and a wider realization of political equality. During the first half of the nineteenth century, an upsurge of democratic ideals and a corresponding extension of voting privileges took place. The causes of this upsurge of democratic ideals were political, social, and economic in nature. What is of interest is the consequences which increment of the voting public was to have for public education and federal aid to public education. As long as political suffrage was restricted to those with certain property or religious qualifications no demand for public education existed because these landed people were wealthy enough to provide for their own education. But once the political franchise was broadened, it became evident that some means of educating the common people was needed.[5]

First, if the ordinary white male was to be given the right to vote on issues of national importance, he would have to be educated so

---

[4]DeYoung, Chris A., Introduction to American Public Education, pp. 10-11.

[5]Cubberley, op. cit., p. 57.

that he could make intelligent choices. Second, this education would have to adhere to democratic ideals. This would give everyone, regardless of class, a certain degree of equal opportunity, to develop themselves to the fullest of their capacities.[6] From these ideas developed new demands for education. Education could no longer be confined to narrow or academic purposes, but would have to encompass the development of the person, both as an individual with certain capacities and as a citizen of a democracy. Once these ideas became accepted, realization that only with a free, public supported, and public-controlled system of education could these objectives be achieved followed. As education has far-reaching influences for the nation, the federal government decided that, for the purposes of national welfare, it could and should give aid to education.

The public school system did not come about rapidly or easily. Three major battles were waged. First was the battle for tax-supported free public education. Then came the struggle for state as opposed to local control of public education for the purpose of providing all children in the state with equal educational opportunity. Finally came the battle to free public schools from religious influences.[7] At the state level, these battles were largely finished by the end of the nineteenth century, at least in theory if not in practice. However, these problems

---

[6]Butts, R. Freeman, A Cultural History of Western Education, p. 444.

[7]Ibid., p. 445.

and issues still have significance at the federal level today. The federal government was slow in developing federal aid to public education on the basis of this concept of national welfare. It took a major crisis before the federal government was to utilize national welfare as a guiding principle for federal aid to education. This major crisis was the "Great Depression" of the 1930's.

Relief Measures of the 1930's

Until the 1930's and the onset of the "Great Depression", the federal government had no established policy concerning national welfare as related to education. Traditionally and constitutionally, as interpreted by the courts, the states and their subordinate units were charged with the welfare of the people.[8] Due to the unprecedented severity of the depression in the 1930's the states were incapable of fulfilling their traditional service-rendering functions. One report states, "Coincident with the cumulation of unemployment was the inability of local communities to meet the increasing costs of their community services. Grave problems confronted public school systems, teachers, and students."[9] Also, much of the expansion of the federal government depended on the interpretation of the U. S. Supreme Court on the constitutionality of

---

[8]Meriam, Lewis, Relief and Social Security, p. 10.

[9]Willey, Malcolm M., (ed.), Depression, Recovery, and Higher Education, A Report of Committee Y. of the Association of American University Professors, p. 389.

the national welfare legislation.[10] With the breakdown of state and local facilities for welfare, the people turned to the national government for aid. Included in the relief measures of the federal government were liberal provisions for education.

The federal government initially made liberal provisions for education because the states could no longer support their educational systems. Also, it was recognized that education had and still has many influences other than purely individual or personal ones. Education has definite implications for the entire nation's welfare.[11] Because of this correlation between education and national welfare, an inquiry into the relief measures of the depression in the 1930's was undertaken. The germs of the federal government's policies in education as related to national welfare are found in the 1930's.

The mass of legislation during the depression years of the 1930's placed a serious limitation on any attempt to examine it in detail. Therefore, several representative examples having a direct bearing on education were selected and examined. The examples selected were the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, respectively and commonly designated as the CCC[12] and

---

[10]Meriam, op. cit., pp. 19-21.

[11]De Young, op. cit., p. 605.

[12]Allen, Hollis P., The Federal Government and Education, p. 92. This title will be used to designate this program through the rest of this investigation.

the NYA[13]. These examples were examined on the basis of their purposes, provisions, and implications for federal aid to education.

The oldest of the federal emergency agencies, the CCC, was established in 1933.[14] Years before the depression of the 1930's dramatized the problem, the difficulties confronting the youth with inadequate training for success in making a good living were recognized. Federal support of vocational education aimed at eradicating this problem. During its existence, the CCC contributed strongly as an immediate solution to the problem of untrained youth.

Initially, the purpose of the CCC was not to educate youth. Primarily this act was to provide useful employment for the unemployed youth of the nation.[15] Nevertheless, provisions were made for the education of the youths joining the CCC and as the CCC continued, the importance and scope of these educational activities expanded.

The initial recognition of an educational program supplementary to the conservation work was an order issued by the War Department in May of 1933. Finally, in November of 1933, official regulations, prepared by the U. S. Office of Education, and issued by the War Department, outlined the aims and machinery of the CCC's educational program.[16]

---

[13]Ibid., p. 94. This title will be used to denote this program throughout the rest of this investigation.

[14]De Young, op. cit., p. 33.

[15]Butts, R. Freeman, and Cremin, Lawrence A., A History of Education in American Culture, p. 582.

[16]Willey, op. cit., p. 400.

The educational program of the CCC was integrated into the administrative machinery of the War Department, but a civilian adviser was appointed by the U. S. Office of Education for each of the CCC Corps areas for the purpose of planning and organizing education for the CCC. Also, each corps had an educational adviser to adapt the general educational program to the needs of the individual camps and the particular group of youths in the camp at any given time. In matters of control, the War Department was in actual control of the entire CCC, but other departments of the federal government provided help and advice. For example, the U. S. Department of Labor was the enlistment agent for the CCC.[17] The educational program set up for the CCC was general in nature and extended from the elementary to the college level. The major consideration of the educational programs was to provide instruction that would return the youth to everyday life, better equipped mentally and morally for their duties.

The implications of this educational program of the CCC for federal aid to education were of an immediate nature, while the long-term implications are yet to be fully realized. For the first time, the individual citizen was given direct federal aid, part of which was for educational purposes. Not only was this education completely controlled by the federal government, but the states were by-passed completely. This, indeed, was a new idea in the field of educational control. Although

---

[17]Meriam, op. cit., pp. 435-436.

the constitutionality of the CCC was never put to a test, no reason existed to indicate that the CCC, or a similar program, would be considered unconstitutional. In the early 1940's, the CCC was disbanded.[18] Although numerous proposals have been made to reinstate a program similar to the CCC, no positive action has been taken by the federal government. Because of the emergency nature of the CCC, its educational provisions and control were an exception to traditional practices and, as such, any long-term implications it had for federal aid to education have not been realized. However, one of its immediate effects was to have important consequences. Because of the success of the CCC other measures were passed to provide for the educational needs of youth in the depression years of the 1930's. As the CCC was the first of the federal programs to aid the welfare of the nation's youth, it was a test case for the idea of direct federal support of individuals for basic needs such as employment, training, and education. Out of the success of the CCC grew other provisions for the aid of education. One of the most important of these was the NYA.

The purpose of the National Youth Administration was similar in many respects to that of the CCC. The NYA was established to provide work for unemployed youth, to lend aid in finding jobs, to give vocational training, and to grant financial aid for school attendance.[19] Thus, the

---

[18]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 583.

[19]Butts, op. cit., p. 532.

NYA provided for unemployed youth and gave vocational training just as the CCC did, but the type of work differed. Also, the provisions for education were set up by the initial legislation which established the NYA. This was not the case with the CCC. Under the NYA, the provisions for federal assistance for students was particularly interesting.

The basic provisions of the NYA was for student aid to needy youth.[20] This aid for needy youth was granted by means of providing jobs on special projects carried out by the schools in which the students were enrolled. In the matter of control, the individual schools were to determine those students in need of assistance. This represented a retreat from the control assumed by the federal government under the CCC. The major kinds of projects in the NYA were departmental assistance, construction, clerical assistance, and semi-professional assistance.

The NYA program had several implications for federal aid to education. The NYA student work program was the first real federal aid given to assist students to attend colleges and universities.[21] It was this program that paved the way for other federal aid to individual college students, such as, the G. I. Bill and the Atomic Energy Commission's fellowship program. Another implication was the tremendous increase in federal participation brought about by the educational program of the NYA. Also, the assistance provided by the NYA was not restricted to

---

[20]Meriam, op. cit., p. 445.

[21]Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education, p. 81.

public educational institutions. A number of privately endowed and denominational colleges also enjoyed participation in the NYA assistance program.[22] Here was a precedent that was to have serious implications for later attempts of the federal government to enact a bill to aid general education. These implications will be discussed later in this chapter.

With the envolvement of the United States in World War II, most of the issues of federal aid for education were relegated into the background because of the greater importance of moving all resources to win World War II. However, with the end of World War II and the build up of the "Cold War", the issues of federal aid to education for the strengthening of national welfare again arose to complicate any attempt on the part of the federal government to enact a comprehensive aid bill for the support of education.

The "Cold War" has put additional emphasis on the demand for federal aid to education to improve the nation's welfare. The "Cold War" is a battle for men's minds and, as such, a premium must be placed on educated citizenry if the ideologies of the enemies of the United States are to be combatted. The basic ideology of the United States is democracy, and the success of this democracy depends on intelligent and educated citizens.

---

[22]Willey, (ed.), op. cit., p. 379.

Present Issues

The present issues of national welfare as a focal point of federal aid to education are an outgrowth of issues unsettled in the past. At the present, two basic issues exist: that of equal educational opportunity and that of federal control of education.

Inherent in the basic democratic socio-political ideology of the United States is the ideal of equality. This ideal of equality is a comprehensive one which includes not just equality before the law or some other specific area, but full, complete, and total equality in all areas, including education. The state-controlled systems of public education have numerous examples of inequality in education. In some cases, the states cannot or will not take the necessary steps to eradicate these inequalities. An example of these inequalities is the segregation issue that came to a climax in the early 1950's and which is still present. This issue of equality is basic to the tenets of democracy in the United States and they must be erased if the principles of democracy are to be fully realized. The proponents of greater federal aid to education believe that only by greater federal aid to education can these inequalities be stopped. This is a basic issue concerning national welfare and federal aid to education, but other related issues are involved. These corollary issues are political, economic, and social in nature.

One issue is that of a further extension of control over education by the federal government. Just as it was argued that state control was needed to provide equal opportunities in education in the local level,

it is now being argued that more federal control is needed to guarantee equality in education on the state level. This battle is an extension of the battle for public control of education. The right of the federal government to grant aid to the states for education has never been denied. The disagreement has been over federal control of education and not over federal support of education.[23] Education in the United States was first locally controlled and, to a certain extent, still is, but the states have asserted their right to control the educational systems and have gradually gained centralized control over education. Although, the states would like further federal aid, they do not want it at the price of further federal control in education.

The issue of control has another facet which is of interest. A most persistent demand for federal control has been brought about by the relative ineffectiveness of many federal grants. This was particularly true of the land grants given by the federal government to support public education.[24] The federal government has constantly fought to gain adequate control over the funds it has granted for educational support. It has been noted elsewhere that as money grants became common the federal government did assert more and more control over the funds it granted for educational support. But since these grants were for specialized

---

[23]Myers, Alonzo F., and Williams, Clarence O., Education in a Democracy, p. 295.

[24]Ross, Earle D., Democracy's College, the Land Grant Movement in the Formative Stage, p. 4.

types of education, such as vocational education, they have done little to equalize general education or to extend federal control over general education.

The setting up of a federal equalization fund is another issue related to national welfare and federal aid to education. A federal equalization fund has been suggested as a means of equalizing educational opportunity and thus promoting the general welfare.[25] In some respects, this is an extension of the battle for state equalization funds and the battle for tax-supported schools. First, claims were made that state funds should be used to equalize local inequalities in education, but now it is claimed that federal funds should be used to equalize state-level inequalities in education. The principle behind these claims is no different than that of tax-support for education, but is rather an extension of the principle. The principle of tax support for education is that all persons in a locality must pay taxes to support public education for other people's children as well as for their own if they have any. Next the principle was expanded to mean that all people in the state should be taxed to provide state funds to support and equalize education between rich and poor localities in the state. Now it is being claimed that the people of the nation should provide federal funds to equalize education between the richer and poorer states, with the ultimate purpose of promoting the national welfare.

---

[25]Myers and Williams, op. cit., pp. 295-296.

An additional issue that is connected with national welfare and federal aid to education is the issue of public funds for children attending sectarian schools. This issue was basic to the struggle for separation of church and state in education, but it has now taken on new implications which places it in the area of national welfare. Direct aid to sectarian schools seems no longer in doubt, although it has some supporters who insist that these sectarian schools perform a public service, educating youth, and thus should have public aid.[26] The most persistent demand is that public aid be given for "auxiliary services", such as textbooks, health, and transportation. The proponents of this concept argue that this would not be aid to sectarian schools but aid to the individual child.[27] This argument is precedented by the relief measures of the 1930's, which aided education, such as the school lunch program and the NYA program of aid to individual students of both private and public educational institutions.

As propounded, this argument is a combination of national welfare and civil rights. The proponents of federal aid to sectarian schools feel that if federal aid is given to some individuals and not to others a discrimination is present. Also, these advocates of federal aid to sectarian schools claim that only by equalizing "auxilary services" for all children will the national welfare be fully realized.

---

[26]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 528.

[27]Ibid., p. 530.

Of course, counter arguments are put forth to refute the previously stated views. The main argument simply states that direct, indirect, or any kind of public aid to sectarian schools or their children is a direct violation of the time-honored principle of separation of church and state in the field of education.[28]

Another issue concerning national welfare and federal aid to education is of a socio-economic nature. This is the issue of inequality in education due to socio-economic reasons. This issue is concerned primarily with higher education and the individual student. Studies have shown that fewer children from the lower classes go to college than from the higher socio-economic classes, although the lower classes have the highest percentage of children of college age.[29] If the full potential of the nation and the corresponding good it can bring to the nation's welfare are to be realized, these inequalities in educational opportunity must be erased. Also, the existence of these inequalities makes impossible the fulfillment of the democratic principles upon which the United States was founded. It is evident that financial problems of the lower class children are largely to blame for failure of many of these children to go on to college. The answer proposed is a program of federal aid, consisting of scholarships to needy individuals for use in attending college.[30]

---

[28]Ibid., p. 531.

[29]Conant, James Bryant, General Education in a Free Society, pp. 86-88.

[30]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 523.

Some scholarships are available but they are far from sufficient to satisfy the demand.

This focal point, national welfare, is closely related to the development of federal aid for education. The "founding fathers" of the United States recognized that education was of great importance to both the people and the nation. The concept of national welfare in the United States evolved out of Article I Section 8 of the U. S. Constitution. It was only after much interpretation by the courts and the social ideas that the "general welfare clause" came to be applied to education. The most rapid growth of the national welfare concept took place during the depression of the 1930's. The "Cold War" situation of the present world has emphasized the need of equalizing educational opportunity not only so the full capabilities of everyone can be used for the nation's best interest, but to reaffirm the United States' basic ideology, to the rest of the world. In this modern age of technological and ideological battles, education has become an important tool to strengthen and protect the nation. As such, education has become increasingly important in the nation's welfare and new financial means are being sought to support education.

Tied in very closely with the nation's welfare is the nation's defense. In this age of atomic energy, a premium has been placed on educated people to man and manufacture the means and methods of national defense. National defense today is one of the basic reasons for the federal government's concern over supporting and improving educational

opportunities and facilities. In this way, national defense has become related to the issue of federal aid for education.

CHAPTER VI

NATIONAL DEFENSE AS A FOCAL POINT IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The pertinence of the relationship between national defense and federal aid to education was actually apparent in the early developmental period of the United States. However, the concept of education as part of national defense really culminated in World War II and the following period. Of course, the wars in which the United States took part had some influence on the development of this focal point. The relationships between education and national defense are quite apparent today and have primarily been brought on by the present state of world affairs.

Early Aspects

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution authorizes Congress to provide for the common defense and the training, disciplining, and organizing of troops for the use of the United States.[1] In other matters of national defense, the U. S. Constitution makes it clear that Congress may take such measures as it sees fit or as the common defense of the nation necessitates.

The first connection between national defense and federal support of education was a purely military one. In 1802, the West Point Military Academy was founded and the Naval Academy was established in 1845 at

---

[1]Smith, James Morton, and Murphy, Paul L. (eds.), Liberty and Justice A Historical Record of American Constitutional Development, p. 63.

Annapolis. These institutions were founded to insure that the Armed Forces of the United States would be led by adequately trained and educated officers.[2] Less than twenty years after the establishment of the Naval Academy, the government began to grant aid to civilian educational institutions with the expressed purpose of training and educating men for the U. S. Armed Forces and for the national defense.

Development and Growth

It was during the U. S. Civil War that the first concrete example of national defense and federal aid to public education occurred. The U. S. Civil War demanded not only more trained men, but better educated men, as mechanized warfare was coming into being. As a result of these demands, a provision for the training of military men was included in the Morrill Act of 1862.

The Morrill Act of 1862 contained a provision that courses in military tactics were to be taught at the land-grant colleges. This provision reflected the conditions of the U. S. Civil War, in which the Union side found that it lacked adequately trained men.[3] This provision left much to be desired as it did not clearly provide for the implementation of the military training it called for in the Morrill Act of 1862. Finally, Congress did authorize the assignment of Regular Army

---

[2]De Young, Chris A., Introduction to American Public Education, pp. 12-13.

[3]Eddy, Edward Danforth, Jr., Colleges for Our Land and Time The Land-Grant Idea in American Education, p. 33.

officers to the land-grant colleges, but the Army was not interested and so no officers were assigned.[4]

The U. S. Army considered West Point the only proper school for military education and the novelty of educating military men in a civilian educational institution was an innovation the U. S. Army was not ready to accept. Nevertheless, the colleges appointed instructors with military backgrounds and tried to carry out the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862. Interest was revived for a short time in 1898 with the onset of the Spanish-American War. After this war, the interest in military education in civilian educational institutions dropped back into its former lassitude, until the First World War.

The role of education in national defense was not fully realized or utilized until the present world situation, after the Second World War. Yet, in connection with the land-grant colleges, this idea of education and national defense was kept alive, and part of the funds allocated to these colleges was used for military education and, thus, actually national defense. The complete acceptance of federal aid to civilian education institutions for national defense had to wait until recent times. Several incidents occurred which helped keep the practice of granting aid to education for national defense alive. These incidents were World Wars I and II.

The First World War had a positive affect on national defense

---

[4]Ibid., p. 64.

and federal aid to education. Before the United States entered this war, the National Defense Act of 1916[5] was passed. The National Defense Act of 1916 established the ROTC military program, in conjunction with the Second National Defense Act of 1920.[6] The importance of these acts was not that they established something new, but that they provided a definite plan of organization, education, and requirements. In addition, better equipment, more personnel, and better coordination with the U. S. Army was achieved. However, with the termination of the First World War and the nation's reaction against war, the military education program of the land-grant colleges suffered. Particularly repugnant to many was the requirement for compulsory training of all able-bodied males in attendance at these colleges. Although some land-grant colleges have dropped this feature, many land-grant colleges still retain it.

During the First World War, another program of importance was established. The SATC[7], Student Army Training Corps, was established in 1918. The purpose of this organization was twofold. The first purpose was to train officers which the U. S. Armed Forces needed, and the second purpose was to cushion the shock of decreased enrollments in the colleges by letting some of the students remain in college and still undergo mili-

---

[5]Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education; p. 149. For identification purposes.

[6]Eddy, op. cit., p. 163-164. For identification purposes.

[7]Axt, op. cit., pp. 74-75.

tary training.[8] Due to its late establishment, just before the end of World War I, the SATC did not prove too effective. It did provide a precedent to follow in World War II. Axt writes, ". . . it is evident that neither colleges or military had a clear conception of the role of colleges in wartime."[9] It was in programs similar to these that the federal government started to give aid to education for the purpose of national defense.

Two related facts caused the foregoing programs to be originated. First, World War I was the first modern technological war the U. S. took a major part in fighting. To a great extent, World War I demanded educated soldiers to conduct it. Mechanized warfare, with planes, tanks, and machine guns, was being used. This mechanization of war called for better educated troops to use and maintain the new war machinery.

World War I also saw the first mass testing program in the United States.[10] The results of the testing program were alarming. It was found that the average draftee was a rather poorly educated individual. This situation not only focused attention on military education but on education in general. This testing program may have accounted for the passage of the Second National Defense Act in 1920, though the war had been over for several years. Even with the realization of the need

---

[8]Ibid., p. 73.

[9]Ibid., p. 77.

[10]Ross, C. C., revised by Stanley, Julian C., Measurements in Today's Schools, pp. 35-36.

for better educated soldiers for national defense, the period after World War I was characterized by a lack of any real progress for federal aid to education for the purpose of national defense. During and slightly proceeding World War II, the federal government began to really function as a source of financial support for education as an adjutant to national defense.

World War II had a great and lasting influence on national defense as a focal point of federal aid to education. During this war, the federal government began the extensive aid program to education for national defense purposes. The extensiveness of this program still exists today. This federal aid was developed for several reasons. World War II differed in many aspects from all previous wars in which the United States had engaged. First, it was an extremely technological and mechanized war, and this required not only highly trained specialists, but soldiers who were able to think for themselves.[11] Second, World War II was a total war. The outcome of the world depended not only on the soldiers in the field but the civilian population which supported the soldiers. Educational institutions had to train both soldiers and civilians for technical services in industry and other occupations needed to meet the demands of World War II.[12] Federal monies were used to

---

[11]Kandel, I. L., The Impact of the War Upon American Education, p. 6.

[12]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

finance this civilian and military education which the war demanded. The federal educational efforts of World War II were so great and varied that only several examples were examined.

One example of federal aid to education for national defense was found in the Army Specialized Training Program, ASTP,[13] while the Navy College Training Program, NCTP,[14] furnished a similar example. The basic purpose of both these programs was to provide selected soldiers with specialized technical training which the U. S. Armed Services could not provide themselves.[15] These two programs were not a new concept of education and national defense. The land-grant colleges had been educating soldiers in varying degrees since their inception by the Morrill Act of 1862. The magnitude of the ASTP and NCTP was of importance. At their height, the ASTP and the NCTP had 380,000 trainees and envolved 440 educational institutions.[16] One outcome of these programs was the recognition by the U. S. Armed Services that civilian educational institutions were capable of producing adequately educated military personnel. As a result of this realization, the U. S. Armed Services have increased and continued to use civilian educational institutions to educate their personnel.

---

[13]Ibid., p. 152. For identification purposes.

[14]Ibid., p. 153. For identification purposes.

[15]Ibid., pp. 152-153.

[16]Ibid., p. 156.

A second illustration of federal aid to education for national defense was the extensive research projects instigated during World War II. Although this trend started in World War II it has continued. Federal funds for research were approximately 3 million dollars in 1940, most of which went to agricultural research, while by 1950 150 million dollars a year was being spent.[17] It is important to note that these funds in 1950 were being used mostly for applied and basic research connected with national defense. The most efficient way to accomplish research during World War II was to use the facilities that were already present in colleges and universities instead of duplicating the facilities elsewhere. During World War II, most research was devoted to the natural sciences in order to develop the means of winning the war.[18]

This financing of education by the federal government for national defense purposes did not end with World War II. This will be discussed later. Another basic reason for some research projects was to help the colleges stem the gap between pre-war and wartime income.[19] During World War II, the enrollments in college went down as did the income of colleges from student fees.

A third area of federal aid to education for national defense, during World War II, was a student loan program. This program was

---

[17]Axt, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

[18]Ibid., p. 88.

[19]Allen, Hollis P., The Federal Government and Education, p. 109.

similar to that instigated under the National Youth Administration during the 1930's. In 1942, the federal government established a loan system for the aid of college students. The loans were for the purpose of helping maintain a supply of technically trained men and women.[20] The fields of engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy were chosen for this special aid. These fields were the scene of accelerated programs during World War II and only full-time students could be utilized in these accelerated programs.[21] The loans enabled many part-time students to become full-time students, thus making it possible for them to devote their full attention to their studies in these special fields. However, only those students within two years of graduation were eligible for these loans. In connection with the student loans started by the NYA, these loans set a precedent that has culminated in a general student loan and aid program. This general aid program was established in 1950 by the Student Aid Act of 1950.[22] The influence of World War II on national defense as an aspect of federal aid to education cannot be over emphasized.

From an analysis of the facts it was apparent that the federal government's aid to education for the purpose of national defense increased during World War II. This was to be expected as the war de-

---

[20]Kandel, op. cit., p. 128.

[21]Allen, op. cit., pp. 103-104.

[22]Axt, op. cit., pp. 243-244. For identification purposes also.

manded that all resources be used to preserve and protect the nation. After the conclusion of hostilities in World War II, this interest in education as a means of furthering national defense did not cease. The reason for this is the "Cold War" situation in the world today.

Present Aspects

In the present world situation education is playing a larger and larger role in national defense. Two reasons account for the importance of education in national defense. First, a large number of personnel must be educated to perform the technology required by the armament race in the "Cold War." Second, the citizens must be trained and educated to understand and withstand the ideological stress of this "Cold War."[23] The present world situation is one of conflicting ideologies. These are the main concerns of the federal government and account for its willingness to support education for national defense purposes. The new concept of war is one of total war. Not only may the battles be fought on the battlefield but they will be fought in men's minds.

Even though this "Cold War" is labeled "competitive coexistence" by some, the possibility of an actual and devastating war is always present.[24] Federal government's support of education for national security is obvious. National defense is the prime motive for federally-

---

[23]Blanshard, Brand, (ed.), Education in the Age of Science, pp. 85-86.

[24]Ibid., pp. 118-119.

financed research. Although this support of basic and applied research began during World War II, the federal government has continued to subsidize these programs of research.[25]

An illustration of this federal support of education through research funds is found in the general fellowship program of the Atomic Energy Commission, AEC.[26] Not only has research been conducted, but those students also receive valuable education in fields related to atomic energy.[27] The AEC fellowship program was administered by the National Academy of Science and fellowships were offered in the area of natural sciences. However, the general fellowship program did not prove effective. Because of the grave concern over national security, all students in the program were extensively investigated. Axt concludes this excessive concern over security and the resultant investigations was the reason for the failure of the AEC general fellowship program.[28]

In 1952, the National Science Foundation,[29] NSF, was established by Congress. The connection between education and national defense is apparent in the establishment of the NSF. The primary goal of the NSF is to finance and promote scientific research and general graduate

---

[25]Millet, John D., Financing Higher Education in the United States, pp. 343-345.

[26]Eddy, op. cit., p. 227. For identification purposes.

[27]Axt, op. cit., p. 144.

[28]Ibid., p. 144.

[29]Ibid., p. 144. For identification purposes also.

study in the interest of national defense.[30] The emphasis of the NSF has been in the area of natural science. This is understandable because of the extreme importance of this area to the development of tools for the use of national defense.

The NSF has several significant implications in national defense education. First, the NSF serves as an agency to coordinate and consolidate all federal programs in the area of basic research. Second, the NSF has definitely provided funds which have enabled tremendous strides to be made in basic research. Third, the National Science Foundation has provided a flexible and long-range program that will aid greatly in making up the deficit in trained personnel in the sciences.[31] An advantage of the NSF over all previous programs of federally-sponsored research is the method of granting funds. The NSF is authorized to make direct grants for research, whereas other federally-supported research has been of a contractual nature. The importance of this is that the funds of the NSF can be used readily with none of the vast procedural requirements needed by the federal contract system.[32]

A picture of the relative importance and size of federally-supported research at colleges and universities can be obtained by looking at the monetary value of the grants for research and the number

---

[30] Ibid., p. 353.

[31] Axt, op. cit., pp. 116-121.

[32] Ibid., pp. 96-100.

of educational institutions participating in the research. In 1950, for example, the AEC funds spent for research at colleges amounted to 14 million dollars. In 1950, the Department of Defense had outstanding obligations for 44 million dollars in defense research projects, in which well over 150 institutions of higher education took part.[33] In its first year, the NSF was authorized $500,000 and for each succeeding year it was authorized to spend 15 million dollars. These figures are totals and, as such, do not show the various types of research for which the funds were used. Nevertheless, these figures give an impressive picture of the size and corresponding importance of defense-related spending in the federal support of education.

The latest and perhaps most emphatic example of federal support to education in the interest of national defense is the National Defense Education Act of 1958.[34] This act provides about 900 million dollars for use over a four-year period and provides aid for several specific educational areas. The specific areas for aid are science, education, mathematics, testing, guidance, and modern-foreign language study.[35] This act contains the matching-fund principle that has become so familiar in federal grants-in-aid.

The broad general purpose of this act is to attain the fullest

---

[33] Ibid., pp. 96-100.

[34] Benson, Charles S., The Economics of Public Education, p. 267. Also for designation purposes.

[35] Barr, M. Monfort, American Public School Finance, pp. 13-14.

development of the mental resources and technical skills of young men and women.[36] The present world situation indicates the reason for the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In 1957, the United States awoke to the fact that her potential enemy, Russia, was quite advanced in the natural sciences. This realization brought not only a thorough re-evaluation of U. S. education, but the demand for a crash program in the area of natural sciences.[37] As in the past when a national emergency arose, the federal government was called on to supply the answer. The federal government's answer to the threat to the nation's defense and welfare was the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The implications of this act are manifold. Because of the specific areas, this act is not going to improve the general educational picture in the United States. The National Defense Education Act will only improve education in those specific areas to which it is limited, that is, science, mathematics, guidance, testing, counseling, and modern language fields. The use of "Defense Education" as the title of this act is significant. The provisions of this act reflect the defense nature of the act. Another influence of this act, because of its specific nature, will be the creating of a greater imbalance in U. S. education in favor of the sciences. In the rush to expand science to help secure the

---

[36]Benson, op. cit., p. 267.

[37]Blanshard, (ed.), op. cit., pp. 181-182.

national defense, many areas of education are being left out. It is significant that at the present no general federal support of the public schools or education exists.[38]

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 will be an effective aid to the development of science education. The expenditure of such large amounts of money will aid in the development of better science education. The inclusion of the matching-fund principle will be an incentive to the states to increase spending for science education. The states will receive federal funds if they spend their funds in those specific areas provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.[39]

The concept of education as a means of national defense and security is old, but not so old as the concept of national defense. The first example of education in connection with national defense, in the U. S., was the establishment of the National Army and Navy Academies in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first example of federal aid for the use of civilian educational institutions for defense purposes was the Morrill Act of 1862 in which military training was established at the land-grant colleges. This type of aid has expanded and continued down to the present.

The real impetus for defense spending in the field of education

---

[38]Barr, op. cit., p. 13.

[39]Benson; op. cit., p. 268.

started in World War II. In this war effort, the demands for not only trained soldiers but technologically trained civilians made it imperative that education be used to the utmost. The mechanization and technology of modern warfare places a premium on educated personnel.

In the present world situation, the demands on education have increased. The blending of World War II into the present "Cold War" situation did not lessen the demands on education but has increased the demand. The demands on education have increased both in scope and depth. Specifically, in reference to depth, the demands on education have taken on a primary concern with the natural sciences. With each succeeding discovery, the demand has been to go deeper and deeper into the natural sciences. Although military considerations demand much applied science, the increased interest and support of basic research is significant in considering the depth of education for national defense. In reference to scope, the federal support program for defense education has broadened into different fields. Starting out as purely a matter of educating soldiers, the federal programs for the support of defense education have expanded into such fields as testing, guidance, modern language, and of course many different fields of science.

The impact of federal spending in defense education has advantages and disadvantages. The spending definitely is helping upgrade those specific areas in which aid is being given. But, on the other hand, this money has done little to upgrade the general educational picture in the

United States. In the near future, no hope seems possible for a general federal aid bill for general education in the United States. In the foreseeable future, it seems likely that federal aid to education will continue to be used to accomplish specific national objectives which education can help accomplish.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

From the examination and analysis of the materials used in this investigation, a few important generalizations can be made. These generalizations deal with the development of federal aid to education.

First, the right of financial support, per se, from the federal government for the purpose of education has never been an issue. Nor has it been questioned that the federal government has a role in education. The real issue has been the manner in which this role should be played.

Second, federal policy toward education has been influenced by factors other than educational ones, such as national land policy, national welfare, political pressure groups, and national defense.

Third, federal educational policy has been increasingly characterized by practical education such as agricultural experimentation, vocational education, and above all applied science as opposed to the old classical "liberal arts" concept of education. This fact is shown by the increasing aid the federal government has given to vocational and science education.

Fourth, except for one major case, the Land Ordinance of 1785, federal financing of education has been to aid specific types of education. While the Land Ordinance of 1785 was for common education it is notable that since this act no general federal aid to education bill has been passed. The Morrill Acts, the Hatch Act, the Smith Acts, and

the National Defense Education Act were all aimed at specific areas of education, both as to level and type of education.

Fifth, federal support of higher education has a trend toward scientific research. Particularly since World War II this trend has become very evident as can be noted by the increased federal expenditures for science education and research in connection with national defense.

Sixth, federal aid policy has tended to keynote education for the many and not the select few. The Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act, and the recent student aid bills have all tended to emphasize educational quantity in the number of students aided.

Seventh, the importance of federal aid has tended to increase. This fact is shown by the increase in real expenditures and the expansion of federal aid to education in new fields.

Eighth, any attempt to pass a general education bill for federal support of education will have to consider the implications that religion, grants-in-aid, land grants, national welfare, and national defense have had in the past and have in the present for federal aid to education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Hollis P., The Federal Government and Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Axt, Richard G., The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education, Columbia University Press, New York, 1952.

Barch, Oscar Theodore Jr., and Lefler, Hugh Talmage (eds.), Colonial America, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1958.

Barr, W. Monfort, American Public School Finance, American Book Company, New York, 1960.

Benson, Charles S., The Economics of Public Education, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1961.

Blanshard, Brand (ed.), Education in the Age of Science, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1959.

Brunner, Edmund de S., and Yang, E. Hsin Poa, Rural America and the Extension Service, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1949.

Butts, R. Freeman, A Cultural History of Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1947.

Butts, R. Freeman, A Cultural History of Western Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1955.

Butts, R. Freeman, The American Tradition in Religion and Education, The Beacon Press, Boston, 1950.

Butts, R. Freeman, and Cremin, Lawrence A., A History of Education in American Culture, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1956.

Conant, James Bryant, General Education in a Free Society, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958.

Cubberley, Elwood P., Public Education in the United States, The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1919.

De Young, Chris A., Introduction to American Public Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1942.

Eddy, Edward Danforth Jr., Colleges for Our Land and Time The Land-Grant Idea in American Education, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1957.

James, Edmund J., The Origin of the Land Grant Act of 1862, The So-Called First Morrill Act, University Press, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1910.

Kandel, I. L., The Impact of the War Upon American Education, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1948.

MacDonald, Austin F., Federal Aid A Study of the American Subsidy System, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Publishers, New York, 1928.

Meriam, Lewis, Relief and Social Security, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., 1946.

Millet, John D., Financing of Higher Education in the United States, Columbia University Press, New York, 1952.

Myers, Alonzo F., and Williams, Clarence O., Education in a Democracy, Prentiss-Hall, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1948.

Orfield, Matthias Nordberg, Federal Land Grants to the States with Special Reference to Minnesota, Bulletin of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1915.

Parker, William Belmont, The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill, Houghton-Mifflin Company, New York, 1924.

Proceedings in A Conference on the Relation of the Federal Government to Education, Published by the University of Illinois, Urbana, 1921.

Prosser, Charles A., and Quigley, Thomas H., Vocational Education in a Democracy, American Technical Society, Chicago, 1949.

Roberts, Roy W., Vocational and Practical Arts Education, History, Development, and Principles, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1957.

Ross, Earle D., Democracy's College The Land Grant Movement in the Formative Stage, The Iowa State College Press, Ames, Iowa, 1942.

Smith, James Morton, and Murphy, Paul L. (eds.), Liberty and Justice A Historical Record of American Constitutional Development, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1958.

Stokes, Anson Phelps, Church and State in the United States, vol. 1, Harpers and Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1950.

Thorpe, F. N., The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters and Other Organic Laws, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1909.

True, Alfred Clark, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1929.

Walch, J. Weston, Complete Handbook on Federal Aid to Education, J. Weston Walch, Publisher, Portland, Maine, 1948.

Watkins, Kermit, Economic Implications of State Grants-in-Aid, Bureau of Business Research, School of Business, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1956.