

History of Education Society

Private Foundations and Public Policy: The Case of Secondary Education during the Great Depression

Author(s): Charles D. Biebel

Source: *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spring, 1976), pp. 3-33

Published by: [History of Education Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367780>

Accessed: 22/10/2010 15:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=hes>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



History of Education Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History of Education Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Private Foundations and Public Policy: The Case of Secondary Education During the Great Depression

CHARLES D. BIEBEL

ONE OF THE conventional justifications for the existence of large private philanthropic foundations in the United States has been their role as creative, innovative promoters of social change. Built on the fortunes of such industrial entrepreneurs as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, foundations early in this century were granted extensive legal privileges and immunity from government regulation in exchange for "voluntary" charitable support of science, medicine, and education, which like religion, theoretically existed in a private, non-governmental domain. Until the emergence of the federal government after World War II as the chief source of funding, private foundations played a predominant part in fostering educational and scientific innovation. Foundation support for social and institutional change, however, was not without inherent problems. The educational program of John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board during the decade of the 1930's illustrates the extent of these problems.

In March, 1933 the trustees of the General Education Board officially chose as their primary objective for the decade "To promote a reorganization of 'general education' through a coordinated national effort (chiefly in junior and senior high schools and junior colleges)." (1) After two years of research and planning, the officers of the foundation were authorized to spend up to ten million dollars to underwrite a nationwide campaign to improve what they termed "general education." The development and execution of this nationwide campaign raises serious questions about the nature of foundation support for public policy in America and the extent to which foundation funding was consistent with democratic ideals.

By the early thirties, the trustees of the various institutes and foundations

Charles Biebel teaches at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

created between 1896 and 1913 by Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller enjoyed a record of success especially in providing critical financial support for scientific and medical advances. In what became known as foundations' "golden age" or "heroic years," four of the Rockefeller philanthropies, the Institute for Medical Research, the Sanitary Commission, the General Education Board, and later the Rockefeller Foundation, supplied the leadership essential to the worldwide control of diseases like hookworm and malaria. In the same years, they concentrated on building permanent public health programs in the United States, including underwriting the founding of the first important schools of public health and public health nursing in this country. Finally, after World War I, the foundations had worked successfully to upgrade and standardize medical education, not only in this hemisphere but in Europe, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia. (2)

Foundations also provided major support for education in this early period. In higher education, for example, the Carnegie Corporation distributed \$15 million to American colleges and universities in 1913 alone. By contrast, the federal government's appropriations for higher education that same year totalled only about \$5 million. (3) At the pre-collegiate level, the most influential foundation had been the General Education Board, the first philanthropic foundation created by John D. Rockefeller and for which he had received a charter from Congress in 1903. (4)

The General Education Board had been an outgrowth of Rockefeller's desire to aid the cause of Negroes; it received over \$29 million in Standard Oil securities between 1902 and 1921. Initially, the Board, composed entirely of successful white businessmen, white educators, and white clergymen, concentrated on creating statewide systems of publicly supported primary and secondary schooling in the American South for both races. To this end, the trustees, together with the foundation's professional staff, had devised an aggressive strategy of aid which included "infiltrating" Southern universities and government agencies with its own paid "evangelists" and requiring matching financial support for its projects from Southern states and communities. The Board had also attempted to address indirectly the problem of an inferior tax base for education by improving agricultural methods in the region. Foundation funds were used to organize model farm demonstration projects, rural marketing and credit agencies and young people's farm clubs. After 1910 the Board was joined by the Rosenwald Fund in financing the construction of thousands of new schoolhouses in the South. While funds flowed much more abundantly to Southern whites than to blacks, the Board's activities did highlight the economic and social plight of the region. Ironically, as in its medical and scientific research programs, the foundation's aggressive private demands on state and local governments as well as its sup-

port of cooperating federal agencies provoked substantial public action aimed toward solving Southern problems. (5)

In the early and mid-1920's, however, the Board's education and social welfare programs languished. A foundation-supported study of violence in labor-management disputes, especially in Western mining camps owned by the Rockefellers, precipitated a bitter, widely publicized congressional investigation of organized philanthropy. The embarrassment to the Board engendered by this investigation was not soon forgotten. It came as the first generation of trustees and senior staff officers were giving way to new, less experienced leaders. At the same time the immense success and prestige of the foundation's scientific and medical divisions began to overshadow the now suspect endeavors in the social sciences. (6) By 1926 all of the Rockefeller philanthropies, including the General Education Board, had become deeply engaged in medical and scientific research. Frequent duplication of effort and fierce competition between family foundations for new programs and personnel finally prompted the appointment of a special review committee charged with recommending ways to reorganize and consolidate the work of the various institutions. By 1929 such a reorganization was effected with the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board singled out as the two organizations to carry on the family philanthropy. New executive officers were secured and to prevent undue overlap and competition between boards, new division directors in the humanities, social sciences, medical and natural sciences were to be appointed to serve simultaneously as officers of both foundations. (7)

Although the organizational charts were redrawn in 1929 and 1930, a precise program goal for the General Education Board remained undefined. Fellowships to individual scholars and aid to selected American universities both North and South which had begun in the 1920's continued, but the trustees and the new officers were reluctant to move even modestly into problem areas which might arouse social or political criticism. For example, late in October 1929, as the nation's economy collapsed, the officers of the Board declined to recommend a \$50,000 subvention to support a non-partisan study by the National Advisory Committee on Education seeking to clarify federal responsibility for education. (8)

By the spring of 1931, however, external forces and internal developments combined to prompt the officers to action. In the first place, when the Rockefeller philanthropies had been realigned in 1929, the General Education Board was authorized and expected to begin dispensing not only its income but its remaining \$20 to \$25 million in principal as well. By 1931 the new officers were ready to begin planning the programs necessary to effect this mandate. At the same time, the high volume of requests for emergency

assistance from hard-pressed school administrators, especially in the South, suggested that the time was ripe for a general reassessment of the Board's priorities concerning public education. (9)

Accordingly, in January, 1931, the officers decided to ask the trustees to grant \$50,000 for a two year, in-house survey of the entire field of education in the United States. After citing the enormous increase in educational enrollments and expenditures between 1900 and 1928, the officers asked rhetorically:

In view of this stupendous increase in educational resources and costs, and in the number of those in the faculties and student bodies, and in view of the significant changes in the social order and the obvious lack of adjustment between our educational and social systems, is not the time ripe for the General Education Board to take stock of the present situation in the entire educational field and to try to discover the present tendencies and movements, the gaps and deficiencies, the promising areas and projects for support, and to compare and appraise the several conditions in order that it may select what would be the most advantageous fields and projects to which now it should devote its attention? . . . There are doubtless as significant and promising opportunities at present as were those which the Board has in the past embraced with such success. (10)

In answer, the trustees at their annual spring meeting in April 1931 empowered the officers to proceed with a Survey of Education and authorized expenditure of whatever funds seemed necessary. (11)

In light of the potentially radical program eventually recommended by the officers, it is significant to note the very conservative nature of the arguments used to justify their initial request for the Survey. Nowhere did the officers mention the national depression nor did they note the extreme social dislocation which might have been documented by the reports and letters of solicitation in the Board's files. Instead, they based their request on the rising scale of national investment in American education and the need for increased efficiency in handling both the financial investment and the increasingly larger numbers of students. They also emphasized the gap between technological advance and public understanding of the benefits and problems of efficiently utilizing new technology. Finally the officers stressed their ever present concern for institutional success, reflecting a desire both for efficient, humanitarian service and renewed national prestige for the General Education Board and its officers.

The conservative posture of the officers provides several clues both to the realities of power and decision-making within the foundation and to the possibilities and limitations of Board support for social and institutional change. Any new program, of course, required the approval of the 15 member Board of Trustees which legally possessed ultimate authority over policy

and expenditures. In 1932-33 the Board was an extremely homogeneous group. All 15 trustees were white, male and protestant. With the exception of 27 year old John D. Rockefeller, III, their average age was 56.5 years. Nine of the 15 were born either in New York or New England; 11 had been educated at Ivy League schools or the University of Chicago, which had been a particular object of John D. Rockefeller's philanthropy since 1896. (12)

Of the 15, nine were also academicians; seven were or had recently been senior administrators of universities such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, N.Y.U., Stanford, and the University of Chicago. Of the remaining six, two were members of the donor's family (John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and John D. Rockefeller, III); two were corporation executives (Owen Young, Chairman of the Board of General Electric, and Harold H. Swift, vice-president of Swift and Company); one was a New York banker (Arthur Woods, who had also served as police Commissioner of New York City from 1914-1918); and one, Raymond B. Fosdick, chairman of the GEB Board of Trustees, was a Wall Street lawyer.

The ideological values of the trustees were far less homogeneous, however. Verbatim transcriptions of Board decisions unfortunately are limited, but existing sources reveal three consistent divisions of trustee opinion in the early years of the decade. One group of trustees comprised of both academicians and businessmen concerned itself almost primarily with the financial prudence of any proposal. Their questions normally were procedural rather than theoretical or substantive. A second group, consisting largely of university presidents and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was more interested in proposed programs which were potentially socially or educationally innovative. This articulate group appeared more than eager to question and discuss the social and philosophical implications of new programs. A final minority group remained constantly critical and skeptical of socially oriented programs in the thirties. They were particularly concerned about exposing the foundation to external political or public criticism. Until late in the decade, the first two groups joined in an uneasy alliance to endorse and support the plans formulated by the foundation's professional officers. (13)

With the trustees thus divided, the initiative for developing the Board's priorities passed to the staff officers. The latter continued to assume central leadership until by mid-decade they exercised power far in excess of that normally delegated to their counterparts in other foundations. The beginnings of this shift in power had occurred in the previous decade in defensive reaction to congressional charges that the Rockefeller family exercised undue dominance of the foundation. Professional officers had been hired at that time, and as program decisions especially in the medical and scientific divisions became increasingly more technical, division directors as-

sumed not only the power to screen initial applications for funds, but also the prerogative of recommending which long range programs the Board would underwrite or exclude. The ascendancy of the professional officers was further strengthened by the inclusion of president Trevor Arnett and the president of the Rockefeller Foundation, Max Mason, as voting members of the GEB Board of Trustees. That the officers' justifications for the Survey of Education were so pallid in 1931 indicates the degree to which they themselves were still sensitive to former restrictions on social programs and the degree to which their power within the foundation was still evolving. (14) Within the year, Arnett, Vice President David Stevens, and the division directors were to develop into an efficient professional cadre exhibiting the internal confidence and organizational skills necessary to the strategic planning and execution of multi-million dollar programs.

One of the traditional strengths of large foundations early in the century had been their capability to organize comprehensive and informed assessments of public problems and to draft recommendations for remedial action. In the autumn of 1931 the Survey of Education began with similar aims. President Arnett first assembled a special staff to abstract the major educational issues that had been raised in books, journals, periodicals, and public addresses in the preceding four year period. (15) At the same time, he began soliciting private assessments of current educational aims and needs from a number of influential American leaders including the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, brother of trustee Raymond Fosdick, Walter Gifford, president of A.T.&T., and trustee Owen Young, president of General Electric. (16) During the fall and early winter, Arnett, Stevens, and the divisional directors selected three major fields of concentration for the Survey: 1) the study of the learning process and the mental, physical, and moral development of the individual; 2) the problem of "preparing the individual for vocations and leisure"; and 3) the means for relating education to an evolving society, that is education which would "insure the active adaptation of the individual to the changes which may come in his social, physical and aesthetic environments." An additional "field of interest" concerned the development of operating programs and the trained personnel necessary to validate and apply the principles developed in the first three areas of concentration. (17)

In December 1931 the trustees accepted both the theoretical and practical direction of the Survey with the understanding that final program recommendations would be submitted in December 1932. The officers, therefore, began to move with great dispatch to utilize the immense prestige and financial power of the foundation in mobilizing a corps of prominent consultants to provide a private, confidential assessment of American educational needs.

Some forty key topics in the three general program areas were isolated early in 1932 and assigned to carefully selected experts for their analysis and evaluation as possible parts of any future Board program. Topics ranged from the methodology of discovering individual interests and aptitudes to the social, economic, and political implications of education to technical studies of various special educational problems. Consultants included academicians such as Dr. Helen Lynd, Arnold Gesell of Yale, President Ernest Wilkins of Oberlin College, Charles Johnson of Fisk, and Jacques Barzun and Rexford Tugwell of Columbia, and specialists like Dr. George Stevenson of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene and V. T. Thayer, Educational Director of the Ethical Culture Schools in New York City. (18)

The foundation paid each consultant from \$400 to \$7000 for their work. Since completed reports were intended solely for the internal use of trustees and officers, the consultants rendered candid "expressions of opinion much more easily than would have been possible if the material were intended to appear in print with full supporting evidence." (19)

At the same time, the officers began to canvas and evaluate the research and experimental activities of those educational and governmental organizations which might be related to a possible Board program. In some cases this meant analysis of written reports, in others members of the foundation staff attended conventions, conferences, or meetings of executive committees of such organizations. (20)

By the fall of 1932 the officers were using the consultants' reports to begin to develop the specific program recommendations which were to be presented to the trustees in December. At the first of a series of intensive weekly staff meetings, President Arnett reported in September that all of the consultants seemed to concur

that the present system of education is outmoded—that it is out of touch with the situation as it exists today; that the rapidity with which social conditions have changed within the last few decades has resulted in widespread maladjustment (sic) of the individual to existing environment; and that educational procedure must be redirected if it is to contribute to the solution of present-day social, economic, and political problems. (21)

These assumptions, it should be noted, were fundamental to future Board planning. They reflect several apparently ingrained notions about American society and its schools: first, faith in the existing social order, no matter how "dislocated" it might be; second, that it is the responsibility of the individual to adjust to seemingly necessary social changes; third, that the public school is the most effective agency by which the individual can be adjusted even though schooling always lags behind rapidly changing social conditions;

and finally, if only the educational system can somehow be reformed, social, economic, or political problems would be peacefully and painlessly solved.

This faith in the efficacy of schooling had no doubt played a part in the founding of the General Education Board and its original efforts to solve the "Negro problem" in the South. As the social and political uncertainties of the depression intensified, faith in the social power of education once again began to overpower the residual opposition within the foundation to social welfare and social reform programs.

One of the principal reasons for the reassertion of such a social activist role for the Board was the leadership provided by the director of the division of social sciences, Edmund E. Day. Day possessed a background and career pattern not dissimilar from that of a majority of the trustees and officers. Born in New Hampshire in 1883, Day had received his B.S. and M.A. degrees from Dartmouth and a Ph.D. in economics in 1909 from Harvard. Beginning as an instructor in economics at Dartmouth in 1907, Day was recalled to Harvard in 1910 where he rose to full professor and taught until 1923. He then moved to the University of Michigan where he served as Dean of the School of Business Administration. In 1927 he left Ann Arbor to head the social science program of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. When the family philanthropies were reorganized between 1928 and 1930, Day became director of social sciences for both the Rockefeller Foundation and the GEB. Like most of his associates, Day was a protestant and a Republican; in addition, he was a member of the Board of Education in suburban Bronxville, New York, a community noted for the progressive educational leadership of its school superintendent, Willard W. Beatty, who was president of the Progressive Education Association in 1933.

It is clear from the minutes of the officers' weekly survey conferences in the autumn of 1932 that Day was gradually assuming the central leadership in developing an imaginative, if grandiose, blueprint for coordinating a national reorganization of education. He was also the officer delegated to articulate the theoretical justification for the new programs to the trustees. By early October he had prepared an important staff memorandum entitled "Cultural Adjustment to a Changing World" which formed the basis for the program in general education, a program originally envisioned costing \$1 million a year for five years. (22) Day later drafted the staff's final Survey Report and was chosen by the officers to present the report and its recommendations to the trustees.

An analysis of Day's position as a nationally prominent social scientist and most influential foundation officer reveals the parameters within which future Board programs would operate. According to Day in December 1933, the upheavals of the early 1930's were caused by the failure of outmoded

social organizations to cope with the radical advances made by science and technology in the 20th century. "Industrialism and urbanism," he wrote, "are new forces of tremendous power, neither of which has been brought under sensible control. The way out is not yet evident, and a prolonged period of readjustment is presumably unavoidable." (23) Yet while acknowledging that "prevailing social ideas and ideals in the United States were seriously out of accord with current social forms and forces," Day argued, not that malfunctioning economic or political institutions be changed, but that the answer to the problem lay chiefly in individual readjustment. (24) And, of course, the ultimate social salvation lay with a properly functioning system of education.

Like many of his contemporaries, Day saw little contradiction between social reorganization and individual adjustment, though the latter would "necessarily present difficult problems both of belief and behavior." (25) Properly functioning schools could insure "the preparation of every individual for participation in human affairs and the advancement of social well-being." (26) While allowing that the family, the church, and the state also contributed to social well-being, Day maintained that "we must look chiefly to the school for the major efforts toward cultural adjustment of the individual, since the school is a social instrumentality with a uniquely flexible adaptability and with a primary responsibility to meet this need." (27) Day defined as "general education" that schooling which could "set the individual in satisfactory general relation to the world in which he lived." And it was in the field of general education that the director of social sciences recommended the Board concentrate its remaining resources.

In effect Day wished to quicken the consciousness of those concerned with educational leadership throughout the country. He believed that the "general objectives of American education can and should be stated more clearly; and that cooperation of persons and agencies at work on various educational problems is the first necessity for constructive changes in purpose and practice." Such changes would not come easily, Day warned, for "throughout our educational system beyond the elementary grades, instruction is dominated by subject matter specialists whose interests tend to run to the training of recruits for the fields in which the teachers have themselves qualified." He added:

Throughout general education we find teaching materials too exclusively organized and presented in terms, not of life problems, but of academic departments or disciplines; we find classroom methods too much affected by the teacher's desire to cultivate the students' command of specialized skills. (28)

Since the great majority of young people in the early 1930's were ending

their formal schooling with high school, Day felt the Board's new program should be designed especially to reshape secondary education. (29) To surmount conventional inertia at this level and achieve the new goals of general education, Day and the officers proposed that the Board establish a National Commission on General Education which could enlist and subsidize the services of leading scientists, scholars, and educational leaders, and oversee the cooperation and assistance of the major universities, scholarly societies, and professional educational organizations in the United States. The Commission on General Education would have four major tasks: 1) the production of new educational materials reflecting the latest findings of experts in both content and methodology in the social sciences, humanities and natural sciences; 2) the establishment of fellowship programs to retrain secondary school teachers whose knowledge or skills were outmoded or inadequate; 3) experimentation at various types and levels of schools to test and appraise new methods and materials including the "structural unity of the entire educational experience for the individual student"; and 4) support of basic research on general problems deriving from the first three categories. (30)

In order to minimize "resistance" to such an enterprise, Day and the officers envisioned utilizing an already existing national educational organization to "sponsor" the commission on general education. Since such an organization would already command stature and authority, it could become an ideal channel for Board funds and influence. The depression had wreaked havoc on the financial fortunes of major representative educational agencies such as the Progressive Education Association (PEA), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the various affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA). Almost without exception, these groups had applied to the Board for emergency assistance. As a result of such applications and the information gathered about each from the Survey of Education, the officers were fully aware of the strengths and weaknesses, financial liabilities, and breadth of constituencies of each organization. For their purposes, the officers had singled out the American Council on Education as the most appropriate organization through which they could work. (31)

The decision to use the ACE once again revealed the degree of the Board's fear of public criticism. Even the most adventurous officers were reluctant to acknowledge publicly the foundation's full role in a social program of national importance. In subsequent planning, neither officers or trustees ever seriously contemplated having the foundation itself openly sponsor a blue-ribbon advisory commission of prominent citizens to organize investigations of the purposes and aims of American education or oversee curricular experimentation and development of new models of institutional organization. Rather, foundation officials were willing to resort to behind the

scenes manipulation of existing organizations as the most practical means of achieving the foundation's goals for the public good.

At their special meeting in December, the trustees were understandably staggered by the boldness of the projected program. In addition to \$10 million for general education, the officers called for \$2,195,000 for a scientific investigation of child growth and development; \$1,500,000 to stimulate the adoption of investigative experiences in senior colleges; and \$5 million to fulfill previous educational projects in the South.

The trustees' immediate questions concerned the scope of the program in general education. Their objections centered around three major concerns. The first dealt with fiscal responsibility. Harold Swift and several others questioned whether the Board was not overcommitting its already dwindling millions and running the risk that existing obligations might not be adequately honored. (32) Others like James Angell and Harold Chase were critical of the grandiose nature of the proposals in general education. Chase, for example, correctly pointed out that for at least a decade the Board had restricted its grants to specific institutions or individuals with very particular research projects. Now, however, the trustees were being asked to authorize an extremely vague but potentially far-reaching program operating under a most general mandate. (33) Finally, the social implications of the general education program disturbed many trustees. "It is a tremendous responsibility," declared trustee Edwin Mims, "for this Board to attempt to determine an attitude toward the social problems of our time. At every stage you would have serious objection that could interfere with the working of the program." (34)

Trustee response proved so uniformly negative that the proposals appeared likely to be killed. However, late in the deliberations, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. announced what proved to be a decisive position:

The officers have presented a thorough, interesting, suggestive, and masterly report . . . We do not wish to enforce on institutions in a dogmatic way any views which this Board may have. The purpose is rather to set on foot and help to make possible further studies in the problems of education, to be made by competent, well-recognized, well-established groups of educators who are doing this sort of thing or would be doing this sort of thing right along if they had the time, or more particularly, the funds. They would do this not in the name of the board—it would be their work . . . The underlying purpose of the program appeals to me and commands my support. (35)

In a compromise reached shortly thereafter, trustees Angell, Chase, Stewart, and chairman Fosdick were appointed a special committee to consult further with the officers prior to final disposition of the proposals in April 1933.

The four month reprieve Day and the officers received was well spent.

Negotiations were immediately begun with influential members of the American Council of Education looking toward a revision of the ACE's structure and functions so that it might appropriately sponsor a commission on general education. The Council has been founded during World War I as a pressure group for colleges, universities, and educational associations like the American Association of Universities and the Modern Language Association. By 1931 its roster included some 254 institutions, roughly 40% of those eligible for membership. (36) Besides acting as a Washington pressure group, the Council in the twenties had supported development of psychological tests for use by colleges and universities; it had also lately begun to act as fiscal agent for research projects conducted by association members. The Council's elderly executive director, C. R. Mann, had served as chief lobbyist since the organization's founding; in 1930, however, funds from the Rosenwald foundation enabled the Council to add a new Problems and Plans Committee designed to assume major policy-making duties for the organization. (37)

Before the officers of the GEB were willing to recommend funds for the Council, they wanted the ACE to enlarge its constitution to become a representative of secondary as well as higher education, to hire a new, younger director, and to delegate increased power to the progressive Problems and Plans Committee including the authority to nominate the director of the Council. The Board officers were, of course, in a strong bargaining position. With support from the Rosenwald foundation soon to terminate and increasing numbers of members withdrawing from the Council because they could no longer afford yearly dues, the future of the ACE looked grave. (38)

In January 1933, Council members friendly to the Board began a serious reorganization drive within the ACE. It was understood only that the Council might expect substantial yearly support from the Board if it were reconstituted to exert strong national educational leadership at both secondary and university levels. (39)

At the same time, Board officers began to build support within the Special Trustee Committee. The most important and influential member of that committee was James R. Angell, president of Yale University. Angell had served as a trustee since 1922 and was himself a former president of the Carnegie Corporation. Angell was fully aware of the relative weaknesses of the various national education organizations and skeptical about the notion of instituting national educational reform. Day and his colleagues took special pains, therefore, to confer with Angell and to prepare new position papers explaining more fully the rationale of the program in general education. They also provided Angell and the other members of the committee with copies of the most important reports from the Survey of Education. (40)

The professional staff's efforts to educate the trustees were not in vain. In a report dated March 20, 1933 the special committee announced that it agreed with the officers that the field of secondary education "... is at present the most important in which the Board can operate and the one which most urgently requires fundamental reorganization on the basis of a satisfactory philosophy of education buttressed by well-devised and adequately supported experimental and demonstrational procedures." The special committee also concurred that a national commission on general education initiated by the Board could provide the leadership necessary for this major reorganization. (41)

In April the trustees accepted the committee's assessment and endorsed in principle the recommendation to set aside \$10 million for the new program. (42) Trustee skepticism about the scope of the program remained, however, and the officers were ordered to present a detailed plan for the commission on general education for specific approval at the next meeting of the trustees in December. At the same time, the trustees began to reassert the belief that the foundation's role should be less directly active than the officers originally wished. One crucial section of the special committee's report describing the commission on general education, for example, stated that the officers would be "presumably participating in the selection of personnel but subsequently withdrawing from *any appearance of* active supervision of the work of the commission and from any apparent effort to control its findings." In formal action, the trustees deleted the underlined words and thus strategically altered the officers' mandate for involvement with the proposed commission. (43)

This decision was not the only blow to the officers' grand design for restructuring American public education. Since reconstitution of the ACE appeared certain, in mid-April the trustees had agreed to allocate \$300,000 for general support of the Council for six years. (44) Three weeks later, however, Day and the officers were shocked to learn that a conservative, insurgent faction had taken control at the ACE's annual meeting, elected one of their spokesmen chairman of the Council's executive committee, and strongly reaffirmed the Council's emphasis on higher education. In opposing any broadening of the Council's activities, the victors charged that the foundation was attempting to subvert and control their democratic organization. For the "insurgents," success proved costly. Since necessary restructuring had not been effected, the Council was informed that financial backing from the Board would not be forthcoming. (45)

Over the summer, the GEB executive committee moved to strengthen the faltering program in general education. In a structural reorganization of their own, the work of the divisions of education, social sciences, natural and

medical sciences were transferred wholly to the Rockefeller Foundation. A new division of general education was then established with Edmund Day as director. (46) In the autumn Day began trying to convince the opposition chairman of the ACE's executive committee, Dean William Russell of Teachers College, Columbia, of the Board's good intentions. (47) Eventually, these efforts were successful. At a special meeting of the ACE's constituent members in February 1934, Russell recommended passage of the structural changes he had helped defeat nine months earlier. After approval of the necessary constitutional revisions, the delegates voted to make the retirement of Executive Director C. R. Mann contingent upon the receipt of long-term foundation support. (48) Such support was not long in coming. In April 1934, the GEB trustees reaffirmed a \$300,000 five year appropriation for general support of the ACE. (49) Within six months, the Council had a new director, United States Commissioner of Education George P. Zook. Negotiations concerning the formation and composition of a commission on general education, however, would consume yet another year.

By the time the commission on general education (officially christened the American Youth Commission) was finally established with an initial grant of \$500,000 in September 1935, Day and the officers had reluctantly concluded "... that it was not desirable to depend exclusively on the Youth Commission for the formation of a broad reorganization of general education in their country. (50) As Day explained in 1936, "It was quite evident that there were three or four 'power groups' already in the situation whose existence had to be recognized and whose co-operation the Youth Commission would have to secure if it was to be at all successful in its major undertakings." Among these "power groups" were the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, and the Regional Accrediting Associations. To insure their co-operation with the Commission, "recommendations were made by the officers to the trustees for the support of certain undertakings by these other important groups. (51)

Day characterized this strategy of manipulation as his "conservative approach" to educational policy making. It involved trustee approval between 1934 and 1936 of \$35,000 for general support of the PEA plus \$703,050 for the work of four commissions of the Association; \$250,000 to the NEA and its Department of Superintendence for 5 years of support for a new deliberative body, the Educational Policies Committee; and \$140,000 for the Joint Committee of Twenty-one of the Regional Accrediting Associations to study new standards for accrediting secondary schools. (52) In addition, in April 1935, the Board granted \$500,000 to the New York State Board of Regents for a comprehensive investigation of the costs, objectives, and results of public education in New York. (53)

This attempt to cultivate selected power groups whose support the Youth Commission might ultimately need was a risk which failed both as a stopgap measure and in the long run. As an immediate stratagem, it did not encourage cooperation among the various institutions involved; on the contrary, it appears to have accelerated a dispersal of the central authority and focus that was originally intended for the national commission. The long range effects were similarly unsuccessful.

Day had envisioned the commission as a massive, supervisory research and development center which would utilize the prestige of a group of prominent laymen and educators and the liberal resources of the foundation for three purposes: 1) to encourage reformulation of the purposes of American education; 2) to encourage the development of new models for institutional reorganization; and 3) to encourage curricular experimentation and the development of new materials and media. (54)

While the various commissions of the PEA and the Joint Committee of Twenty-one of the Accrediting Associations did attempt to encourage innovative curricular programs and new institutional models, the bulk of the money given to the NEA, the New York State Regents Inquiry, and indeed, the 1.3 million dollars given to the Youth Commission was spent in often over-lapping efforts to "encourage reformulation of the purposes of American education."

The unexpected failure of the Youth Commission to provide central leadership in overseeing all aspects of the foundation's plan to restructure American education can be attributed to at least two unforeseen factors: first, the crucial two year delay in organizing the Commission, and second, the announcement by Edmund Day in the summer of 1936 of his intent to resign from the professional staff to assume the presidency of Cornell University. To succeed Day, the trustees chose Robert J. Havighurst who had served for three years as assistant director of general education.

The new director's background was not dissimilar from that of his predecessor. (55) His educational philosophy, however, differed significantly from Day's. Shortly after his promotion, the new director added a novel dimension to the Board's program, "The Study of Youth." (56) Unlike Day and most professional educators of the period, Havighurst considered the "youth problem" little connected with formal schooling. The massive unemployment of young people which persisted into the late 1930's was for Havighurst a portent of a permanent future reality. While Day assumed public schools, especially high schools and junior colleges, would absorb the "adjustment" responsibilities for this group, Havighurst saw the need for a new battery of supplementary agencies which would help meet the economic and social needs of young people who must be kept out of the employment

market. "The Board's job," he wrote several years later, "was to help make America's provision for the care and education of youth keep step with the major social changes in which the country was engaged." (57)

To this end, Havighurst poured new energy and direction into the American Youth Commission and encouraged it to concentrate on problems normally outside the usual range of school responsibilities: job preparation and placement; society's treatment of rural and Negro youth; and new forms of custodial and informal educational experiences like the Civilian Conservation Corps. By spring of 1939, he was also encouraging the National Association of Secondary School Principals to initiate their own study of the occupational adjustment of youth in the depression. (58)

Havighurst also began to rely much more heavily than his predecessor on the American Council on Education to provide some of the central leadership for educational reorganization originally destined for the commission on general education. For example, as the Educational Policies Commission and the PEA's Commission on Secondary School Curriculum began publishing their versions of new objectives in general education, Havighurst and Zook late in 1937 prepared a proposal for a \$200,000 Commission on Teacher Education to work for five years on implementing new policies for recruiting, selecting, and training teachers. On the officers' initiative six months later, the ACE was granted another \$9,000 for a study of "Cooperation Among Agencies Interested in General Education." This project was intended to devise ways of minimizing duplication of efforts and orchestrating the complementary programs of the various organizations working on problems of general education. (59) Where Day had once placed emphasis on funding organizations reformulating the purposes of education, developing new curricula, and experimenting with new teaching methods, Havighurst boosted new studies of occupational adjustment and the custodial care of youth and through the American Council tried to accelerate the development of ways to disseminate the results of the program's findings.

Under Havighurst's leadership, foundation support for the program in general education did not slow from 1937 through 1939; on the contrary, appropriations in this period quickened, amounting to 4.5 million dollars, over half of the total amount eventually designated for the general education program. (60)

Ironically, but perhaps not too surprisingly, as the program in general education became more comprehensive and the balance of grants increased, trustee ambivalence concerning the nature and scope of general education also mounted. In July 1937, the trustees had ominously signalled a renewed interest in Southern education by creating a new division of southern education administratively co-equal with general education. To head the new

division, the trustees hired a southerner and long-time Dean of the College of Agriculture and Provost of Cornell, Albert R. Mann. At the same time Mann was also elected to serve as vice president of the Board. (61)

The trustees appear never really to have understood the intent of the general education program. (62) In December 1936 in one of his final statements as director of general education, Edmund Day was still trying to explain to the trustees what the program was all about. Day prefaced his remarks by candidly admitting "... there have been signs from time to time that at least some members of the Board have been a little ill at ease with this program—lacking complete understanding and full conviction of the value of the undertaking." (63)

Day's admission that some members of the Board were "a little ill at ease" was no doubt greatly understated. In March 1937, Havighurst informed the new President of the foundation, Raymond Fosdick, that he was in the process of formulating new "ideas about the problem of maintaining trustee understanding and support of the program in general education." (64) Several of these ideas were tried. With trustee approval, the officers formed an Advisory Committee on General Education late in 1937 composed of a half dozen distinguished American "social philosophers" to advise the officers concerning the basic philosophical assumptions underlying the program in general education. (65) During the fall of 1937, the officers also inaugurated a series of confidential reports to the trustees. Published on the 15th of each month, these reports were designed to keep the trustees in closer touch with the activities of the programs in southern education and general education. For the first issue in October 1937, Havighurst prepared an extremely sanguine analysis of "Strategy on the General Education Front." (66)

In addition, at least once each year the director of general education prepared a major statement for the trustees explaining in detail the historical, philosophical, and strategic elements of his program. (67) That such efforts were continually necessary was illustrated by a letter President Fosdick received in July 1939 from trustee Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond *New Leader*. Acknowledging receipt of the latest of Havighurst's explanatory documents, Freeman wrote:

I hope this will clear up some of the misunderstanding of the Board concerning this phase of our work. It is a little alarming to discover from casual discussion with different trustees that there is less enthusiasm for this program of General Education than for anything we are doing. Were the program not so far advanced, I believe many of the trustees would favor an entire shift of emphasis. (68)

With the outbreak of World War II in Europe in late 1939 and the allocation of greater sums of money for the general education program, trustee

enthusiasm deteriorated further. Military preparedness programs began to relieve the economic dislocations which had compelled the officers to assume substantial Board powers in initiating the general education program. Trustee membership, it should also be noted, had undergone significant alteration since the early thirties. Of the seventeen members of the Board in 1940, only five had been trustees in 1932-1933 when the general education program had been authorized. President Fosdick, furthermore, lacked the degree of commitment to the program which his predecessor, Trevor Arnett, possessed. Nor did Havighurst command the personal prestige with either President Fosdick or the trustees which Edmund Day enjoyed. The new Board and a new president began reasserting their power.

It should have come as no surprise, then, when in March 1940 Fosdick asked Havighurst for the names of five "expert witnesses" who could assess the importance of the Board's work in general education. After consulting with several of these experts, Fosdick wrote the following month: "... it has helped me enormously in coming to certain conclusions in relation to the termination of these activities." (69) Those conclusions became clear on April 4, when the trustees in executive session without staff members present agreed in principle that the program in General Education should be phased out by the end of 1940. On June 6, Fosdick reported tersely that he had discussed the trustees' decision with the director of the general education program: "Mr. Havighurst met the suggestion in admirable spirit and is leaving the General Education Board on December 31st of this year." (70)

While the officers of the General Education Board had failed to restructure American education as they had boldly planned, their actions did have important repercussions. Institutionally, the Board's intervention had produced significant results. The American Council on Education, for example, had been in serious financial straits in 1932 before the officers of the GEB had finally selected it to serve as the sponsor of a national commission on general education. With that selection, its future was secure. Between 1934 and 1940, the ACE received over one-third of all Board funding in general education, more than 3.2 million dollars. This included \$395,000 for general institutional support, over 1.3 million dollars for the Commission on Teacher Education, and \$410,000 for eight other related projects. The sheer volume of this funding plus the prestige of the foundation's trust assured the ACE a bright future as sponsor or fiscal agent for subsequent government and foundation programs. (71)

As for the American Youth Commission, with the termination of Board funding in 1940-1941, it issued one final report and ceased to exist. (72) Ironically, with American entry into World War II, the ACE quickly returned to its former role as pressure group coordinator for institutions of higher

education. Under the aggressive leadership of college presidents like James B. Conant of Harvard, Frank Graham of the University of North Carolina, Raymond Kent of the University of Louisville, and former GEB trustee Henry Chase of New York University, the ACE was soon preoccupied with securing favorable manpower decisions and lucrative training and research grants for colleges and universities from the War Department. By the end of the war, as the federal government quickly superseded the foundations as primary sources of educational funding, the ACE once again became the voice of American higher education. (73)

The NEA and its affiliate, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, also benefited enormously from nearly half a million dollars in grants in the late 1930's. Most of this money went to support the work of the Educational Policies Commission, a deliberative body of prominent educators whose function was to stimulate the general planning of educational reorganization. When the ACE failed to reorganize quickly enough to warrant creation of the national commission on general education, the EPC had been one of the means of filling that void. After E. E. Day left the foundation to become president of Cornell in 1937, he became a member of the EPC and for eight years tried to prod the Policies Commission to assume the reform leadership which he had originally planned for the commission on general education. One of the results of that prodding was the publication in 1944 of *Education for All American Youth*, a volume Lawrence Cremin has described as having significantly summed up "the best laid plans of the teaching profession for American education in the postwar decades." (74) Unfortunately, although the EPC's pronouncements were well received by establishment educators, the Policies Commission seldom moved beyond its role as spokesman for the profession and thus failed to rally the lay public to a reconsideration of education priorities. The Policies Commission did serve to enhance greatly the reputation of the NEA at the very time when its officers were vigorously recruiting a larger dues-paying constituency for their organization. When the general education program was terminated in 1940, the EPC received one final five-year tapering grant. (75) By 1945, the NEA was able not only to absorb the full budget of the EPC but to continue its support of the Commission's work for almost thirty years.

Like the ACE, the financial future of the Progressive Education Association had been bleak indeed in 1932. The infusion of over 1.6 million dollars in GEB funding, however, allowed the PEA to flourish brilliantly during the later depression years sponsoring curricular experiments such as the Eight-Year Study and the development of new materials and methods by its various commissions. (76) In 1940, most critics felt that the money invested in the PEA by the foundation had been well spent, if for nothing else than to prod

the mainstream, conventional educators represented by the National Education Association. With the cessation of foundation funding in 1940, however, disaster struck. Lulled by the great surge of activity generated by the Board's grants during the thirties, the leaders of the PEA had failed to devise a means of developing a self-sustaining constituency. With foundation money gone, the programs of the Association were fatally weakened. By 1943, dues-paying membership had decreased so dramatically that the PEA Board of Directors even resorted to changing the name of the Association in an unsuccessful attempt to broaden the base of support. (77)

In all, some eighty-two other organizations at local, state, and national levels benefitted from the Board's generosity. With the exception of the half million dollar subvention given the New York State Board of Regents for the study of the costs of public education, most other large grants went to major university schools of education and to schools, colleges, and universities developing new instructional materials or experimenting with new methods. (78)

In retrospect, the Board's program in general education raise serious questions concerning the support of social change by private foundations. Although foundations no longer play as prominent a role as forty years ago, the questions raised are still pertinent today and remain largely unanswered.

On many counts, the foundation seemed an ideally suited institution to support desperately needed social and institutional innovation. The General Education Board possessed abundant economic resources in the midst of economic scarcity; it had enjoyed a long record of program success; unlike many foundations, it commanded well-trained officers who were relatively free of direct donor domination; and finally, it professed a longstanding commitment to serving the public good.

In practice, however, the Board labored under a considerable number of self-imposed constraints. Internally, the homogeneity of trustees and officers and the drive for organizational success and self-preservation served to limit or preclude unusually innovative experimentation especially in social welfare areas. While divergent political and social viewpoints existed among the white, male, protestant, largely upper-middle class trustees and officers, the range of that divergence was exceedingly small. As the American economic order faltered and, many would argue, the need for encouragement of social and educational innovation was at its highest, the Board's response was a narrow decision to "reform" the educational system to insure that young people "adjust" to the realities of modern America. It is hard to escape the conviction that the officers and trustees, representing a foundation which by its nature was private, elitist, and paternalistic, could not trans-

cent their collective vested interest in sustaining a social and economic order largely created by their class—all in the name of democracy and the public interest.

Even more disturbing than the Board's ends were the Board's means. To restructure American secondary education required the coordinated joint efforts of a considerable number of interrelated institutions. By necessity, the GEB had to gain the allegiance and cooperation of various professional organizations, accrediting agencies, universities, and national representative associations, plus a prestigious group of prominent laymen. To achieve their goals, Board officials countenanced a policy of manipulation, cooption, and covert control of the necessary institutions and educational associations. These, ironically, were the very tactics disparagingly ascribed to the entrepreneurs whose fortunes had created and sustained the large foundations. In retrospect, one must ask whether the Board's contribution to the survival and success of particular organizations during the depression and to the demise of others was in the long run in the best interests of the country.

The absence of adequate institutional mechanisms for cultivating and encouraging social change in America becomes even more apparent today. Government, especially the federal government, has replaced the foundation as the major purveyor of funds for research, experimentation, and innovation. Too often, however, funding from federal agencies is tied to the exigencies of cold war foreign policy or the rhetorical vicissitudes of domestic politics. In addition, state governments, professional unions, testing and accrediting agencies, and related bureaucratic organizations have multiplied their authority, making power more diffuse and more difficult for citizens to confront and the number of agencies with a self-interest in the status quo more formidable. (79)

And finally, our contemporary response to worsening economic and social problems is distressingly similar to the General Education Board's reaction to the depression. By insisting that the schools take as their primary function the preparation of students for the job market, or lack of one, we come close to resurrecting the Board's "adjustment" motif of the thirties. In so doing, we avoid dealing with the underlying social and economic causes of our problems. Such an approach proved ineffective in the Great Depression, and will no doubt prove insufficient in the present.

Notes

I wish to thank the Faculty Research Allocation Committee of the University of New Mexico for their financial support of my research; the Rockefeller Foundation for permission to quote from their manuscripts; and my colleagues Joel Jones and Steven Kramer for their insights and encouragement.

1. See General Education Board (Edmund E. Day), "Recommendations," in "Report on A Study of American Education," December 13, 1932, in Rockefeller Foundation Archives, New York City, N. Y. The Archives of the Rockefeller Foundation contain over seventy-six boxes of extensive manuscript materials pertaining to the program in general education from 1931 to 1943. These include correspondence, staff memoranda, informal and formal reports and recommendations, minutes of meetings of the staff, trustees, and executive committee, and diary material of staff members. Of the literature on philanthropic foundations in the United States, see especially, Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy* (Chicago, 1960); Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropies (Peterson Commission), *Foundations, Private Giving, and Public Policy* (Chicago, 1971); Waldemar A. Nielsen, *The Big Foundations* (New York, 1972); and Warren Weaver, ed., *U. S. Philanthropic Foundations, Their History, Structure, Management, and Record* (New York, 1967).
2. See Raymond B. Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation* (New York, 1952); Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving* (New York, 1962); and Nielsen, *The Big Foundations*, pp. 50-56.
3. *Ibid.*, 380. In 1974 the federal government alone spent over 9 billion dollars on higher education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 10, 1975.
4. For the activities of the General Education Board in this area, see especially Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving*; and General Education Board, *Review and Final Report, 1902-1964* (New York, 1964).
5. In this regard it is noteworthy that by 1914 the General Education Board subsidized the salaries of 625 employees of the United States Department of Agriculture engaged in Southern programs. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 converted this part of the Board's activities into a federally financed program which included a \$250,000 appropriation for work in Southern states where the Board had been active. See GEB, *Review and Final Report*, 14.
6. On the internal vicissitudes of the Board in the 1920's, see the unpublished personal historical notes written in 1930 by former Board officer Edwin Embree, in "Rockefeller Programs—Early History," in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives. All GEB documents hereafter cited can be found in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives.
7. Concerning the reorganization of the Rockefeller philanthropies, see the materials in "General Education Board Reorganization, 1925-1928"; Embree, "Rockefeller Programs—Early History"; GEB *Annual Report 1928-1929* (New York: GEB, 1930); and GEB, Minutes of the General Education Board, December 17, 1931, 2351-2352.
8. GEB, "Minutes of the Officers' Conference," October 28, 1929, Volume II, 83.
9. GEB, "Minutes of the Officers' Conference," April 10, 1930, Volume II, 117. By November, 1930, the officers' assessment was widened to include a review of the child study research which the Board had inherited from the Laura Spelman (Rockefeller) Fund in the major foundation reorganization in 1928-1929, GEB "Minutes of the Officers Conference," November 10, 1930, Volume III, 30.
10. GEB, "Minutes of the Officers Conference," January 15, 1931, Volume III, 40; and GEB, Minutes of the General Education Board, April 16, 1931, 2219-2222.
11. *Ibid.*, 2227.
12. For additional biographical data on the trustees and officers, see Appendix.

13. For insight into the values of the trustees in the early 1930's, see especially the verbatim transcriptions of the Special meeting of the Board, December 13-4, 1932; the Special Trustee Committee Meeting, March 10, 1933; and the Stated Meeting of the Members and Trustees, April 13, 1933.
14. As late as December 1931, President Arnett was assuring the trustees that the officers would rapidly "put aside" any projects where there might be the "existence of uncontrollable opposition to Board participation." See GEB, Minutes of the General Education Board, December 17, 1931, 2353. Given the Board's earlier reforming zeal in the South and later activities during the depression, this sensitivity is most ironic.
15. See the officers' "Report on the Survey of Education" presented to the Trustees on December 17, 1931, in Minutes of the General Education Board, 2350-2366. Arnett engaged eleven special consultants and assigned three additional staff members to this preliminary research. Results were then discussed at weekly staff meetings. The items to be covered in this research were outlined by Arnett in a memo "Critical Notes on Developments in Education," May, 1931.
16. See "Reports Received During the Survey of American Education," September 27, 1939; and GEB, Minutes of the Executive Committee, October 9, 1931, Book XX, 2333. Gifford was elected a trustee in 1935.
17. "Report on the Survey of Education," in Minutes of the General Education Board, December 17, 1931, 2355.
18. See "Reports Received During the Survey of American Education," September 27, 1939.
19. Edmund E. Day, "Report on a Survey of American Education," December 13, 1932, 11-12. In all, some forty seven reports were completed in the summer and fall of 1932, and each was duplicated and bound for permanence and ease of reference.
20. See, for example, the memoranda from Trevor Arnett and Lawrence Frank to the officers assessing the American Council on Education, April 24, 1931, January 8, February 23, and October 9, 1932; and the memoranda from Frank, David Stevens, and Daniel Prescott concerning the Progressive Education Association, September 18 and November 9, 1931, and October 29, 1932.
21. "Survey Conference," September 24, 1932.
22. "Survey Conference," October 6, 1932.
23. E. E. Day, "Report on A Study of American Education," December 15, 1932, 17-19.
24. *Ibid.*, 22.
25. *Ibid.*, 19.
26. *Ibid.*, 14.
27. *Ibid.*, 19.
28. *Ibid.*, 27.
29. Since many experts predicted that two years of "terminal" junior college would also soon be added to the high school experience of many youth, this area was also added to secondary education.
30. *Ibid.*, 31-35.
31. For the background of this decision, see the minutes of the officers' "Survey Conference," October 6, 1932.
32. Minutes of Special Meeting of the Board, December 13, 1932, 1-2, 5.

33. Ibid., 2, 6-7.
34. Ibid., 3.
35. Ibid., 5.
36. See Report of the ACE Executive Committee, in *Educational Record*, 13 (July, 1932): 160-162. In 1931, the ACE had already lost 13 members unable to pay yearly dues.
37. Report of the ACE Executive Committee, *Education Record*, 12 (July, 1931): 222-226.
38. Memoranda to the staff written by Trevor Arnett, July 15, 1932 and January 6, 1933; David Stevens, March 4, 1933; and Lawrence Frank, April 3, 1933.
39. Memoranda to the staff written by David Stevens, March 4, 1933; and Lawrence Frank, April 3, 1933; and Frank's telegram to Stevens, April 5, 1933. See also Charles Judd to Lawrence Frank, April 6, 1933; and Stevens to trustee Harry Chase, April 10, 1933.
40. See especially, "Memorandum on The Proposed Program in the Field of General Education," January 18, 1933; David Stevens' memorandum concerning a meeting between Arnett, Stevens, and Angell in New Haven January 25, 1933; "Materials on the Problems of Secondary Education," January, 1933; "Opinions on Reorganizing Secondary Education," January, 1933; and "Memorandum for the Trustees' Committee on The Board Study of American Education," March 10, 1933.
41. Stenographic transcripts, Special Trustee Committee Meeting on the General Education Program, March 20, 1933; and "Report on the Study of American Education," in Minutes of the General Education Board, April 13, 1933, 2694-2698.
42. Minutes of the General Education Board, April 13, 1933, 2698-2699.
43. Stenographic transcripts, Stated Meeting of the Members and Trustees of the General Education Board, April 13, 1933, 5-6.
44. Minutes of the General Education Board, April 13, 1933, 2699-2670.
45. See Minutes of the ACE Annual Meeting, May 5-6, 1933, in *Educational Record*, 14 (July, 1933): 260-271; David Stevens' memoranda on ACE reorganization, May 4, May 8, and May 9, 1933; C. R. Mann to General Education Board, May 6, 1933; Secretary Walter Brierly to C. R. Mann, May 13, 1933; and E. E. Day, "Report on Program in General Education," November 25, 1933, 4-5.
46. GEB, *Annual Report, 1934-1935*, vii.
47. Minutes of the General Education Board, December 14, 1933, 2864-2866; and Minutes of Special Meeting of the ACE, February 10, 1934, *Educational Record*, 15 (April, 1934): 154-157.
48. Dean Russell's speech at the Special Meeting is revealing:

The thing I did not understand and did not come to understand until late in the fall was that the work of the P and P committee and the work of the ACE had so highly recommended itself to certain of the foundations that far from trying to dominate the Council, they were really trying to call upon an organization of the type that they thought the Council wanted to be, to assist them in mapping out researches, investigations and experiments that would affect the welfare of American Education as a whole . . . Ibid., p. 155-156.
49. Minutes of the General Education Board, April 20, 1934, 3027-3028.

50. Day, "Report on the General Education Program," December, 1935. Zook worked on the prospectus for the Youth Commission throughout the winter of 1934 and into the Spring of 1935. A final proposal was submitted to the foundation March 23, 1935, and approved by the trustees April 15, 1935. See George Zook to Day, March 19, 1935; Zook to Arnett, March 23, 1935; and Minutes of the General Education Board, April 15, 1935, 3371-3372.

Day worked closely with Zook to refine the goals and personnel of the Commission prior to its first meeting September 16, 1935.
51. Day, "Report on the General Education Program," in Minutes of the General Education Board, December 17, 1936, 3992-3993.
52. See the General Education sections of the *General Education Board Annual Report*, 1933-34, 1934-35, 1935-36.
53. Minutes of the General Education Board, April 11, 1935, 3365-3369. It might be noted that trustee Owen Young also served as a Regent of the New York State Board of Regents and was chairman of the subcommittee of the Board of Regents responsible for the study. Mr. Young always excused himself from meetings when appropriations to the Board of Regents were discussed.
54. E. E. Day, "Report on a Study of American Education," December, 1932, 31-35.
55. Havighurst was born in DePere, Wisconsin, June 5, 1900. He received his A.B. from Ohio Wesleyan in 1921 and his Ph.D. from Ohio State in 1924. He then spent two years at Harvard as a National Research Council post-doctoral fellow. He began his teaching career as an assistant professor of chemistry at Miami University (Ohio) in 1927 but left after one year to become an assistant professor of physics at the University of Wisconsin. At Madison, he was associated for four years with Alexander Meiklejohn's Experimental College. In 1932 he returned to Ohio State as associate professor of science education. Two years later, he began work for the GEB as assistant director of general education. After leaving the Board, he became a professor of education at the University of Chicago.
56. See Havighurst memorandum to Raymond Fosdick, June 22, 1937, 2.
57. Havighurst, "Preliminary Report on the Program in General Education, 1933-1940," 1940, 14. Havighurst prepared this 110 page report shortly after the trustees' decision to terminate his program. For the contrast between Day and Havighurst, compare the former's "Report on the General Education Program," December 1936 with the latter's "The Status of the Program in General Education," November 10, 1937, especially pages 5 to 7.
58. Minutes of the General Education Board, May 19, 1939, 39099-39100. The American Youth Commission had begun its Employment and Occupational Adjustment Project a year earlier with an appropriation of \$150,000. See Minutes of the General Education Board, January 21, 1938, 38003-38006.
59. Minutes of the General Education Board, December 2, 1937, 37209-37211; and Minutes of the General Education Board, June 10, 1938, 38140-38142.
60. See the "Treasurer's Report" appended to each *General Education Board Annual Report* for 1936-37, 1938, and 1939.
61. *General Education Board, Annual Report, 1936-1937*, viii, 6. For the first time, the annual report of the Southern Education Program preceded that of the General Education Program. General Education had dominated the *Annual Reports* since 1933.

62. For example, looking back in 1939 former officer Warren Weaver recalled that the trustees had "... had very vague ideas of what this was all about. They apparently had embarked on a rather venturesome education program without any very clear conception of motivation, of what they wanted to accomplish, or of what the practical possibilities actually were." Warren Weaver to Robert J. Havighurst, September 25, 1939.
63. Day, "Report on the General Education Program," in Minutes of the General Education Board, December 17, 1936, 3989. Day wrote Havighurst three years later that he believed that it was not until his speech in December, 1936 "... that the trustees had at last gained some real insight into the importance of what the program was trying to accomplish." Day to Havighurst, January 16, 1940.
64. Havighurst memorandum to Raymond Fosdick, March 25, 1937.
65. See Havighurst, "The Status of the Program in General Education," November 10, 1937, 7-9.
66. GEB, "Trustee Bulletin," no. 1, October 15, 1937, 7-9.
67. See especially "The Status of the Program in General Education," November 10, 1937, and "Plan of Operations in the General Education Program," May 31, 1939 for good examples.
68. Douglas S. Freeman to Raymond Fosdick, July 1, 1939.
69. Havighurst to Fosdick, March 8, 1940; and Fosdick to Professor George Works, April 25, 1940.
70. Minutes of the General Education Board, April 4, 1940, 39531. Raymond Fosdick to John D. Rockefeller, III, et al., June 6, 1940.
71. For the final tabulation of the Board's appropriations, see Havighurst, "Preliminary Report of the Program in General Education, 1933-1940," 1940; and his public summary in *General Education Board, Annual Report, 1940*, 7-75.
72. After an abortive attempt to join the ACE and the EPC into one large National Education Policies Commission in 1941, the GEB authorized one final \$300,000 appropriation for the ACE for general support. See George Zook, "President's Annual Report," *Educational Record*, 24 (July, 1943): 251.
73. For the activities of the ACE during World War II, see William M. Tuttle Jr., "Higher Education and the Federal Government: The Lean Years, 1940-42," *Teachers College Record*, 71 (December, 1969): 297-312; and Tuttle, "Higher Education and the Federal Government: The Triumph, 1942-1945," *Teachers College Record*, 71 (February, 1970): 485-499.
74. Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York, 1961), pp. 329-332. On Day's active role with the EPC, see the stenographic transcripts of the EPC meetings for early 1940's in the Archives of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
75. *General Education Board, Annual Report, 1940*, 36.
76. The best account of the PEA's activities in the 1930's is Patricia A. Graham, *Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe* (New York, 1967).
77. Ralph Tayler to Fosdick, December 9, 1940. On the fate of the PEA, see Graham, *Progressive Education*, pp. 102-244; and Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, pp. 257-270.
78. *General Education Board, Annual Report, 1940*.
79. Significantly, it was the U. S. Office of Education, not private educational or

philanthropic organizations which provided funding for the Life Adjustment Movement, a movement which flourished from 1944 to 1954 and which embraced many of the principles of the GEB's program. The Office of Education sponsored two National Commissions on Life Adjustment Education for Youth, countless national, regional, state and local conferences, workshops, and surveys, and a host of publications.

With a few exceptions such as the Carnegie Corporation's support of James B. Conant's Study of American Education from 1954 to 1962, public secondary educational policy has increasingly been determined by federal priorities.

APPENDIX A

Trevor Arnett, Trustee GEB, 1920-1936

Born in Little Hereford, England, 1870.

A.B., University of Chicago: 1898

Post-Graduate, University of Chicago: 1898-99

Fellow, University of Chicago: 1899-1900

Accountant and Chief Clerk, Auditor's Office, C.G.W. R.R.: 1893-96

University of Chicago: Chief Accountant, 1899-1900

Auditor, 1901-1922

V.P. and Business Manager, 1924-26

General Education Board: Secretary, 1920-24.

President, 1928-36.

International Educ. Bd.: President, 1928-36.

Baptist, Republican

James R. Angell, Trustee GEB, 1922-1934

Born in Burlington, Vt., 1869

A.B., University of Michigan: 1890

A.M., University of Michigan: 1891

A.M., Harvard: 1892

Studied Universities of Berlin and Halle, 1893; Vienna, Paris, Leipzig

Instructor, Philosophy, University of Minnesota, 1893

University of Chicago: Asst. Prof., Psychology, 1894-1901

Assoc. Prof., Psychology, 1901-1905

Prof. and Head of Dept., 1905-1919

Dean, University Faculties, 1911-1919

Acting President, 1918-1919

President, Yale, 1921-1937

President, Carnegie Corporation, 1920

Harry W. Chase, Trustee GEB, 1930-1946

Born in Groveland, Mass., 1883

A.B., Dartmouth, 1904

A.M., Dartmouth, 1908

Ph.D., Clark University, 1910

University of North Carolina: Prof. Psychology, 1910-1914
Acting Dean, 1918-1919
Chairman, Faculty, 1919
President, 1919-1930

University of Illinois: President, 1930-1933

New York University, Chancellor, 1933

Episcopalian

Raymond B. Fosdick, Trustee GEB, 1922-1948

Born in Buffalo, New York, 1883

B.A., Princeton, 1905

M.A., Princeton, 1906

L.L.B., New York Law School, 1908

Assistant Corporation Counsel, New York, 1908-1910

Commissioner of Accounts, New York, 1910-1913

Rockefeller Bureau of Social Hygiene, 1913 (in Europe)

Member, NYC Board of Education, 1915-1916

Special Rep. of War Dept. in France, 1915-1919

Under-Sec. of League of Nations, 1919-1920

Private practice, New York City, 1920-1935

President, GEB and R.F., 1936-1948

Jerome Greene, Trustee GEB, 1912-1939

Born in Yokohama, Japan, 1874

A.B., Harvard, 1896

University of Geneva, 1896-1897

Harvard Law School, 1897-1899

Asst. General Manager, Harvard Univ. Press, 1899-1901

Sec. to President, Harvard University, 1901-1905

Sec. to Corporation, Harvard University, 1905-1911, 1934-1941

Gen. Manager, Rockefeller Inst. for Med. Research, 1910-1912

Advisor to John D. Rockefeller, 1912-1914

Secretary, Rockefeller, Foundation, 1913-1917

Banker, Lee Higginson & Co., 1917-1932

Director, Manhattan R.R., 1914-1925

Sec., Reparation Comm. Paris Peace Conference, 1919

Independent Democrat

Ernest M. Hopkins, Trustee, FEB, 1930-1942

Born in Dunbarton, New Hampshire, 1877

A.B., Dartmouth, 1901

M.A., Dartmouth, 1908

Dartmouth: Sec. to President, 1901-1905

Sec. of College, 1905-1910

President, 1916

Worked for various Indus. concerns: Chicago, Boston, Phil., 1910-1916

Asst. Sec. of War, 1918

Director, B & M R.R., 1920-1947

Republican, Baptist

Max Mason, GEB Trustee, 1930-1936

Born in Madison, Wisconsin, 1877

B. Litt., 1898, University of Wisconsin

Ph.D., Göttingen, 1903

Instructor, Math, M.I.T., 1903-1904

Asst. Prof., Math, Yale, 1904-1908

Prof. Math, U. of Wisconsin, 1908-1925

President, U. of Chicago, 1925-1928

Dir., Nat. Science, R.F., 1928-1929

President, Rockefeller Foundation, 1929-1936

Edwin Mims, Trustee GEB, 1931-1936

Born in Richmond, Arkansas, 1872

A.B., Vanderbilt, 1892

M.A., Vanderbilt, 1893

Ph.D., Cornell, 1900

Asst. Prof., English, Vanderbilt, 1893-1894

Prof., English, Trinity College, N.H., 1894-1909

Prof., English, U. of N.C., 1909-1912

Prof. Engl., head of Dept., Vanderbilt, 1912-1936

Editor, *South Atlantic Quarterly*

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., GEB Trustee, 1903-1939

Educated, Brown University

John D. Rockefeller, III, GEB Trustee, 1932-1954

B.S., Princeton, 1929

David H. Stevens, GEB Vice President, 1930-1938

Born in Wisconsin, 1884

A.B., Lawrence College, 1906

M.A., Lawrence College, 1910

A.M., Harvard, 1912

Ph.D., U. of Chicago, 1914

Latin Teacher, Wisconsin, 1907-1908

Instructor, English, Northwestern Univ., 1908-1911

University of Chicago: Instructor, English, 1914-1918

Asst. Prof., English, 1919-1923

Dean, College of A & S & Lit., 1920-1923

Assoc. Prof., 1922-1925

Prof., 1925-1930

Asst. to President, 1926-1929

Assoc. Dean of Faculties, 1929-1930

Walter W. Stewart, GEB Trustee, 1932-1950

Born in Kansas, 1885

A.B., U. of Missouri, 1909

Instructor, Economics, U. of Missouri, 1910-1911

Instructor, Economics, U. of Michigan, 1911-1912

Asst. Prof., Economics, U. of Missouri, 1913-1915

Prof. of Economics, Amherst, 1916-1922

Dir. of Research & Statistics, Fed. Reserve Bd., 1922-1925

V. P., Case Pomeroy Co. investment securities, 1926-1927

Economic Advisor, Bank of England, 1928-1930

Chairman of Bd., Case Pomeroy & Co. investment securities, after 1930

Harold H. Swift, GEB Trustee, 1931-1950

Born in Chicago, Illinois, 1885

B.Ph., U. of Chicago, 1902

Vice President, Swift & Company

Pres. Bd. of Trustees, U. of Chicago

Augustus Trowbridge, GEB Trustee, 1930-1934

Born in New York, 1870

Columbia University, 1890-1893

A.M., Ph.D., University of Berlin, 1898

Instructor, Physics, U. of Michigan, 1898-1900

Asst. Prof., U. of Wisconsin, 1900-1903

Professor, U. of Wisconsin, 1903-1906

National Research Council, 1920-1921

Professor, Physics, Princeton, 1906-1934

Dean of Graduate School, Princeton, 1928-1934

Ray Lyman Wilbur, GEB Trustee, 1931-1940

Born in Iowa, 1875

A.B., Stanford, 1896

A.M., Stanford, 1897

M.D., Cooper Medical College, 1899

Instructor, Physiology, Stanford, 1896-1897

Lecturer, Physiology, Cooper Medical College, 1899-1900

Stanford: Asst. Professor, 1900-1903

Professor, Medicine, 1909-1916

Dean, 1911-1916

President, 1916-

President, A.M.A., 1924

U. S. Secretary of Interior, 1929-1933

Republican

Arthur Woods, GEB Trustee, 1930-1934

Born in Boston, 1870

A.B., Harvard, 1892

Graduate work, U. of Berlin

Taught at Groton, 1895-1905

Reporter, N. Y. Sun; in lumber business in New Mexico till 1907

Deputy Police Commissioner, New York City, 1907-1909

Police Commissioner, 1914-1918

On Board of 3 Banks

Republican, Episcopalian

Owen Young, GEB Trustee, 1925-1939

Born in New York, 1874

A.B., St. Lawrence College, 1894

L.L.B., Boston University, 1896

Professor of Law, Boston University, 1896-1903

Private law practice, 1896-1913

General Electric Company: Counsel, Vice President, 1913-1922

Chairman of Board, 1922-1939

RCA: Chairman of Board, 1922-1929

Chairman, Exec. Comm., 1929-1933

Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, New York