Between 1905 and 1925, the General Education Board (GEB) continued John D. Rockefeller's pattern of philanthropy for education and established its own philosophies of what programs to endow and what directions were appropriate for education. Programs that the GEB established and funded demonstrate their goals for education. Many of these programs resulted in the growth of vocationalism within public schooling. This study explores five areas regarding vocationalism of public education: (1) secondary education; (2) elementary education; (3) surveys of education; (4) position statements; and (5) mental measurements. Analysis of the five segments showed that the GEB acted as if people's destinies were set and that education should parallel these destinies and prepare people to meet them. In the three educational programs, successful and influential changes were made in the curriculum without persuasion by the GEB. A pattern of control over the programs funded is seen. Examination of enrollment in public high schools by course of study indicates that through all of the vocationalizing, students preferred academics. From the evidence, the nationwide movement toward a "factory model" of schooling did have its root belief in the inferiority of certain classes of people. The study showed that a paternalistic attitude extended to rural and poor people of ethnic derivation also. (Two appendices--Enrollment in Public High Schools by Course of Study and Sample General Education Board Appropriations--and 102 references are included.) (NLA)
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The General Education Board was formed in 1903 by John D. Rockefeller to represent him in financial giving toward education. He had established a precedent of philanthropy and wished to have more direction in his gifts toward education. During the period 1905 to 1925 the General Education Board (GEB) did continue Rockefeller's pattern of giving in education and in fact established its own philosophies of what programs to endow and what directions the members thought were appropriate for education. Through programs which they established and funded, insight can be gained regarding their goals for education. Many of these programs resulted in the growth of vocationalism within public schooling.

Yet, turning over the philanthropic duties to a board did not remove Rockefeller from the action. With one of his early donations to the GEB he issued the following explanation:

In making my recent gift to the General Education Board . . . I provided that two-thirds of the gift should be applied to such specific objects within the corporate purposes of the Board as either I or my son might from time to time direct.²

In other words the GEB's philosophy of giving had to reflect that of its benefactor, John D. Rockefeller. Exploring these gifts and their results is enlightening as to GEB and Rockefeller purposes and influence exerted on changing the public school curriculum to a more vocationalizing function that had existed before.

Four areas are important to explore regarding vocationalism of public education: secondary education, elementary education, surveys of education and policy statements. A fifth area, mental measurements, is also interesting, regarding letters that were exchanged and a resulting donation.

Secondary Education

Beginning about 1905, the GEB adopted a program to improve Southern education. GEB officials worked through the president of the state university in states which chose to participate. This president recommended a professor of secondary education from his staff, and the GEB paid part of the professor's salary to represent them in improving secondary education in that state. The professor then traveled to schools, worked with local administrators, made recommendations, and helped to implement programs.3

Many of the letters were concerned with business, such as dates for meetings. Other letters listed courses, changes that were being made, and whom the professor was meeting with and when the meeting would occur. Often the letters expressed dismay at how slowly moving the local administrators were. This study focuses on letters and reports that pertain to curriculum. In addition, the material used is a representative sampling of what is expressed in the collection.

Early reports tend to reflect mostly academic programs, with such additional electives as agriculture, manual training, domestic science, school garden work, and

bookkeeping. Yet, as time progressed the professors' interest turned greatly to vocational education, particularly agricultural and domestic. An example is Joseph S. Stewart in Georgia. Through 1905 he recommended a highly academic program. Yet, in 1906 he visited a private industrial school. He boasted to Wallace Buttrick of the GEB about the work in the home, dairy, garden, barns, and woodworking shop. He then recommended higher taxes to support schools. He hastened to add that they did not have to be as industrial as the one he had visited. However, that Fall, the Georgia legislature passed legislation to build an agricultural high school for every congressional district. Stewart had assisted in formulating the curriculum for these schools: English, mathematics, history, science plus agriculture, shop work, laboratories, and farm plots. Buttrick advised him to oversee these schools, to get the best men to run them, and to write him monthly reports.4

Bruce R. Payne was the first Professor of Secondary Education for Virginia. Payne sent a booklet to Battrick in 1906, with a cover letter that he had addressed to 154 principals in the state. The booklet recommended agriculture, nature study, and school gardening. In 1911, Charles G. Maphis replaced Payne. A letter of 1912 from Maphis to a superintendent blamed over-stressing preparation for professions in school for the high dropout rate. By the end of the second year, he stated, 30% had dropped out; the third, 54%, and the fourth, 66%. He defined equality of opportunity as offering parallel courses of study, equally emphasized: classical, business, agricultural, domestic arts, etc. He stated, "Your schedule administers practically the same diet to all alike, though their tasks may be different and their needs may vary." He recommended English and mathematics being required and everything else being electives, such as Latin, German, French, history, science, typewriting, bookkeeping, stenography, commercial arithmetic, psychology, and the principles of teaching. He urged the superintendent not to require Latin for the commercial courses, to have less homework, to strengthen the commercial courses, and to add manual training, domestic
science, and homemaking (domestic arts). "Your attendance is far too low..." he concluded.5

West Virginia professor, L. L. Friend, wrote that he was working on establishing more high schools. He sent an annual report in 1912 stating that agriculture was offered in many high schools but not always seriously enough. Not many were offering domestic science and manual training, he reported, and where they had been introduced, high school instruction was in closer contact with life. He also recommended practical application of chemistry, hygiene, geometry, and drawing. Furthermore, he reported that several high schools were offering commercial courses and emphasizing practical English.6

Other professors reported similar results in vocational expansion. Some oversaw the building of agricultural high schools or the addition of industrial and household


arts in more schools. All indicated that these courses represented "progress" and that the changes were welcome."

Also important to describing General Education Board influence on secondary education is work that they sponsored by conferences and other programs such as State Agent for Secondary Education. For example, South Carolina had a state high school inspector, B. L. Parkinson, who reported to the GEB. He reported in 1920-21 that 33% of South Carolina's secondary pupils were in vocational courses, which made up 11.2% of the total teaching time in the state.8

H. M. Ivy, the State Supervisor of Secondary Schools for Mississippi, reported that he had recommended that a school district reopen their manual training shop. The State Agent for Florida, W. S. Cawthon, stated that one

---


department of home economics had been made right, "a full
time teacher well qualified having been employed."^9

A conference of state education personnel was held
in April of 1919. The conference report stated that the
public's interest had been awakened and changes had been
taking place. They requested that the GEB continue their
participation in their schools for the sake of profes-
sionalism and continuity from state to state. Following
that, a conference of state superintendents reported that
Smith-Hughes funds were working well and that county school
boards were buying property for training and industrial
schools. Following a conference in 1924, A. A. Murphee,
President of the University of Florida, and John W.
Abercrombie, State Superintendent of Education in Alabama,
wrote to the president of the GEB that the recommenda-

---

had paralleled exactly the recommendations of the GEB.¹⁰ Although a deliberate connection cannot be made between GEB recommendations and conference results, at least one can suspect that the GEB's agenda usually took precedent at such conferences.

A further writing by Jackson Davis, Assistant Director of Education in 1932 is enlightening regarding the General Education Board’s influence on State Boards of education. Their policy was to recognize the authority and responsibility of the state superintendent of education and assist the state department in building a competent staff, but the policy continues:

The Board, however, has the right to terminate its support if the essential purpose of the Board in making the appropriation is no longer being carried out.

It continues by giving examples of personnel hired and fired when GEB officials did discontinue their support. Although this policy was not directly stated until 1932, the

implication was that this policy had been in effect for a long time, as the examples refer to past experiences.\textsuperscript{11}

Further enlightening to this discussion of General Education Board control is an earlier letter in a series between Henry Prichett of the Carnegie Foundation and members of the General Education Board. The two foundations were working together on the Conference for Education in the South. Concerning the Conference, E. C. Sage of the GEB wrote to Pritchett asking him to meet a day before the conference began for:

A rather private conference with these men [the high school inspectors] so that we may get at real things and not waste time and opportunity at a more public meeting where the friends would talk to the galleries.\textsuperscript{12}

Not only then, did the GEB carefully guard its donations and resultant programs, but also its members, although not publicly stated, did their best to present their own agendas for professors of secondary education, high school inspectors and other personnel who led state educational programs to follow. And apparently they usually were able to influence the educational leaders, to follow


GEB recommendations. Therefore, the change from the more academic earlier secondary programs to the more vocational later ones would indicate that this was what the GEB approved of.

By 1920-21 at least one state had 33% of their pupils enrolled in vocational courses. Perhaps this movement toward vocationalism would have happened without the Rockefeller interests' involvement. Yet the fact that they were involved so heavily speaks to their influence in vocationalizing public secondary education following the founding of the GEB.

**Elementary Education**

The GEB also funded rural school supervisors, men and women who oversaw the development of rural elementary schools. Separate supervisors were appointed for black and white schools. The focus of this study is white schools. The program was widespread throughout southern states.

These rural school supervisors' purpose was to expand rural education and back such programs as consolidation, increasing tax support, organization, salary and training of teachers, and length of school terms. Although no record indicates that the GEB expected the rural school
supervisors to advance vocational education, all of them did.\textsuperscript{13}

Curiously, school supervisors believed it was the job of public educators to assure the future of agriculture and domestic science. For example, school people officiated at fairs where children's agricultural and domestic products were displayed. T. J. Coates of Kentucky described the exhibits he saw in their school fairs: "the regular school work and the work in manual training, domestic science, agriculture, etc." He also boasted proudly about the work he saw: "real dresses, and real canning . . . real plows, real gates, and real axe-handles." L. C. Brogden of North Carolina wrote about rural school demonstrations in which contests and demonstrations in baking, sewing, and agriculture were sponsored. J. L. Bond of Arkansas sent a pamphlet about a country school fair. There were competitions in physics, writing, maps, drawing, spelling, music,

needle work, manual training, farm and garden work, and club work.  

Also during their actual state work of goal setting, visitations, and inspections, these rural school supervisors promoted vocational agriculture and domestic science. W. K. Tate of South Carolina sent a letter to his county supervisors, encouraging them to read two pamphlets regarding vegetable growing and preserving. He urged them to promote manual training, cooking, homekeeping, and agricultural clubs in schools. Lueco Gunter, also of South Carolina, was offering a workshop for educators. Some of the emphases were manual training for boys, domestic science for girls, industrial work taught in every school, and home and farm demonstration work closely allied with school. L. C. Brogden reported that his "progressive teachers" gave regular and systematic instruction in agriculture to boys; tomato growing and canning to girls, plus home gardening, cooking and sewing, home making, and housekeeping. He also encouraged county demonstration schools. These, he believed, should instruct teachers how to teach cooking,

sewing, music, and practical agriculture and how to make all courses applicable to their locations and situations. He expected this instruction "to increase the professional efficiency of the teachers."15

J. T. Calhoun of Mississippi reported that one of his counties had set up as a "model county," including on staff a farm demonstrator and an agent of home economics. Also they were the headquarters for the county agricultural high school. M. L. Duggan of Georgia wrote that every rural teacher should introduce agriculture, gardening, home economics, etc. J. L. Bond of Arkansas was emphasizing county farm demonstrations and county canning club agents, working through the schools. He was also recommending industrial training, including agriculture, in rural schools and high schools and summer school for teachers to teach agriculture club work. J. B. Hobdy of Alabama encouraged domestic science work in rural schools. L. J. Hanifan of West Virginia wrote about one distinct supervisor who had introduced manual training, domestic science, and music and drawing. He referred to these additions as "unique." C. J.

Brown of Louisiana reported that many of his schools were doing work in domestic science, manual training and gardening. J. B. Brown of Tennessee termed the following report "progress": "The consolidated school with its courses in agriculture, home economics and manual training . . . is rapidly growing in public favor." The following year he also affirmed the addition of vocational subjects, home economics and manual training.\textsuperscript{16}

William Knox Tate of South Carolina wrote about "progress" in Charleston, part of which was a gift of $7,000 for a domestic science department. He wrote another letter in 1912 to Frederick T. Gates of the GEB complimenting him on his position paper on rural schools which espouses agriculture over other types of education (explained further in section "Position Statements"). He then elaborated by citing some examples that he had seen. One school was offering domestic science and agriculture: teachers taught on farms and in homes of the community. He noted also that the most successful work in agriculture and domestic arts,

sanitation, and "other things we believe are important in
country schools" was being done in schools that already were
established in reading, writing, arithmetic, and other
standard school subjects. Buttrick responded by agreeing
that he was committed to Mr. Gates' idea. Furthermore, to
dispense with boring curriculum, Tate established a school
in an old farmhouse, with a workshop for boys and a kitchen
for girls. He did not teach academics but had the students
grow vegetables and make wooden articles. Students learned
from measuring gardens and dividing profits, including a
thorough mastery of arithmetic, reading, writing, and
English, plus, reading recipes and books about birds.17

The rural school supervisors also held and attended
conferences that dealt with education. From the agendas and
reports in GEB files one can determine what were of interest
to the supervisors. Apparently these meetings were paid
for, sponsored, and attended by GEB officials. One that the
GEB sponsored was the Conference for Education in the South.
In 1914 an adopted statement included a proposal that rural
schools be the center of community life. Also they expected
that each principal be trained in agriculture and that each
school have at least one teacher trained in domestic science

17William Knox Tate, South Carolina, to Wallace Buttrick,
GEB, 16 May 1908, and to Frederick T. Gates, GEB, 12 July
1912, and Wallace Buttrick, GEB, to W. K. Tate, South
Carolina, 16 July 1912. General Education Board records.
Fosdick, Adventure in Giving, 73.
or household economy. In 1915 Abraham Flexner invited R. H. Wilson of Oklahoma to the Conference for Education in the South. In it he affirmed that the GEB was greatly interested in the "entire rural school problem."\(^{18}\)

A conference was held in Virginia about education in 1917. A pamphlet presented the program. Some topics were canning, commerce and agriculture, marketing, and "How to Make Christiansburg and Up-to-Date Business Community." One invited speaker was Professor of Secondary Education, Charles G. Maphis. Thomas Jesse Jones of Hampton Institute spoke on food production.\(^{19}\)

A conference of rural school supervisors in 1917 proposed a list of principles that they had agreed upon. They suggested simplifying the elementary curriculum: "The main topics of history, geography and applied science, including health and sanitation, should receive a fuller and richer treatment, while many less important facts and topics should be wholly omitted." They reiterated the point about


text books, that they needed to omit minor facts and secondary matters. They recommended that all schools have classrooms, a library, laboratories, and classrooms for domestic science and farm mechanics. Also, in addition to a playground, school facilities should have a school garden and a demonstration plot. Courses, they stated, should be closely related to the life of the community, for example courses in home building, farm life, and rural economy.20

This particular conference had an interesting background. Letters indicate that the Rural School supervisors had planned to attend a different meeting but the GEB let them know that they would not pay for the supervisors to attend. A telling letter of April 1917 said that he, the author, had heard that the GEB "were not inclined to favor" the planned meeting. Another meeting was then scheduled by the GEB.21

Another conference which GEB officials attended was held April 22-24, 1919. One discussion centered on "What Forms of Industrial Work Can Be Profitably Introduced into Country Schools?" The account listed work that was being


done in states. In Virginia, Smith-Hughes schools were offering elementary farm mechanics, cooking and sewing for girls, and some woodworking for boys. In Tennessee, school officials were consolidating schools, promoting vocational work especially in home economics, farm mechanics, and industrial work. In Alabama they were offering domestic science and manual training; in Arkansas, practical agriculture and correlating home life with school work.22

A few inferences can be drawn about rural school supervisors. First, these supervisors were recommending practical and agricultural education in rural areas. Although direction by the GEB is not obvious, Frederick Gates' paper clearly espouses perpetuation of agriculture in rural schools and Buttrick supported the data too. Also, the GEB expressed interest in the "entire rural school problem." One cannot see GEB control in vocationalizing the rural school curriculum, yet they continued funding the supervisors who were working toward that end. Finally, conference results indicate that both supervisors and GEB authorities perpetuated the idea of agricultural and domestic education for rural areas. The GEB clearly demonstrated control, albeit unstated until 1932, through financing. Therefore, one can conclude that in elementary

---

education, the GEB also supported the growth of vocational education.

**Surveys of Education**

The General Education Board also conducted surveys of education, describing the condition of education in those states and cities which chose to have them. Sometimes the areas invited their survey and other times the GEB requested it. These surveys took differing amounts of times, from months to years, but each time the GEB sent in a person of their own choosing and a staff. The area was expected to help finance the survey also. Finally, the GEB issued a report that was made public. Then the school people in that location could implement the recommended programs and changes at their own discretion.

In 1914, the GEB formed a committee to recommend the most "fruitful" areas for educational investigation. The three members of the committee were Jerome Greene, Wallace Buttrick, and Abraham Flexner. Their report of October, 1914 was confidential to Board members and sheds light on their programs' intentions and on the influence that they deliberately wielded in the field of education. They described the two directions of their programs: extensive, to extend educational facilities where they had not been before because of indifference or poverty, and intensive, to make existing programs more responsive to social, economic, and professional needs. As examples of extensive programs
they listed Professors of Secondary Education and Rural School agents. As examples of intensive programs they listed establishing industrial education in Negro schools and "constructive" educational experiments in the "ideal rural school."\(^2\)

The report suggested surveys in all states, their goal being for the states to compare with and emulate one another. They especially wanted the states to pay for these. They also suggested that the GEB help the states select model counties in which to develop adequate educational systems, including agricultural clubs and county training schools. Thus "the ideal rural school, pictured by the chairman and authorized by the Board, could be realized more effectively. . . ." One way to do this, according to the report, was to support county industrial teachers and to contribute industrial equipment. They recommended five "important phases of educational experience" to investigate and publish. One important phase was industrial education; one of the most urgent emphases was state surveys. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. appreciated and valued the report.\(^2\)


The following year another GEB committee was formed to recommend educational research, with Rockefeller as the chairman. Flexner informed Henry Prichett that the first venture probably would be a thorough study of the Gary Schools. "Following this," he continued, "I hope very much that we can enter upon the larger problem of industrial and vocational training in the public schools." In fact a committee was formed later that year to study industrial education. Two opinions were offered on the subject: states had been working to foster industrial education, both within and outside of public schools, and a national commission was suggesting federal money to fund vocational and industrial schools. They selected Leonard Ayers to conduct it.25

One of the first surveys was the Maryland Survey, conducted in 1915 by Frank P. Bachman of the GEB. The GEB funded three quarters of the cost. When the study was almost completed in November, the Baltimore News summed up the Board recommendations. "Shake-up Expected" read the headline. According to the report, the Board was recommending vocational training for industrial sections and agricultural for farming areas. It quoted Bachman's report as declaring it a mistake to have the same course of

instruction all over the state. In 1916 the State legislature accepted the GEB report and implemented its suggestions. An even earlier survey in Delaware, yielded the same results, with the state enacting the GEB recommendations.26

In 1916 Abraham Flexner wrote to W. K. Tate, Rural School Supervisor for South Carolina, explaining that the GEB had authorized a report of "interesting and significant experiments" in rural education and that he wanted him to visit progressive schools to learn and to teach about them. One of the subjects Tate chose to fill this request was agriculture and homemaking. He had two examples that he mentioned: a farm life school and an agricultural high school.27

The Gary survey is also pertinent to this study. The GEB conducted this survey in 1918, the first newspaper reports occurring in December and continuing through June 1919. The earliest articles report that the GEB found Gary


schools were good but lacking administration. The report indicates that students in these schools took arithmetic, English, music, history, gymnasium, shop work, cooking, sewing, drawing, the emphasis being vocational. The GEB apparently concluded that the work was not directly vocational but that it had some vocational value. Different schools had different emphases; for example one emphasized carpentry, plumbing, sheet metal, painting, printing, poetry, and cobbling, whereas another emphasized machine work, foundry, forge, and painting. A later article described GEB findings: they welcomed that school was more than "book-work" and that it taught the "business of Living." They praised the program for its enrichment and diversification.28

In 1919 the GEB conducted a survey in Tarrytown, North Tarrytown, and adjoining districts in New York. They found that Tarrytown High School met college entrance

requirements but did not "neglect the needs of students who desire to pursue the commercial course or to work in the area of industrial and household arts." They commended North Tarrytown Junior High for adding a vocational course to the regular courses, endeavoring to give a "practical turn" to the regular courses plus manual training for boys and cooking for girls. But they recommended for both the junior high and the high school "broadening the practical opportunities . . . certainly in commercial work and in the household arts for the girls and in the industrial arts for boys." 29

Another survey took place as a result of a letter to Wallace Buttrick, explaining that an inheritance of $1,650,000 had been left for the education of the poor in Winchester, Virginia and requesting help from the "experts." A second letter thanked him for the survey that the GEB had agreed to do. A news clipping of 1920, published by the Winchester Chamber of Commerce, explained the outcome of the study. They planned an athletic stadium, auditorium, art-history museum, dispensary and center of hygiene instruction, swimming pool, gymnasium and shower baths, domestic science and home economics laboratories, cafeteria lunch facilities, open air classroom for anemic or convalescent

children, vocational and pre-vocational shops for agriculture and industry, library-study room, and agricultural laboratory and experimental orchard. These plans indicate a definite leaning toward vocational education for these poor children.\(^\text{30}\)

The GEB conducted a survey in Indiana in 1921-1922. The report concluded that vocational education was inadequate and limited and needed to be considered a part of the regular educational program and needed to include all students. The specifically recommended agriculture for boys and home economics for girls. In fact a news clipping reported that vocational education was favored "beyond all other forms of education."\(^\text{31}\)

The results of these surveys indicate definite interest in promoting vocational education. In Maryland; Gary, Indiana; Tarrytown, New York; Winchester, Virginia; and Indiana the survey results are in keeping with the survey policy, as stated by the GEB committee for educational investigation. The committee recommendations


specifically supported Gates' position paper on the rural school, which touted agricultural and domestic education. Furthermore, for schools generally they seemed to recommend vocational education as a genuine alternative for non-college bound students. More importantly legislatures also saw their recommendations as significant, many enacting GEB advisements into laws.

**Position Statements**

The GEB also published policy statements of the Board and "Occasional Papers." The purpose of the Occasional Paper was to distribute them in large numbers and bring the subject to the attention of those who were interested. Additionally, Abraham Flexner appeared to use these to stimulate discussions, sending the papers to different people and asking for a response.

Occasional Paper Number One was *The County School of Tomorrow*, by Frederick Gates. In it Gates called for dropping educational traditions: not to teach them to be philosophers, men of science, lawyers, doctors, or politicians but to teach them to meet the "lowly" needs of rural life. He suggested the need to teach "every industry in the district": kitchen, barn, dairy, shop. He listed such necessary information as health, how to cook, what and how

---

to eat, model kitchens, model homes, and making clothing. Further he addressed the importance of scientific farming and the school as a community. He envisioned a community of young workers in agriculture, kitchen, sewing, dairy, orchard, lawn, etc. He minimized the importance of the "three R's" and suggested they only be taught within the realm of experience.  

In an exchange of letters between Abraham Flexner and Charles Eliot, Flexner addressed The Country School of Tomorrow. He said that the Board had been authorized to promote such an experiment in rural education. Eliot's response was equally telling. He referred to a surgeon who had been compelled to study Latin and Greek.

He believed that he got as much appropriate mental training out of the languages as he would have out of natural history and mechanical studies. He was of course deluded; but he did not know that.

Flexner's return letter indicated agreement with Eliot.  

Charles Eliot, who was with the GEB after his retirement from Harvard, wrote Occasional Paper Number Two, Changes Needed in Secondary Education. Flexner sent copies of this paper to certain people, asking for their comments.

---


He then wrote Eliot with the replies he had received. One opinion was from Charles Judd of the University of Chicago School of Education. Eliot had written that the future of human development depended on industry. He had supported practical courses, elimination of memory work, and use of concrete experiences. Although Judd agreed with the use of concrete experiences, he stated that science, philosophy, theology, and language were more important for intellectual development and that memory work was sometimes needed.\textsuperscript{35}

On March 6, 1916 the GEB issued a press release in response to Eliot's paper. It referred to parts of Eliot's essay, saying that the best knowledge came from observation of the senses and that poor children were better off having to do things. They recommended more hand, ear, and eye work, such as drawing, carpentry, turning, music, sewing, cooking, and the sciences of observation (chemistry, physics, biology, and geology.) For country schools they added agriculture and work in a school garden.\textsuperscript{36}

Occasional Paper Number Three was \textit{A Modern School} by Abraham Flexner. He supported the need for the rudiments of


education but not for courses whose purpose it is to "train the mind." Rather, he maintained that a "man educated in the modern sense . . . will be contentedly ignorant of things for learning which no better reason than tradition can be assigned." He preferred studies that served "real purposes," which he divided into four fields: science, industry, aesthetics, and civics. "Industry" included learning a manual skill and even work in industry. His recommended curriculum did not include, for example, algebra or geometry for any person who would not need it.37

Flexner continued publishing his opinions even after some adverse reactions. William McAndrew wrote him, accusing him of supporting child-centered over subject-centered curriculum. He stated that although centralized government could train for industrial efficiency, that attitude in education had caused a classed society. He recommended helping individuals to utilize their powers and to want to use them for the benefit of their fellows. Not all reactions opposed him, however. Thomas A. Edison took the opposite approach: "no school which adopts the suggestion of Eliot and Flexner can possibly fail," he stated.

"That school will anticipate that which in twenty years will become universal."33

Flexner also wrote some articles addressing education. In *Parents and Schools*, he stated that mental discipline did not carry over to other subjects, except in particular categories. He went on to declare that learning Virgil was just as valid as learning to bake a pumpkin pie. Regarding formal grammar and arithmetic, he maintained that they were not necessary beyond a few basics and that if one did not need them, he should not study them. "Education as Mental Discipline" addressed training of the mental faculties. He stated that schools should concern themselves with what children naturally do, offering subjects that serve a purpose, to replace Latin, math, ancient history, and "bookish" science.39

The General Education Board issued some reports on education that also contained policy statements. Wallace Buttrick wrote about the poor state of agriculture in the South, that farmers were not heeding the advice of the National Department of Agriculture and that boys were


leaving the South. To correct this problem, he called for agricultural schools, one in every consolidated district, and practical textbooks to teach agriculture. He warned that "nature study," such as it was known then, was too cultural and not practical.⁴⁰

National Education Association (NEA) admonished the GEB in 1914. Perhaps this public caution is telling, regarding GEB activities during this time period:

We view with alarm the activities of Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations, agencies not in any way responsible to the people, in their efforts to control the policies of our state institutions; to fashion after their conception and to standardize our courses of study, and to surround the institutions with conditions which menace true academic freedom and defeat the primary purpose of democracy as heretofore preserved inviolable in our common schools, normal schools, and universities.⁴¹

The GEB's response was carefully worded to indicate that they had never tried to control or modify policies or courses of study. It enumerated their programs: agricultural clubs and farm demonstrations, Professor of Secondary Education (whose actions were determined by their own institutions), colleges and universities, Negro schools (especially industrial education), and certain experiments


at three universities. Probably the unseen influence was between the personnel who coordinated these programs and the people who executed them.

An article in The South Atlantic Quarterly in 1915 does more to elucidate GEB activities in southern rural areas. They had been helping with farm demonstrations and building dormitories for young people to attend county high schools. Plus they had introduced the teaching of domestic science, aided in agricultural club and demonstration work, and devoted energies toward making school part of community life.

Four reports by the GEB also describe some of their involvement in educational activities. They viewed their own activities as important and significant: "It is difficult to overestimate the value of the several general studies in public education financed by the board." At this time they recommended that many of their activities be turned over to the states but that they would still cooperate with them.

42Ibid.


In a 1926 report they praise the influence and "far reaching" effects of Professors of Secondary Education and Rural School Supervisors. Also, it states that following the Indiana survey, the GEB had provided a two-year demonstration of rural supervision in Indiana. Another 1926 report explicates some of their work in secondary education. It states that one way in which they had "helped" the South in secondary education was in making appropriations to extend the cooperative farm demonstration movement. Another way was through Professors of Secondary Education. These were in twelve states. In addition to programs to stimulate education by improving facilities, teachers, attendance and legislation, they had also worked on "suitable" courses of study:

They emphasized the importance of placing in the curriculum subjects which would prepare boys and girls for living a useful life—for example such subjects as agriculture and home economics. As a result some of the southern states established farm life or agricultural schools... Reform of curriculum remains as one of the major problems facing educational leaders.

Although they express concern that these programs were not having a lasting effect on the South's largely academic course of study, they close by saying that these endeavors had been made possible through gifts from the GEB.45

In addition, a 1927 memorandum about surveys sheds light on the GEB's attempted influence in educational change. The report bemoans that the surveys, which they had funded, had been publicized as General Education Board surveys. This had caused political problems for them, it states making it hard for their representatives to put their recommendations into effect.46

Although the GEB carefully worded their public statements, their own reports are clear in indicating deliberate influence in areas which they chose. One of the area which they chose was agricultural education in rural areas. Also, they recommended other vocational training and domestic education. An attitude that people's destinies were already set and that education should merely parallel those or prepare students for them came through with some consistency in position statements. At least one sector of the educational community was concerned about this phenomenon, the National Education Association. Yet, apparently the philanthropic activities were concealed in enough rhetoric of noninterference that the General Education Board continued to effect changes in education as they could persuade people to accept them.

A last area to explore is comprised of letters exchanged between two psychologists, Lewis M. Terman and Robert M. Yerkes, and the General Education Board. These letters indicate GEB interest in vocationalism because of their willingness to fund Terman and Yerkes' plan. The program involved vocational guidance for young people leaving school and for businesses hiring them, diagnosis of intelligence levels near the borderline of "mental deficiency," and a three-tiered educational format. These programs stemmed from testing done in the military in order to separate and train according to ability. About this, Yerkes claimed that it was not undemocratic and that it gave a man a proper chance to learn. He said that he had been bombarded by requests for such tests to use in schools.

The three-tiered educational program consisted of a high track for students bound for professions, a medium track for those bound for industry, and a low track for those bound for manual occupations. What would normally be kindergarten through 5th grade would be a three year program for the high track, four for the medium track, and six for the low track. Yerkes' plan was to have each track attend

separate schools. Also, he stated that the present system ignored individuality and was undemocratic. 48

Flexner wrote to Dr. C. M. Campbell of Johns Hopkins who responded, "I entirely approve of this plan." He also asked an opinion of Dr. Harry M. Thomas, a physician, who also supported the plan. Flexner complained to Yerkes that his suggestion made school too complicated, but that the plan would require testing. Yerkes sent a pamphlet that explained the army program and further explained his own opinion that "low grade" children received large amounts of attention and that "high grade" children were being sacrificed. Flexner then notified Yerkes that the GEB was giving $25,000 for them to develop intelligence tests for school children. 49

Summary

The most extraordinary and obvious inference that can be made from the five segments is that the GEB acted as if people's destinies were set and that education should parallel these destinies and prepare people to meet them.


In the three programs, Professors of Secondary Education, Rural School Supervisors, and Surveys of Education, changes were made in curriculum, apparently without persuasion from the GEB, yet by their own admission their programs had been successful and influential. Also, the GEB carefully watched over its funds. If a person did not follow its prescription, funds were removed. In addition, all of the programs culminated in the same emphases of practical, vocational, and domestic courses. In the Gary survey, for example, they praised the opportunities afforded a young person.

The policy statements are clearer statements of belief and intent, that rural education or education for people with manual destinations should only be concerned with the immediate situations and consequences. Apparently, for example, it bothered GEB members not the least that, in order to stimulate agriculture in the South, young people's education should consist primarily of agriculture and domestics. How much control the GEB exerted is not clear. Again, policy statements indicated interest in advancing vocational education. Also control over the programs funded is seen, as well as choosing their own people to conduct surveys, and holding private transactions before a more public meeting. All of these together show a pattern of control. Perhaps one can say that they were used to getting their own way. Yet, even in the best of circumstances one cannot predict outcome. Appendix A indicates that through
all of the vocationalizing, students mainly preferred academics. Appendix B shows some examples of GEB funding and amounts that were spent.

The benefit of this study lies not in placing blame or praise, but in observing actions. From the evidence, reasoning cannot be inferred, yet the nationwide movement toward what may be termed a "factory model" of schooling did have at its roots belief in the inferiority of certain classes of people, such as poor, ethnic, and rural. James D. Anderson’s study has shown the actions of industrial philanthropic groups and others to impose training for lower class jobs upon black Americans in the South. This study has shown that this paternalistic attitude extended to rural and poor people of other ethnic derivation also.

50James D. Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South.
# APPENDIX A

**Enrollment in Public High Schools by Course of Study, 1923-1924**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

51Table 5: "Enrollment in Public High Schools by Courses of Study, 1923-1924." General Education Board records. Series I. Box 313. Folder 3275. Rockefeller Archive Center.
APPENDIX B
SAMPLE GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD APPROPRIATIONS

**Northern:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Department/Committee</th>
<th>1915-1916</th>
<th>1916-1917</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Survey</td>
<td>$18,580.54</td>
<td>26,583.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to State Superintendant</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Education 1921-23</td>
<td>12,383.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee on Mathematical Requirements</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>38,797.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southern White:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Activity</th>
<th>1915-1916</th>
<th>1916-1917</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Survey</td>
<td>$24,999.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Elementary and Secondary Curriculum</td>
<td>7,152.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Secondary Education</td>
<td>35,252.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agents for Secondary Education</td>
<td>24,052.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Agents</td>
<td>1,244.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Survey of Public Education 1919</td>
<td>28,755.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Secondary Education 1904-1925</td>
<td>65,487.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agents for Secondary Education 1920-25</td>
<td>29,352.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Agents 1914-1929</td>
<td>74,195.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Professors of Secondary Education 1904-1925</td>
<td>56,961.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agents for Secondary Education 1920-25</td>
<td>29,495.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Agents 1914-1929</td>
<td>116,501.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Professors of Secondary Education 1905-1925</td>
<td>39,740.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agents for Secondary Education 1920-25</td>
<td>26,341.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Agents 1914-1928</td>
<td>60,944.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Survey of Public Education 1920-1921</td>
<td>17,135.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Secondary Education</td>
<td>48,750.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agents for Secondary Education</td>
<td>26,347.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Agents</td>
<td>106,424.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B (Continued)

### SAMPLE GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD APPROPRIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Professors of Secondary Education</th>
<th>State Agents for Secondary Education</th>
<th>Rural School Agents 1914-1928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Survey 1929</td>
<td>2,197.39</td>
<td>31,144.44</td>
<td>68,545.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Study of High Schools 1928</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>54,380.27</td>
<td>31,339.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Survey of Educational Conditions and Needs</td>
<td>17,383.44</td>
<td>66,275.00</td>
<td>58,512.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Professors of Secondary Education</td>
<td>64,441.66</td>
<td>29,692.18</td>
<td>54,130.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Professors of Secondary Education</td>
<td>55,873.93</td>
<td>24,124.99</td>
<td>57,172.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Survey of Public Education, Educational Tests 1919</td>
<td>11,383.25</td>
<td>67,799.70</td>
<td>58,040.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>State Agents for Rural Schools</td>
<td>62,216.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>State Agents for Rural Schools</td>
<td>65,551.94</td>
<td>52,594.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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