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FOREWORD

This book has been a long time in the making. It was a hard book to write, hard from every point of view,—hard to gather the evidence, hard to estimate its validity, hard to organize it intelligently and very hard indeed to present it judiciously, fairly and without prejudice. Not many authors would have had the courage to face such a task and very few would have been so conscientious in attention to every detail of collection and composition. It would be too much to expect of Doctor Beale that he could remain cold, dispassionate and absolutely objective in his attitude towards a situation which, when every allowance is made, constitutes a real menace to freedom of thought in America.

Not every one will agree with Doctor Beale's conclusions, a great many will not even accept his premises, some will object that the evidence upon which he bases some of his statements is not the soundest. Be that as it may—I can only testify as one who has gone over this book in manuscript sentence by sentence and has wrestled with the author over a thousand different points, that I have noted in Doctor Beale, along with a great zeal for freedom, a great reverence for the truth. I do not believe that he has ever consciously distorted the evidence to justify a conclusion pleasing to himself. On the other hand, while he has striven hard to be fair minded, Doctor Beale would be the first to agree that he clearly has not been strictly objective. I doubt whether on such a thorny subject a strictly objective narrative could be written. Only a zealous lover of
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PREFACE

When the Commission on Social Studies in the Schools asked the present author to make a study of freedom in teaching, he protested that he was not an educator. Professor Counts explained that the Commission wanted not an educator but an historian, partly because it wished the study to be a history done by some one trained in the critical method of the historian, partly because the study could be made more objectively by some one who was not himself an educator. Out of this conference with Professor Counts in the winter of 1931–1932 grew the conception of this book. The author brought to the work a knowledge of the social and cultural setting, in which the schools have functioned at various periods of our history, and a background of two years' work on a projected history of tolerance in America. He had to read industriously in books on the theory and history of education in order to orient himself for this particular phase of the history of tolerance. Neither Professor Counts nor the author dreamed in that first conference how stupendous a task, how all-enveloping a subject lay ahead. Indeed, the first plan was to include freedom of teaching in both schools and colleges. When the Commission decided it preferred to limit the scope to teachers' colleges and schools below college grade, the author feared these would not provide sufficient material for a book. Instead of a paucity of material, however, the author's difficulty has been to condense into one book substance enough for several. Finally, the work became two books, A History of Freedom in Teaching and this present contemporary study of the problem of freedom for the teacher in the period since the World War.

It soon became obvious that the problem of freedom in
liberty would have had the patience to do the enormous amount of research which this book has involved, and no zealous lover of liberty could have presented the facts which these researches have disclosed without some heat.

Conyers Read

Executive Secretary

The American Historical Association.
teaching could not be made clear by a simple description of cases of dismissal. More subtle violations of freedom are far more important; there are hundreds of these for every one dismissal. Besides, the problem varies from era to era, from community to community, from one type of school to another. No understanding of the problem of freedom can be attained without thorough knowledge of the forces that dominate the schools and form the public opinion in which the schools must operate. Even the fundamental purposes of education are inextricably bound up with the problem of freedom. The vastness and many-sidedness of the subject became an overwhelming difficulty.

Moreover, the vagueness of many of the factors involved in freedom and the intangible quality of many of the sources of this particular study added further difficulties. There were no authoritative case studies for the lower schools such as the ones the American Association of University Professors has provided in the college field. For the period since the World War, there is an abundance of material, but it is difficult to get. A few places like the files of the American Civil Liberties Union and the issues of *School and Society* do provide records of interferences with freedom in teaching. But most of the recent material has to be gathered from a variety of scattered sources, local newspaper files, clipping collections, more especially from correspondence and personal interviews. In the absence of printed records, information about cases involving freedom and many of the facts concerning the more subtle pressures upon teachers are to be obtained only by talking to men and women actually teaching in the schools.

A further difficulty arises from the fact that so few teachers have had sufficient training or have done enough thinking to grow out of conventional community opinions and to realize that there is a problem of freedom at all. One of the most striking revelations of the study was the small number of teachers even aware that they would not be free to differ from com-
munity views. The controversial questions frequently discussed by well-trained teachers in the better school systems or discussed only at the peril of their positions by teachers in many other communities meant nothing at all to the average teacher over the country. In many cases it had not occurred to the teacher that his own and the community's view of the matter could be open to controversy at all. In other cases the teacher had never heard of the social, economic, or political problem under discussion and did not know what was meant by it. Thousands of teachers are utterly uninformed and unaware of anything outside of their textbooks and the minutiae of small-town life. Consequently, there was only a limited group of teachers capable of contributing material on freedom or even comprehending what freedom meant. Many members of school of education faculties are as unaware of the problem as these teachers. The author found one of the best known schools of education in the country so absorbed in methods courses and so little interested in ideas that only two of the faculty members to whom the author talked could provide any assistance at all. These two were specialists in the problem of laws and court decisions affecting freedom and were of great assistance in this one limited field; one of them had been trained in a history department, not in a school of education.

When, with difficulty, the author found people informed and interested in freedom, his troubles had only begun. Practically every case involving freedom presented two or several points of view. The motives and capacity of the various persons ready to testify had to be weighed carefully. Often it was impossible to unravel the truth. Administrator and teacher have such different points of view that they could with equal honesty and conviction tell opposing stories. Not only conscious misrepresentation and deliberate perversion but unconscious distortion and prejudice warped the picture. Reliable evidence was hard to obtain. Sometimes testimony of several apparently distinct witnesses all emanated from one common source. Often where evidence
was abundant it was conflicting. Only with great patience could one hope to untangle the truth. Where administrator and teacher tell contradictory stories the truth often lies somewhere between. Then if one discovers and presents the truth, both administrator and teacher turn on one with anger. Neither wants objective narration; each wishes special pleading of his own cause. Furthermore, the author was obviously not able in every case to make careful personal investigation. In many cases therefore he had to investigate his informant and accept the testimony of one other apparently trustworthy person conversant with the facts. In many other cases he had to discard material entirely, because there was no way of determining the trustworthiness of alleged facts or because the informant showed evidence of prejudice. If in a particular case the author has made mistakes it is because of the insuperable difficulties of his task.

One of the worst problems was to get people who knew the facts to talk. With certain notable exceptions, administrators usually were unsympathetic with the study, felt that it was better to let a dangerous topic alone, and talked with great reluctance, if at all. They are not interested in freedom. One characteristic of the successful administrator is skill in avoiding trouble. Whatever they say is guarded and reveals as little as possible. Some of them talk in vague generalities. Others avow devotion to the cause of freedom but avoid specific applications. Still others assure one that their teachers enjoy complete freedom, when through investigation already made one knows that in reality the reverse is true. One learns not to place too much credence in the statements of administrators. In specific cases, where one has evidence of violations of freedom, the usual administrative tactics are to deny the facts completely. Administrative denials in such cases, one discovers, mean little. Some administrators, like the superintendent in whose schools one of the most flagrant cases occurred, refused to reply to the author's letters at all. In general, superintendents and school-
board members seem to feel inwardly, even when they do not openly say it, that it is impudent for any one to question or enquire into the motives for their actions.

Teachers, on their part, were likely to be completely indifferent to the author’s undertaking. Many care nothing about freedom or a study of freedom and want only to draw their salaries with as little effort as possible. Many do not know they are not free and will be happier never to discover it. Many others are interested to the extent of complaining a little but not enough to fill out a questionnaire or write a brief note providing some specific piece of information. So strong a human trait is procrastination that many teachers with the best intentions in the world just never get around to supplying the material that they fully intend to send. One charming New York City possessor of some clippings containing relevant material promised to send them and to write a one-page personal account of an interesting episode. It took an interview in New York, a dinner in Cleveland, letter after letter to this teacher, two interviews with a common friend who was greatly interested in the author’s study, and then more letters to this friend finally to extract from this teacher the material that she really meant all along to supply. The author made a trip to South Carolina, talked to the State Teachers’ Association meeting and to other groups of teachers in other parts of the state. He met great enthusiasm for his study, found attentive listeners, and was asked many obviously intelligent questions. He obtained a great deal of valuable first-hand information. In each meeting he distributed a number of questionnaires to teachers eager to fill them out; some even took extra copies because friends would wish to answer them. Out of the whole State of South Carolina the author ultimately received for his pains exactly two questionnaires.\(^1\) When teachers do respond, one still has difficulties. Some reply that they are completely free and then believe this

---

\(^1\) The author sent 2,000 questionnaires throughout the country. He received 989 answers.
generalization by every answer to a specific question. Some teachers see only good about them. Others are too loyal to their school or community to admit any faults. Others mournfully assure one that they have no freedom at all and then reveal a burning desire to put freedom to some utterly trivial use. The average teacher is so conventional-minded that he, like the community, honestly feels that the unconventionalities of the teacher whose freedom is denied should really not be tolerated. Many teachers, at the other extreme, carry perpetual chips on their shoulders and would never be satisfied under any circumstances. These teachers’ exaggerations of their lack of freedom must be discounted. At the other extreme, the jealousies of fellow-teachers, which lead to condemnation of a real victim of interference with freedom, must also be discounted. In still other cases, friends of a teacher, like the teacher himself, are incapable of seeing that here the teacher’s own contentiousness or antagonizing personality, rather than a lack of freedom, is at the root of the trouble.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty has arisen from the fears of teachers and administrators alike. Many refused to talk at all. Others talked only after repeated assurances of the author’s discretion in protecting their identity. Still others mentioned cases of violation of freedom, but felt it unwise to stir up new trouble by telling the details. “The more you stir up an affair the more it festers” and “It is better to let sleeping dogs lie” met the author at every turn. Often teachers grumble in general but, when pinned down to specific instances, think better of it and refuse to reveal them. Teacher after teacher told the author an interesting story and then concluded by abjuring him to hold it absolutely confidential, since if the author told it somebody might recognize it and that would cost the teacher his position. Other teachers have supplied information and then have written to reconsider and recall lest they lose their jobs. Perhaps it is a friend of the teacher who might get in trouble. Perhaps the teacher knows somebody connected with the administration
who would be offended if he told the facts. Assurances that the material would be used anonymously often brought forth information. But in many cases the teacher felt the consequences of discovery too serious for him to risk even anonymous use of material. Often teachers were silenced by merely a vague fear that in some way, out of the whole United States, an incident might be recognized. Even when information was freely given for use in this study, a number of people became frightened and ran to cover, when they saw it in type in final form, and withdrew their names and forced anonymous use or sought to suppress it altogether. For example, when the author sent back in final form, for possible correction, the material one well-known superintendent had supplied, the superintendent replied, not that the facts were incorrect, but that before he could consent to their use he must see the whole manuscript and know the context and presumably the author’s point of view. A full explanation of the context in which each item was used and several follow-up letters have failed to elicit a reply. Of seven items sent him in final form for possible correction, one prominent educator, secure though his position is, replied approving two, correcting one, insisting that permissions be received from someone else on two others, and curtly writing “Do not use” across the remaining two, one using his name, the others used anonymously—not because the facts were incorrect but because even this professor thought it better to run to cover. Another professor, perfectly secure on the faculty of an Eastern college, which would not be in the least interested in this particular item, withdrew his name from an event of forty years ago in a distant state, because someone he knew then might be alive, because his sister, retired and living on a teacher’s pension in the state, might be affected, and because his college regarded him as a bit of a radical anyway, and he wished not to strengthen that impression. Encounters of this kind with powerful men or men in secure positions make one wonder, not that some teachers wrote and admitted they were cowards and pleaded
that they must keep their jobs and therefore wished their names withdrawn, but that any teachers dared supply information at all. The multiplicity of examples of fears of teachers about supplying facts is in itself eloquent testimony of the lack of freedom in the schools. The author began with a feeling that a few cases might be exaggerated into too gloomy a picture; his experiences in getting material have convinced him that any presentation of obtainable and publishable facts is an inevitable understatement of the truth.

Unfortunately because of the above difficulties much of the material in this volume has to be used anonymously. Sometimes it has been impossible to reveal the persons involved or the name of the community. Sometimes the authority for statements must be withheld. This is done in many cases at the request of the person who supplied the material; in other cases on the author’s own initiative because he wished to run no risk of repaying helpfulness to him with trouble for a teacher, who might be penalized for aiding this study. Since much of the material has had to be used anonymously and since much of it is controversial, the author has carefully preserved in two thick files all letters quoted and the original notes he took at the time of all interviews. These manuscript sources contain the exact names, places, and authorities whose identity could not be revealed in this book, so that for anonymous facts in the book the author has carefully preserved the names and could produce them if the exigencies of the case permitted it. Not only all printed references have been verified, but every letter used, except a few that came anonymously with questionnaires from carefully selected teachers, has been sent back to the writer, in the form quoted, for his correction and permission to print. With two exceptions (where one teacher’s unconscious self-revelation rendered approval improbable, and where the truth spontaneously told by another in an interview seemed more valuable than would have been his carefully prepared subsequent statement in writing), all material obtained in in-
terviews has been returned to the person who gave it with a request that he make any necessary corrections and then give his approval. The corrections have been incorporated except where trustworthy conflicting evidence invalidated them. In most cases where approval was withdrawn from a part or all of the material, that portion has been deleted; in a few cases, where it was important to use it and the correspondence indicated that the facts are correct and only the correspondent's courage deficient, the substance has been used with all names withdrawn from it. This double checking and thorough documentation has seemed important. If the reader is irked by too many footnotes the author begs him to remember that only when carefully documented can a study of this sort be valuable.

The difficulties he has described above, with teachers' fears and with administrators' reticence, make the author inexpressibly grateful to the host of professors, administrators, teachers, school-board members, appointment office officials, authors and publishers of textbooks, and interested citizens who have co-operated with him and supplied material. Without their assistance this book could never have been written. The author feels particularly indebted to the Iowa teacher who writes: "You may, if you choose, use my name in both cases, and have my permission to quote from my letter, as you choose; even though one of the former members is still on the Board and might not care for the truth served up in the manner mentioned" and to Superintendent Floyd of Struthers, Ohio, who sent back material that the author had used without his name with the reply; "Go ahead and use my name. The lines are drawing tighter and tighter between the right and left. We will have to come to some showdown somehow." Many teachers have exhibited daring not to be found in most ordinary citizens in risking administrative wrath and even their positions in supplying information. The author salutes them. If after all his care he inadvertently causes them trouble he apologizes and will do anything possible to make amends. District Superintendent
Tildsley of New York has rendered a particular service to the cause of freedom: he has had the supreme courage herein publicly to avow that he was formerly mistaken in his attitude toward freedom. In the back of this volume are listed the people, except classroom teachers, with whom the author had the most helpful interviews. It seemed wiser not to risk detection and discipline by including teachers’ names. To all of those listed, to the teachers not named, and to the hundreds of others who by correspondence have supplied useful material, the author expresses his gratitude and appreciation.

To a number of persons the author is particularly indebted: to Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, and Jesse H. Newlon for the conception of this study and for their understanding and encouragement throughout its preparation; to Bessie L. Pierce for her excellent works on pressure groups in the schools and for her great generosity in making available her advice and her valuable files of pamphlets and correspondence; to John L. Tildsley, district superintendent in New York City, for making available by correspondence and in person the wisdom and experience of his many years of service in the New York schools; to John W. Studebaker, formerly superintendent at Des Moines and now United States Commissioner of Education, for the careful placing of a large number of questionnaires and for discussions and disagreements with the author, which provided valuable criticism; to George Johnson of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and Catholic University of America, in Washington, D. C., for wise counsel and enlightenment concerning Catholic schools; to J. C. Dixon, state supervisor of Negro Education in Atlanta, Georgia, for invaluable assistance in attaining some degree of understanding of Negro schools; to Clyde Miller and Marie Duggan of the Bureau of Educational Service at Teachers College, Columbia University, for providing contacts with superintendents over the country and for making available the wisdom acquired through years of ex-
perience in trying to place teachers and for sharing their understanding of the qualities superintendents wish and those they will not tolerate in prospective teachers; to Harold Easterby, professor at Charleston College, Charleston, South Carolina, for innumerable valuable contacts that he made for the author in various parts of South Carolina; and to A. Cline Flora, superintendent at Columbia, South Carolina, and to his principals and teaching staff for the unusual cooperation and assistance they gave the author. David S. Muzzey and Carlton J. H. Hayes, professors at Columbia University, were most generous in supplying information on the difficulties their texts have encountered in the schools. Charles H. Thompson, professor, and Dwight O. W. Holmes, dean of the School of Education of Howard University, read and gave valuable criticism of the author’s chapter on Teachers of Negroes and the Negro section of the chapter on Appointments; Carlton J. H. Hayes and George Johnson did the same for the chapter on Catholic schools and the Catholic section of the chapter on Appointments; Edith B. Wertz, long a teacher in private schools, now head of the North Shore School at Huntington, Long Island, did likewise for the sections on private and progressive schools; Andrew C. McLaughlin, professor at the University of Chicago, gave the author the benefit of his rich experience and sound judgment in criticism of the chapter on textbooks; Karl W. Guenther, chairman of the N.E.A. Department of Classroom Teachers Committee on Academic Freedom and secretary of the Southeastern Michigan Associated Teachers’ Clubs criticized the chapter on means of obtaining proper freedom. Conyers Read, executive secretary of the American Historical Association, and his assistant, Evelyn P. Braun, have gone over the manuscript carefully and have conferred with the author on various occasions over particular passages. To them the author is deeply indebted for innumerable suggestions of great value. Their patience in the expenditure of their time has been equalled only
by the wisdom of their counsel in difficult questions. To Laurence H. Eldredge of Montgomery and McCracken in Philadelphia, the author is deeply obliged. To various other friends the author is indebted for critical reading of other portions of the manuscript. Aletha Ellsworth, a teacher in the Fordson
High School at Dearborn, Michigan, read and gave helpful criticism of the whole manuscript from the point of view of
a classroom teacher. The author is deeply obliged to his
friend, Paul Lewinson, for suggestions provided in many dis-
cussions of this subject both by his argumentative bent and
by his incisive comments upon his recent experiences in edu-
cation courses; to his friend Jean Spaulding, a teacher of
Washington, D. C., for painstaking reading and invaluable
stylistic criticism of the manuscript, to Katharine Elizabeth
Crane, assistant editor of the Dictionary of American Biog-
raphy, for the incisive, sometimes savage criticism of the
manuscript in final form, which only editorial experience
and true friendship can furnish, and to his friend Merle E.
Curti, professor at Smith College, for innumerable valuable
suggestions and inspiration in the process of gathering material
and for many criticisms and suggestions that resulted from his
patient reading of the finished manuscript. The author’s father,
Frank A. Beale, and his mother, Nellie K. Beale, did a large
share of the stupendous labor of compiling the results of the
questionnaire and have given criticism throughout the writing
of the book. The author’s father did much of the gathering of
laws from the various state session laws. Miriam Idleman
Knapp of New York City gave intelligent help in using the
immense collection of American Civil Liberties Union manu-
scripts. Two research assistants, Enid Frazier Gilluly and Jane
Kline of Washington, D. C., did careful and intelligent research
on special problems. Five successive secretaries, T. Eliot Weil,
now American vice-consul at Marseilles, France, David Blumen-
stock of Chicago, Illinois, and Jessie E. Lauscher, Anne Wood-
ward King, and Lida Smith Mayo, all of Washington, D.C., have worked faithfully, and with an interest that has greatly facilitated the work. Miss King has done most of the verifying of references. To the Library of Congress, the author is deeply indebted for the use of a study and for excellent and unending service throughout the preparation of this book. To Martin J. Roberts, superintendent of the Reading Room, Robert C. Gooch, Willard Webb, and Harold O. Thomen, his assistants, V. Volta Parma, curator of the Rare Book Room, Olive M. Jack, assistant director of the Law Division and the Law Division staff, and the staff of the Periodical Division—the author is especially grateful for cheerful and efficient assistance. Georgia Faison and Rosalie Carmichael of the University of North Carolina Library have been very helpful. To Josiah C. Russell, professor of history at the University of North Carolina, Joseph Y. Barnett of Laguna Beach, California, Donald Becker of Summit, New Jersey, and Alexander H. McLeod of Lumberton, North Carolina, the author is obligated for painstaking reading of proof. To El Rita Wachs Brown of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and J. Kester Svendsen of Charleston, South Carolina, the author is indebted for patient assistance in compilation of the index. Acknowledgement of assistance and cooperation is due to many former students at Grinnell and Bowdoin colleges who have contributed to this work from their experience as teachers. Finally, the author wishes to express appreciation of the freedom that was allowed him by the Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, the American Historical Association, the Carnegie Corporation, and Charles Scribner's Sons. The author owes much to various friends who have advised him and criticized the manuscript. They have saved him from many stupid blunders. Discussion with them has been invaluable in clarifying the author's expression of his ideas. Changes the author has made in the manuscript have, however, been made voluntarily by him after conference. At no
time he has been subjected to pressure or forced to make changes, modify his conclusions, or suppress his findings. Freedom from efforts to prevent his following where the facts seem to lead him is important to an author of this kind of work, and it is rare. Without it this study could never have been written.

Howard K. Beale.

Thetford, Vermont.
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TEACHERS OF NEGROES

Roughly one-tenth of the people of the United States are Negroes. Their children are mostly in segregated schools or schools predominantly Negro. White teachers of Northern Negroes suffer no special restrictions. Sometimes white teachers who do not like it are forced to teach Negroes. Occasionally one such has to teach with a Negro on a mixed faculty. When in Chicago in 1928 a Negress named Mandelle B. Bousfield became principal of the Keith School whose pupils were almost entirely Negroes, one of the three white teachers asked for a transfer to another school, but it was not granted and she

1 The material in this chapter comes partly from a large amount of reading in connection with this book, and partly from a study of racial tolerance. As this chapter is but a summary and as much of the information was given by persons who do not want their names revealed, no attempt is made to document it. Beyond printed matter, the material comes from (1) several letters: M. W. Adams, former president of Atlanta University, to H. K. B., July 20, 1933, July 30, 1934; M. E. Coleman, white supervisor of attendance of Atlanta Schools, to H. K. B., July 23, 1934; Jackson Davis of the General Education Board to H. K. B., April 26, 1933; Edwin R. Embree, president of the Rosenwald Fund, to H. K. B., May 1, 1933; J. B. Felton, white state supervisor of Negro Schools of South Carolina, to H. K. B., July 17, 1934; W. A. Robinson, Negro principal of the Laboratory School, Atlanta University, to H. K. B., July 24, 1934; C. H. Thompson, Negro professor at Howard University, to H. K. B., July 30, 1934; H. L. Trigg, Negro state supervisor of Negro Schools of North Carolina, to H. K. B., July 24, 1934; E. H. Webster, for thirty-two years dean of Morehouse College, to H. K. B., May 19, 1933; Walter F. White, Negro secretary of the N. A. A. C. P., to H. K. B., July 19, 1934; (2) interviews with W. W. Alexander, white director of the Southern Interracial Committee, Atlanta, Ga.; M. E. Coleman; J. C. Dixon, white state supervisor of Negro Education of Georgia; W. E. B. Du Bois, Negro editor of the Crisis and professor at Atlanta University; R. E. Eleazer, white director of educational work of the Southern Interracial Committee; H. Easterby, white professor at Charleston College; J. B. Felton; G. H. Ferguson, white assistant director of the Division of Negro Education of North Carolina; A. C. Flora, white superintendent of Schools in Columbia,
TEACHERS OF NEGROES

had to remain and teach under Mrs. Bousfield.\(^2\) In ideas and conduct, however, whites who teach Negroes in the North are as free as other teachers.

In the South they are not, particularly if they are Northerners. In the old days, when nearly all teachers of Negroes were white, a Southern white who taught a Negro day school might have been regarded as queer, but, if he had social standing anyway, his teaching did not injure it. A Northerner who taught Negroes was always suspect. Now practically all teachers of Negro public schools are Negros, though principals are likely still to be white. A few white teachers continue in private schools. Until recently a great many of the teachers of Negroes have always been Northerners. They lead even now a life of depressing isolation and loneliness. However great their interest in the Negro, however much they enjoy their work, they crave white companionship. Their occupation cuts them off from this. Formerly they were insulted and annoyed, sometimes threatened. Now they are merely ostracized and ignored. Many of them have taught for years without the slightest contact with the white community. Even other teachers and church groups shun them. Their Negro associates, on the other hand,

South Carolina; Kemper Harrel, professor of music at Spelman and Morehouse colleges; Mrs. Kemper Harrel, Negro member of the Interracial Committee, Atlanta, Georgia; D. O. W. Holmes, Negro dean of the School of Education, Howard University; John Hope, Negro president of Atlanta University; H. R. Hunter, white assistant superintendent of Schools, Atlanta; H. H. McCarley, white county superintendent of Schools, Charleston; Mrs. C. P. McGowan, white member of the Interracial Committee, Charleston; N. C. Newbold, white state director of Negro Education of North Carolina; Mary White Ovington, a white founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York City; William Pickens, a Negro secretary of the N. A. A. C. P.; Florence Reed, white president of Spelman (Negro) College, Atlanta, Ga.; A. B. Rhett, white superintendent of Schools, Charleston; W. A. Robinson; W. A. Sutton, white superintendent of Schools, Atlanta; C. H. Thompson; Walter F. White; G. C. Wilkinson, first assistant superintendent of Schools in Washington, D. C.; and numerous white and Negro supervisors, principals, and teachers who prefer not to have their names mentioned.

\(^2\) Interview with Professor Charles H. Thompson of Howard University; C. H. T. to H. K. B., July 30, 1934; Mrs. Mandelle B. Bousfield to H. K. B., July 19, 1934.
usually make their own friends among Negroes and hesitate, from long-standing inhibition, to make social advances. Besides, both white and Negro teachers know that social mingling outside of school activities would injure if not ruin the school by winning the active hatred of the white community around it. These teachers suffer not only social but intellectual isolation, since professional stimulus comes as much from teachers in the same field in other schools as from teachers of other fields in the same school. They live, too, a frightfully abnormal life. In ideas, these white teachers would have to use extreme caution not to bring attacks upon the school except that the white community's ignorance about them protects them and leaves them probably freer than teachers in neighboring white schools.

The Negro teacher in the North in most respects is no more restricted than the white teacher. In unsegregated schools—and most Northern schools are not segregated—he has theoretically the same equipment as white teachers. But Negroes usually live in the older parts of town abandoned by whites, and therefore their schools are usually old and in bad repair, often unsafe, and frequently overcrowded. In some cities they do

---

Chester, Pennsylvania, has, however, recently built a fine new Negro high school under a segregation plan. Interview with Professor Charles H. Thompson, Howard University, 1934; James N. Rule, Pennsylvania state superintendent of Instruction, to H. K. B., Oct. 18, 1934. The Beverly Hills-Morgan Park section of Chicago has segregated some 97 per cent of its younger Negroes in the Shoop Elementary School by permitting transfers of all white pupils to other schools and drawing the boundaries of the Shoop district in such a way as to include all Negro families except a few in a small neutral zone from which children may go either to the Shoop School or to a white one. It is now trying to oust Negro pupils from its high school, the Morgan Park High School. Superintendent Bogan issued an order in the fall of 1934 that the Negroes be admitted to the high school. In spite of a protest strike on Oct. 8 of some 1700 white pupils, apparently with parental encouragement, the Superintendent has stood firm and the Negroes are still in the school. *Washington Post*, Oct. 9, 1934; *Chicago Daily News*, Oct. 6, 8, 9, and 11, 1934; *Chicago Tribune*, Sept. 30, 1934; *Chicago Sunday Bee*, Sept. 23 and Oct. 7 and 28, 1934; *Chicago Defender*, Sept. 29 and Oct. 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1934; Supt. William J. Bogan to H. K. B., Oct. 29, 1934, and Feb. 19, 1935; Dr. Arthur G. Falls, chairman of the Interracial Commission of the Chicago Urban League, to H. K. B., Nov. 13 and Dec. 17, 1934; interview with M. Glenn Harding, white resident of Morgan Park, 1934; M. G. H. to H. K. B., Nov. 14, 1934, and Feb. 28, 1935.
have complete equality. Their curricula, texts, and salaries are usually the same. Often they have sufficient political power fully to safeguard their rights. They have access to the best training institutions,⁴ to the best library facilities, and to art collections, concerts, and plays. They keep their health by use of parks, excellent athletic facilities, and good doctors and hospitals. They mingle professionally with white teachers. Since they are usually in large cities, they enjoy the intellectual stimulus of a large group of intelligent, educated Negroes. Difficulties stand in the way but there is no insurmountable bar to their having white friends and mingling socially with them, and a few of them do. In short, though they actually know few whites, they have every opportunity for enjoyment of the best things in life, and though there are places where Negroes just do not go or are made unwelcome, they are able to be self-respecting citizens at least partially free from the stigma of inferiority from which their Southern fellows never escape. In a few large Northern cities there is a community of intelligent and cultivated Negroes large enough to provide intellectual stimulus and companionship among the Negroes themselves.

In the Border States Negro teachers are usually in segregated schools. They rarely have full equality in equipment and salaries. They are excluded from much of the white cultural life of the community. Yet they are approaching equal treatment inside of the system, and, in their life outside, though they generally live apart, they are usually not subjected to the indignities of the South. The Border States teacher lives in a community that is a compromise between North and South. In Washington, D. C., for instance, the Negro teaches in segregated schools, but in them he has equality with white schools and considerable

⁴ A tendency has recently developed toward separate and inferior teacher training institutions for Negroes, which may have serious effects upon their future; but as yet Negroes have not been excluded from white institutions in the North, though they are not encouraged to attend them. See Rayford W. Logan, "Educational Segregation in the North," Journal of Negro Education, II (January, 1933), 65–67.
political power. He is not segregated in public conveyances, but the Library of Congress cafeteria or a Negro restaurant are the only places where he can lunch with a white teacher and discuss mutual problems. He has full use of the city’s library facilities and the rich collection of the Library of Congress, but he is excluded entirely from privately owned art exhibits, from lectures, from all plays, and, until a recent relaxation in connection with Roland Hayes’s singing allowed him segregated concert seats, he was barred from hearing good music except what he could himself produce and what a radio could provide.

In the South the freedom of the Negro teacher is limited by a number of factors that apply to Negroes only. Negro schools could not make headway without white support. White men’s purposes for Negro schools, therefore, have had an important influence upon Negro teachers. Northerners who provided the first support were interested in educating Negroes largely through religious motives. Many of the early Negro schools were definitely sectarian religious institutions. Negro private schools still tend to be. This religious heritage of Negro education exerts a narrowing and restrictive influence even today, particularly in the private schools. Then, too, after Northern influence ceased to dominate and Southern support was necessary, industrial training for Negroes became the order of the day. Southerners could be won to support industrial training who would have opposed cultural education for Negroes. Booker Washington and, before the World War, foundations that supported Negro education sponsored the industrial training ideal. Washington is now dead. The foundations, what-

---

6 North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia have been singled out for examples not because they are worse than other Southern states but because the author had contacts there. North Carolina is decidedly freer than most Southern states. Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana are generally agreed to be more restricted than any described.

6 For a fuller discussion of this controversy over industrial training see H. K. Beale, History of Freedom in Teaching in American Schools, chap. VI, section 3.
ever their past attitudes, are now encouraging cultural subjects and the institutions that teach them. Southern white opposition to cultural training has weakened. Indeed, many Southern whites now support liberal arts education for Negroes. Yet, in spite of all this, many Negro leaders feel that the old industrial school influence still subtly influences and restricts many Negro educators.

Another great limitation upon the Negro teacher is lack of funds arising out of white opposition, or, at best, indifference to Negro schooling. There is a feeling that education ruins a “good nigger” and puts dangerous ideas into his head. In any case, in a region whose white schools are handicapped by poverty, there is little inclination to spend tax money on Negroes. Today, the opposition is in large part economic. The poor white wants to keep the Negro ignorant to avoid competition for jobs the whites want; the wealthy white, in order to retain cheap labor for other tasks. Generally, salaries have not been considered in this study of freedom. In the case of Southern Negro teachers, however, appropriations are so small that more funds do become a pressing problem of freedom. Appropriations for white schools in Southern states are inadequate. Rural white schools are ill equipped and the teachers poorly trained. Yet the Negroes get still smaller appropriations. In 1916 a

8 Interview with J. C. Dixon; J. C. D. to H. K. B., July 14, 1934; interview with J. B. Felton; J. B. F. to H. K. B., July 17, 1934. Mr. Felton, however, points out that “there are [also] a good many people who feel that the Negro should have a square deal and are putting forth a special effort to see that this is done.”
9 Pages could be filled with the discriminations against Negro school appropriations. Booker Washington calculated that in 1911-1912 in the sixteen former slave states plus Oklahoma and the District of Columbia, the Negroes had 11 per cent of the population and only 2 per cent of the school funds. In 1916 the United States Bureau of Education issued statistics on appropriations for Southern schools. The expenditure per school child for teachers' salaries in the North ranged from $15.78 in Wisconsin to $36.30 in California. In the South as a whole the average expenditure per school child for whites was $10.32, for Negroes $2.89. In Oklahoma the average per capita was $14.21 for whites, $9.96 for Negroes; in Kentucky, $8.13 for whites, $8.53 for Negroes; in Maryland, $13.79 and $6.38; in Delaware, $12.61 and $7.68; in Texas, $10.08 and
Government report on education warned that the widespread publicity for gifts to private Negro schools must not lead to the belief that the discrepancy in public schools was offset in private schools, because there, too, the contributions to whites were greater than those to Negroes. By 1929–1930 the appropriations for both kinds of schools had increased, but the discrepancy remained. Six Southern states spent on teachers' salaries less than 30 per cent as much per capita on Negro children as on white; Alabama 29 per cent, Florida 28 per cent, Georgia 25 per cent, Mississippi and Louisiana only 22 per cent, and South Carolina 16 per cent as much. In Alabama Negroes comprised 38 per cent of the population and received 10 per cent of the school funds. In Florida the figures were 34 and 6, in Georgia 42 and 14, in Mississippi 52 and 20, in Louisiana 39 and 12, and in South Carolina 51 and 10. Southerners make comparisons with their own past and feel they are doing much for Negroes. There has been a quantitative increase in money appropriated in every Southern state for both whites and blacks. Nevertheless, except in Kentucky and Delaware, the Negro schools are still pitifully discriminated against. In South Carolina com-

\$5.74; in Arkansas, \$12.95 and \$4.59; in Tennessee, \$8.27 and \$4.83; in Virginia, \$9.64 and \$2.74; in North Carolina, \$5.27 and \$2.02; in Florida, \$11.50 and \$2.64; in South Carolina, \$10.00 and \$1.44; in Georgia, \$9.58 and \$1.76; in Alabama, \$9.41 and \$1.78; in Mississippi, \$10.60 and \$2.26; in Louisiana, \$13.73 and \$1.31. For the South as a whole the distribution was much fairer in counties that had fewer Negroes than in those with large Negro populations. In counties with less than 10 per cent Negroes the average salary per capita for whites was \$7.96, for Negroes \$7.23; in counties with 10–25 per cent Negroes, \$9.55 for whites, \$5.55 for Negroes; in counties with 25–50 per cent Negroes, \$11.11 and \$3.19; in counties with 50–75 per cent Negroes, \$12.53 and \$1.77; in counties with over 75 per cent Negroes, \$22.12 and \$1.78. U. S. Bureau of Education, Negro Education (Bulletin, 1916, no. 38), II, 10–11; ibid., I, 28; Booker T. Washington, "Industrial Education and the Public Schools," The Negro's Progress in Fifty Years (American Academy of Political and Social Science, Annals, XLIX [September, 1913]), 225–226.

\textsuperscript{10} U. S. Bureau of Education, op. cit., I, 8.

\textsuperscript{11} In 1928–1929 the expenditure for teachers' salaries per school child in Oklahoma was \$30.06 for white children and \$23.98 for Negroes; in Kentucky, \$24.66 for white children and \$25.44 for Negroes; in Maryland, \$51.52 and \$33.63; in Delaware, \$47.81 and \$34.66; in Texas, \$36.38 and \$14.61; in Arkansas, \$20.02 and \$8.86; in Tennessee, \$25.70 and \$13.01; in Virginia,
parison of expenditures as officially reported in 1911 and in 1931 shows that Negro schools are actually getting a smaller proportion of the funds than they did twenty years ago.\textsuperscript{18} It is only recently that public Negro high schools have appeared at all. In 1914 Virginia had 600 white and only 5 Negro high schools. In 1916 New Orleans had none.\textsuperscript{18} Atlanta procured one only under the present superintendent.\textsuperscript{14} Charleston has one, but it is so poor that it will not equip pupils even for the Negro colleges. A Southern Negro still cannot usually get a public high-school education unless he lives in a compara-

$29.17$ and $12.68$; in North Carolina, $26.79$ and $11.10$; in Florida, $35.20$ and $9.80$; in South Carolina, $35.70$ and $5.89$; in Georgia, $22.45$ and $5.65$; in Alabama, $25.26$ and $7.35$; in Mississippi, $29.80$ and $6.70$; in Louisiana, $38.40$ and $8.68$. In 1930 the Negroes were 7.4 per cent of the population of Oklahoma and got 5.1 per cent of the school funds; in Kentucky they were 9.2 per cent of the population, and got 8.0 per cent of the money. In Maryland the figures were 16.9 per cent and 11.7 per cent; in Delaware, 13.4 per cent and 15.0 per cent; in Texas, 15.9 per cent and 13.9 per cent; in Arkansas, 27.0 per cent and 18.0 per cent; in Tennessee, 19.3 per cent and 13.0 per cent; in Virginia, 29.9 per cent and 11.0 per cent; in North Carolina, 29.8 per cent and 12.6 per cent; in Florida, 34.0 per cent and 5.6 per cent; in South Carolina, 51.4 per cent and 10.3 per cent; in Georgia, 41.7 per cent and 14.0 per cent; in Alabama, 38.4 per cent and 10.1 per cent; in Mississippi, 52.2 per cent and 20.0 per cent; in Louisiana, 38.9 per cent and 12.1 per cent. *Negro Year Book* (Monroe N. Work, ed.), 1931–1932, 203–206.

\textsuperscript{18} Results computed from figures cited above. In South Carolina white school property represented 87.6 per cent and Negro property 12.4 per cent of the whole in 1911; in 1931, white property 88 per cent and Negro, 12 per cent. The white percentage of the total number of teachers employed increased from 60.7 per cent in 1911 to 65.1 per cent in 1931, while the Negro percentage decreased from 39.3 per cent to 34.9 per cent of the whole. The white proportion of the total operating expenditure increased from 84.3 per cent in 1911 to 88.5 per cent in 1931, while the Negro proportion decreased from 15.7 per cent to 11.5 per cent. Committee on Research Investigation of the Negro Schools, Palmetto State Teachers’ Association, MS. Report, March 23, 1933. It is true that the Negroes made up 55.2 per cent of the population in 1910 and only 45.6 per cent in 1930 but the decrease in their proportion of total funds is none the less significant in view of the extreme inadequacy of their funds and in view of a general feeling that Negroes are getting so much larger a proportion of school funds than formerly.


\textsuperscript{14} Even then the Negroes got it only because they had obtained the right to vote on city bond issues and in a close election on school bonds agreed to vote for the bonds only on condition that a portion of the money would be spent on a Negro high school.
tively large city. North Carolina has made great strides in Negro education, but Negro schools are still behind those of the whites. In many a community school officials who do aid Negro schools say they do it as quietly as possible lest the whites think too much money is being spent on Negroes. Negro salaries were pitifully low even before the depression—in South Carolina from $240 to a maximum of $360 a year. Negro schools, like all others, have suffered from the depression. An unskilled factory worker laboring in 1933 at the minimum “blanket code” rate for a year received $728. One of every thirteen Negro teachers received $25 a month or less, which meant $100 or $150 a year or less.\textsuperscript{18} Besides, in some communities Negro schools have been closed entirely in order that white schools might keep open during the depression.\textsuperscript{18}

The result of all this is lack of ordinary school equipment, overcrowded classes, and schools held in dilapidated churches or wretched shacks that look as if they might tumble down before school is dismissed. The usual Negro school has from fifty to seventy pupils of all grades under one teacher. In 1934, of 3434 Negro schools in Georgia, 2568 were one-teacher schools; 566, two-teacher schools. This means that only 8.7 per cent of Georgia's Negro schools had more than two teachers. Of the 5685 Negro teachers, 3134 or 55.1 per cent taught in one- or two-teacher schools. Only 2747 or 47.0 per cent held state certificates.\textsuperscript{17} When the Legislature of South Carolina passed the new, still rather easy certification law, it was found that only 10 per cent of the Negro teachers could qualify, and so the law had to be indefinitely suspended for them.\textsuperscript{18} The average teacher of a one- or two-teacher school has had no schooling beyond the eighth or tenth grade in a similar school, with perhaps a little work in town. Training schools are scarce, poor in

\textsuperscript{18} See H. K. Beale, op. cit., chap. VII, section 8.
\textsuperscript{17} Interview with J. C. Dixon, J. C. D. to H. K. B., July 14, 1934.
\textsuperscript{18} Committee on Research Investigation, op. cit.
quality, and beyond the reach of a $240 or $360 a year salary. The industrial education movement overlooked the fact that high schools and colleges were necessary for the training of teachers. The teacher's salary is so low and Negro homes so poor that the rural teacher often has to board in a shack, where he and a large family live and sleep in the same room. The home environment of pupils is so bad that the problem of teaching would tax the powers of the best trained of teachers. Negro schools usually run for only four to six months instead of the eight of white schools. Certain states are proud of having pulled them all up to a six months' term. Compulsory school laws, where they exist, are not enforced for Negro children, and attendance is irregular. In cities shortage of buildings necessitates two or three short-session schools a day in some places. No books are available to the rural teacher, and he usually has never formed a reading habit anyway. His children, who come out of homes with no books, read so slowly that he must make much shorter assignments than in Northern schools. Even in cities, books are not available because "Jim Crow" rules apply to libraries, and, where Negro "branch libraries" exist, they are not branches through which Negroes may draw books from the main library but pitiful separate collections of the few books the Negro fund can afford or old ones discarded from the main library. Only where a Rosenwald Library or the library of a Negro university like Atlanta or Fisk is available, can a Negro teacher get books for his own reading. Most of the controversial subjects, whose discussion is a problem to teachers in Northern towns, the Southern Negro teacher has never heard of. He is lucky if he can pass examinations on accepted subjects. To talk about freedom for a teacher under the physical handicaps that surround the average Negro teacher in the deep South is fantastic.

Negroes even in the North have little or no voice in school administration, but in the South even whites give little attention to the administration of Negro schools. Negro teachers are usually selected on chance considerations. County superin-
tendents do not give the same care to choosing them that they give to whites. They often feel that anything is good enough for "nigger schools." Whites tend to pay no heed to immorality in Negro teachers because, oh, well, it does not matter with "niggers." In one Southern city an elderly and dictatorial principal of a white school, charged with brutality to white children, investigated in a public hearing for an alleged severe whipping, then moved to another principalship to avoid taking formal action, was finally made supervisor of Negro schools. He could do no harm there. In many places, discarded textbooks are sent to Negro schools. Negroes never participate in choosing texts. Charleston is proud of its textbook committees of teachers, but they are all white teachers. "The white teachers know better what books are desirable for the Negroes." The one exception is Negro history and life. Negro teachers are sometimes allowed to choose texts in this. One liberal superintendent let his Negro supervisor inaugurate a course on the Negro and choose the text. The superintendent merely inspected the books chosen to be sure there was nothing in them that would cause trouble. North Carolina has accepted a course in Negro history for high-school credit throughout the state. In one Georgia city a booklet, Georgia in the Nation's News, that presented the Negro as a clown, was being used in the public schools. The threat of a private-school teacher to send it to Du Bois for publicity, obtained its removal.

In 1932–1933 the chairman of the book committee of North Carolina did ask an outstanding Negro to review the geographies to see if they contained anything objectionable to Negroes. This, however, is unusual in the South. Most texts are written from the point of view of the superior white man. It is very hard to find any that satisfies the Negro as fair to him. Yet even if he could find them, he usually could not use them, since the white man chooses the texts and prefers the other kind. Besides, most Southern states have exclusive adoption laws that provide only one text and prevent the adoption of another for Negro schools or else follow a practice whereby
new texts go to white schools and cast-off ones are passed on to Negro schools. In 1934 one of the large textbook publishers wanted to publish a Negro reader by competent Negroes, endorsed by prominent Negro and white educators, and illustrated with Negro pictures. The experts agreed it was an excellent book that would have a wide appeal to Negro schools. But the project had to be abandoned because investigation showed that adoption practices of Southern states, where the Negro schools are, would make it impossible for Negro schools to use it.¹⁹

One serious limitation on Negro teachers has been the domination of old-school Negro preachers. They long controlled the community and the teacher and were ultraconservative. They have been powerful enough to make life miserable for a woman teacher and to cost her her position if she opposed one of them. They are often poorly educated and resent training or ideas superior to their own. Now the preachers are losing their hold. They are alarmed and distressed over it, but the teacher, even religious as she usually is, rejoices.

To those really concerned about Negro schools,²⁰ morality has been a problem, too. Because he is trying to live down slave morality, because the teacher is a leader in the community, and perhaps because the whites hold Negroes to so loose a standard, particularly strict moral standards are held up for the Negro teacher. In spite of the handicaps of slave tradition, the necessity of living several in a room, and the loose standards to which whites have held Negroes, the Negro teacher has stood up well. State superintendents in two Southern states report moral breakdowns less frequent among Negro than among white teachers, though for the race as a whole the reverse is true. Nevertheless, the problem of raising moral standards creates frequent trouble.

"Conservatism of Negro parents," says H. L. Trigg, "is a limitation upon the personal life of teachers, and might be a

¹⁹ Interview with an official of that firm, January, 1935.
²⁰ For the attitude of many whites toward Negro immorality see supra, 446.
limitation on their academic life were it not that they are generally unable to understand and interfere with the inside workings of the school. But Negro teachers are, themselves, very conservative anyway.\footnote{H. L. Trigg to H. K. B., July 24, 1934.}

Personal politics, bickerings, jealous feuds, and scandals frequently disturb Negro schools. Negroes as a race and as educators, yet have to learn the art of cooperation. White friends of Negroes are impressed with the tendency of one Negro educator or scholar to depreciate to a white friend the abilities and views of other Negroes that white man knows and respects.

There are good Negro school systems. North Carolina schools are much better than those farther South. Larger towns like Atlanta usually have better schools. Other places like Columbia, South Carolina, have good schools because fair-minded superintendents have interested themselves in improving the Negro schools. In the best of them, however, the Negro teacher lacks the freedom of whites, and in most of them Negroes are forced to teach largely vocational subjects.\footnote{The finest Negro high school in North Carolina, for instance, which is at Winston-Salem, is largely a vocational training school, though, unlike Negro high schools in many places, it does prepare for college. Cutting off of supplementary local funds in 1933–1934 has forced the discontinuance of a great number of vocational classes.} Besides, so bitter is race jealousy even in communities with the better Negro schools that what is done for them must often be accomplished clandestinely and concealed from the community.\footnote{The Negro supervisor and superintendent in one city with good Negro schools insisted that their identity and that of the city be concealed in this volume. Particularly dangerous were statements that the Negro supervisor helped choose Negro teachers and a Negro history, and a description of cordial relations between the Negro supervisor and his fair-minded superintendent, who, on the supervisor's suggestion, ceased calling Negro teachers Mary Doe and used "Miss" Doe instead. "We have spent many years," wrote the supervisor, "building up . . . a sentiment favorable to Negro education, and widespread publicity to many of these minor details would undo in a single stroke what we have been able to achieve through the years. These paragraphs coming from a 'Northerner' would create a resentment which would fall heavily upon our schools throughout the City and State."}

Among Southern Negroes there is little intellectual com-
panionship for a well-trained teacher. Yet he cannot seek it among whites of his own attainments. Even if he could find whites to accept him on equal terms, he would not dare mingle with them except on professional business as no Negro teacher could hold his position who was known to mingle socially with whites. "Jim Crow" laws cause inconveniences and humiliations. The cultural life of the community is largely white, and that is closed to Negro teachers. They are barred from parks, bathing beaches, recreational centers for which their taxes help pay. They are subjected to the same indignities as the roughest field hand for, where color is involved, good manners and education do not count in the deep South. Even the most brilliant college professor, if black, is treated as a pariah. Du Bois, brilliant author of numerous books and Harvard doctor of philosophy who has also studied abroad, was described during his professorship at Atlanta University by Mary Ovington, a white woman:

Yet Atlanta had to endure the knowledge that its most distinguished citizen was black. Of course, as few as possible knew it. No contact was ever permitted with an educated black man. He must not touch the white world. If he entered a street car, he would be assigned a rear seat away from the whites. He might not enter the public library, he whose private library added dignity to the city. Drama and music were closed to him save on the most humiliating terms. He was never invited into a Southern white man's home. He, on his part, despised the city's terms and lived almost as though it did not exist. He never entered a street car; he walked or took a cab. He never crossed the threshold of theatre or opera house. His world was on the University campus, and there among his friends he did his work. . . . Occasionally friends and admirers from the North and from abroad came down to see him. They stopped at a hotel into whose lobby he might not step. . . . And to acquire wisdom they went up the hill to see this colored "untouchable." ²⁴

In Atlanta the written law is that Negroes must sit in the rear

²⁴ Mary White Ovington, Portraits in Color, 82–83.
of the car and whites in the front. The unwritten law is that no Negro woman may be seated anywhere in the car while a white man stands. Shortly before the author's visit to Atlanta, two good-mannered, quiet, intelligent Negro women, both college students, were seated in a Walker West View street-car, when two white college men entered. In accordance with Atlanta custom the women had to surrender their seats in the "Negro part of the car" to the white men. They had books and packages to gather up and did not move quite so quickly as the men thought they should. So one white "Southern gentleman" struck one of the Negro women a blow across the face. If these women become teachers, they will know how to "keep their places." **

But no Negro teacher must complain about what he regards as injustices. In Charleston, recently, after repeated urging from the white members of the Interracial Committee to speak frankly, a Negro high-school teacher gave an address at the annual meeting of the interracial group, in which he pointed out with what he regarded as irrefutable evidence that in the past fifteen years the community attitude has grown steadily worse for the Negro socially, educationally, economically. He also read from Langston Hughes's poem, "I Do." His dismissal from the schools was demanded because he had "preached social equality." He countered by asking the School Board what it meant by "social equality," by asking the Superintendent and a Gentile lawyer on the School Board, both Charleston aristo-

---

** "Jim Crow" laws are not interpreted in this way in North Carolina, Virginia, or other more northerly Southern states. Even in Atlanta some whites do and others do not avail themselves of this unwritten law to take Negro seats.

** That was the teacher's interpretation. A white member of the Committee writes, "In our monthly meetings we urge utmost frankness, but at the Annual Meeting, Lincoln's Birthday, which we have at last succeeded in alternating at a white and Negro church, and where we try to reach new people who have never even tho't along our lines, we suggest not giving 'strong meat to babes.'" Letter to H. K. B., July 23, 1934.

** A public meeting held in a white church with a Negro pastor and a Negro choir on the platform.
crats, if they ever had a Jewish attorney on the Board to their homes for dinner, and by pointing out that there were marked social inequalities within both races. He was admittedly the most brilliant Negro in the schools, but he was suspected of having agitated among Negro teachers for political equality. After a hearing and a reprimand, he was retained. One school official said it was because he promised never to mention social or political equality again; another said it was because investigation showed that he never had; still another said it was because the forces of freedom had won. In any case, his experience will effectively prevent most Negro teachers from protesting. In another Southern town a teacher recently lost his place because he said Negro students were not fairly treated by whites. In a number of cases in South Carolina, on the other hand, white superintendents have stood by Negro teachers under attack for things they have said.

Several subjects are taboo among Negro teachers. They are not forbidden by specific ruling. Negro teachers rarely get into trouble for discussing them. The Southern attitude is decided enough and so well known to Negroes that they simply do not discuss them. Furthermore, a Negro is almost certain to be misinterpreted if he does express views on controversial subjects. One of the taboos is politics: advocacy of Negro political activity or discussion of the “right” to vote. Recently, in South Carolina, the Negro State Teachers’ Association chose as the subject of discussion at its annual meeting, “Training for Citizenship,” an apparently harmless topic generally urged as one of the chief aims of the schools. As “wiser” Negroes thought it over, they feared the effects of the subject upon certain whites and decided it might injure the Negro schools to use

28 A white member of the Interracial Committee says, “I was very much surprised that he kept his place in the schools. The only comment I heard . . . was that he was a fine teacher, and that the Board did not feel responsible for him outside of his work. . . . I think that many of the most intelligent Negroes felt with me that we had won a victory as far as the School Board went.” Letter to H. K. B., July 23, 1934.
the word “citizenship” in connection with Negroes. So they changed the topic to “Character Training in Education” and then went ahead with the same program. In a recent book Woodson writes, “A few years ago a rather youthful looking high school principal in one of the large cities was unceremoniously dismissed because he said jocosely to the president of the board of education, in reply to his remark about his youthful bearing, ‘I am old enough to vote.’ ‘Horrors!’ said the infuriated official. ‘Put him out. We brought him here to teach these Negroes how to work, and here he is thinking about voting.’”

The race question is the question most vitally important to Negroes. Whites, however, must never know it is being discussed, and there are always some Negroes who will seek favor with whites by “telling on teacher.” The subject is sometimes guardedly discussed in class. But fear both of the white community and of the rashness of Négro youth makes most teachers avoid it. They are afraid of injuring not only themselves but the cause of Negro schools. Indirectly, however, teachers do get their ideas across to pupils. There are only a few whites whom any one Negro trusts. A Negro generally regards all but one or two Southern whites as enemies. However “friendly” a white man is, Negroes distrust him because of his attitude toward their race, because they are always subject to injury from him, and because the friendliest whites never really favor the fullest development of the Negro race. So Negroes never feel entirely free to talk to whites. Almost all teachers have a philosophy on this, and by subtle methods they instil it into their pupils.

Partly because county boards are usually illiberal and often illiterate farmers, and partly because the Negro community is even more religious and conservative than white communities, Negro teachers avoid many subjects like evolution and prohibition. “Radicalism” would not be tolerated. Discussion of communism or socialism would be impossible. But then the average

---

Negro teacher would not know what socialism is and would be as ignorant about and afraid of communism as the white man. One of the signs of radicalism usually forbidden is subscribing to the *Crisis*, edited by the "radical" Du Bois. Two or three years ago the dismissal of the president of the South Carolina (Negro) State Teachers’ College was demanded because he advertised in the *Crisis*. He was not dismissed, but he had to stop the advertising. President J. E. Shepherd of the North Carolina College for Negroes at Durham deemed it wise to cease advertising after the same experience. A Florida county superintendent forbade teachers to read the *Crisis*. "Many would not dare in other states," said one supervisor, "even if they wanted to which is unlikely, and even if they had the money which is still more unlikely." Few public-school reading rooms would be allowed to have it.

The most strictly forbidden of all subjects is "social mingling" or "social equality" of the races. In 1923 a New Orleans Negro teacher was dismissed because, in a paper he edited, he reprinted a news item under the heading "Bill Eliminating Race Distinction Introduced in Kansas Legislature. Proposed Bill Would Eliminate Theatre and Hotel Discrimination." Though he stated clearly that he had not advocated social equality in his paper or in his school, he admitted to the Board that he believed in it. "Of course," wrote the President of the School Board, "the members of the board, the elected representatives of our Southern civilization, did not hesitate an instant, upon hearing such a statement, to summarily dismiss a school teacher presenting such views." 

In Knoxville, Robinson, principal of a high school, was invited to march his Negro pupils in an Armistice Day parade. He said he would not if they were segregated. He was promised they could march with white schools. Then the whites tried to turn trucks in between Negroes and whites. The next year he was given a good place. The third the whites refused to yield. So he gave a half-holiday

---

80 *Crisis*, XXVII (December, 1923), 76.
to his school, and told his pupils they could march if they wished, but that he would not. His remarks got out, and though it did not yield, pressure was put upon the School Board to dismiss him.**

Few Negro teachers in the South have security of tenure. They not only have no permanent tenure and no right to a hearing, but they do not even have a yearly contract. In the far South, except in a few large cities, they are subject to dismissal without cause. Economic conditions, decreased income from taxes, or a falling off in attendance may be used at any moment as an excuse for closing a Negro school or for dropping one of the teachers in a two-teacher school. Teachers often do not know whether they will be allowed three, four, five, or six months, as the term is often irregular depending on funds left over for Negroes after white schools are cared for. *** A leading Negro in a Southern city said, “The colored teachers have no protection against instant dismissal. They need their salaries and don’t dare do anything about conditions.” “No Negro teacher would feel it worth while to fight the thing out and if he did he would lose,” said one white state supervisor of Negro schools. “No Negro could enforce legal claims against a white school board. No Negro will go to court if he can avoid it. He feels it is useless; and it hurts him.” One home economics teacher did threaten court action when the county superintendent put the Slater Fund money that was due her as salary into

** Interview with W. A. Robinson; W. A. R. to H. K. B., July 24, 1934.

*** School laws often provide the same school term for blacks and whites but are just disregarded in Negro schools. In 1933 the South Carolina Legislature almost passed a bill to support white high schools for eight months, white elementary schools for seven, and all Negro schools for four. The Negroes opposed the bill and succeeded in getting it passed for eight and seven months for all schools. Of course, the Negroes know that the superintendents will get around it, but they feel that even if Negro schools are kept open for only four months in practice, it is a great gain to have the law itself give them equal footing. Critics feel that this merely increases the Southern tendency to justify itself by pointing to “legal” positions on the Negro problem which practice belies and is intended to belie. Critics feel that legal hypocrisy of this sort injures rather than aids Negroes.
the general white school fund. In the end, however, she had to
give up the case. A Negro county supervisor says the thing
Negro teachers and schools need more than anything else is
economic security. In one Southern city, where the maximum
salary is $62 a month for a short term, a group of Negro teachers
recently began to discuss salaries. An effort was made to organ-
ize the teachers to ask for more. But the teachers became afraid
it would either hurt the schools irreparably, or, since they had
no security, cost the teachers their jobs and give them the reputa-
tion of agitators. So most of them became alarmed and re-
fused to sign even a simple request for more than $62 a month.

An even more terrible insecurity hangs over every Negro
teacher. In a land of lynch law for Negroes, no one is safe. Vi-
olence or rough treatment by officers of the law may befall any
Negro without any contributory act on his part. He usually
cannot complain or get redress in the courts if the offending
party is a white man. One experience will illustrate. In a cer-
tain Southern city, a competent and much respected Negro su-
pervisor of many years’ service recently went to the railroad sta-
tion to take a train to the State Teachers’ College for a summer
course. She was happy in anticipation of a summer’s advanced
study. The guard gruffly forced the Negroes back off the plat-
form until the whites were in the train. A New York excursion
of Negroes crowded the waiting room. As they waited, she saw
a white trainman coming toward her husband with a black-
jack in his hand and intent to kill in his eyes. Her husband’s
back was turned. She grabbed the man’s arm as he struck and
warded off the blow so that her husband was not killed—merely
left unconscious in his own blood on the floor. A station guard
who knew her told the trainman he had made a mistake. Her
husband’s only offense was that he was of the same general
type of Negro as a New Yorker on the morning train who, not
used to the ways of the South, had stood up for his rights in
an altercation with the trainman. All Negroes of a type looked
alike to the trainman as to many whites. Cheered on by white
friends he had returned to teach the “impudent nigger,” who had argued with him, his place. No attempt was made to arrest the intended murderer. He was white. Instead, the injured Negro was brought into court for unprovoked assault on the trainman, and several white men who were not near the Negro waiting room swore that they saw the Negro attack the trainman. Fortunately, both the supervisor and her husband were respected by influential whites and known to be “safe Negroes.” They therefore had reputable white character witnesses. The case was dropped. White friends helped them sue and collect damages from the railroad. Had they not been well known by influential whites or had the trainman’s blow been successful, this efficient supervisor might have been rewarded for years of service by being set to scrubbing floors, through an event over which she had no control. This has made her do a lot of thinking. She believes that legal and social security against this kind of catastrophe is what the Negro teacher needs more than anything in the world.**

Finally, the Negro teacher’s freedom is restricted by a survival of the old slave psychology. Fundamentally the Southern white attitude is still that of master toward slave. He regards the Negro as an inferior being, who must be controlled by whites. The great majority of Southern Negroes are discouragingly backward. It is, however, their slave background, their lack of education, and the determination of Southern whites to keep them this way that makes them backward. The white resents intelligent, educated Negroes, for they refute his basic philosophy of racial inferiority. The accomplishments of Negroes in the North, the groups of cultivated Negroes found in Northern cities, and Negro contributions to American culture give evidence that it is the old slave psychology of the South that keeps the Negro “inferior.” In the Army intelligence tests during the War, the Southern Negro was decidedly inferior to the Southern white. The intelligence of the Southern whites,

---

** Interview in March, 1933; letter to H. K. B., Nov. 16, 1934.
on the other hand, was "practically identical" with that of Northern Negroes. Both in turn were decidedly inferior to the Northern white. All of this, however, must be assumed to reflect educational opportunities rather than inherent intelligence. The old slave psychology of whites is more restrictive of Negro teachers' freedom than all specific restrictions together. The white man wants and often gets a Negro teacher who is "a white man's nigger," who stands hat in hand before a white man, who knows enough not to sit in a white man's presence, who goes to the white man's kitchen door, who does not "put on airs" by acting as a normal self-respecting educated human being. Recently at a South Carolina State Teachers' Association meeting Dean Hancock warned Negro teachers not to dress too well because it would hurt their schools. Many whites like to see Negroes in cast-off clothing. They feel that a well-dressed teacher is getting too much salary, rising above his station. Good clothes are to whites a symbol of rising to the point of restlessness, questioning, perhaps even power. Dressing well might injure teachers or their schools. In 1916 a Negro teacher in New Orleans received this note: "Say, Mr. Nigger, you must move at once or we will burn you out. Tired having Niggers acting like white people, living in fine houses and singing and playing the piano. Last Warning. Give you one month to move out. Move across the street in those small houses suited for Niggers. Com. of White Men." Soon afterwards the teacher's house "caught fire." Du Bois tells of the troubles of a Georgia Negro who tried to teach in his native Georgian village after going North to school. He was finally dismissed because the son of a member of the School Board remembered that he was the "nigger" who by accident had bought an opera seat next to

---


the son in New York City—"tried to force himself into a seat beside the lady I was escorting," the son put it."

Some of the white men in charge of Negro schools combine domineering over the Negro with much talk about their affection for him. Often this is mere hypocrisy. Often it is the sincere feeling of interest in a poor inferior being. School boards are usually made up of white men who have never known any Negro but a servant or a workman. Many Southern administrators honestly and devotedly seek to serve Negro education. Yet with the exception of some of the state officials supported by the General Education Board and an occasional unprejudiced superintendent, the friends of the Negro share this attitude of condescension. Where the Negroes are allowed a representative in a department of education, he is put in the basement or in a separate old building. Even the excellent work of J. C. Dixon, the white state superintendent of Negro schools in Georgia, is housed not in the State House but in a dilapidated old building across the street.

One symbol of this white attitude is the white refusal to call a Negro "Mr." or "Miss." When a school administrator addresses his Negro teachers he calls them by their first names, or by their last names alone, or by their full names. He does not use "Mr." or "Miss." Every Negro teacher mentioned this when asked about freedom and resented the indignity of being refused the "Mr." and "Miss," after he had earned it by becoming a respectable citizen and teacher. At first the emphasis of both blacks and whites upon this apparently trivial matter seemed childish. Then a white supervisor of schools explained that, of course, she called Negro teachers by their first names as it would be very bad for the Negro children to hear their teacher addressed by a white as "Miss." Then, too, it became evident that the white men who are emancipated from the slave

\[\text{\textsuperscript{36} W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, } \textit{The Souls of Black Folk}, 229-230, 242-244, 245-246.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{37} This is a real problem even in North Carolina where Negro schools are better, but is much less of a problem there than farther south.}\]
psychology are usually the ones who say "Mr." and "Miss." Occasionally, there is a man like Superintendent Rhett of Charleston, who retains the slave attitude toward Negro schools but uses "Mr." and "Miss" probably because his unquestioned aristocracy makes it safe for him to do so without risking his "white superiority" and because, being an old-school gentleman, he is instinctively courteous—even to Negro teachers. Usually, however, the "Mr." and "Miss" symbolize the whole point of view of the white man using them. The General Education Board state supervisors use the titles. Superintendent Flora in Columbia, South Carolina, does. In one Southern city whose Negro teachers are freer than most, a new liberal superintendent spoke of a Negro teacher at a Negro meeting as Mary Doe. The Negro teachers immediately became antagonistic because this presaged an illiberal, unfriendly superintendency. But the superintendent had merely done it instinctively as a Southern white. His Negro supervisor felt free to tell him it was a mistake.\(^8\) Henceforth he always used "Mr." or "Miss." He won his Negro teachers by it, as this marked him as the friend of Negro education, which his relations to his Negro teachers have proved him to be.

Besides, the Southern Negro teacher is himself dominated by this slave psychology. He has always lived in an environment where his inferiority has been impressed upon him not only by the backwardness of Southern Negroes generally, but by segregation and forced humility on the part of capable and intelligent Negroes. All of his relations with white men are based upon his inferiority. Through their texts, their curricula, and the fields of study closed to him, Negro schools have trained the Negro to implicit belief in his own inferiority.\(^9\) Southern whites have taught the Negro to accept racial inferiority as the explanation of the position of the Negro. "Negro educators of

\(^{8}\) This relation between the superintendent and his Negro supervisor is itself eloquent testimony of the superintendent's liberal attitude.

\(^{9}\) See Carter G. Woodson's illuminating study, The Mis-Education of the Negro, especially 2-5, 18-22, 75-76.
today," wrote Woodson in 1933, "may have more sympathy and interest in the race than the whites now exploiting Negro institutions as educators, but the former have no more vision than their competitors. Taught from books of the same bias, trained by Caucasians of the same prejudices or by Negroes of enslaved minds, one generation of Negro teachers after another have served for no higher purpose than to do what they are told to do." The principal of the Laboratory School at Atlanta University gave to several hundred Negro teachers a questionnaire that contained statements expressing the white idea of inherent inferiority. The teachers were to agree or disagree with these statements. Here were Negro teachers answering questions under a Negro professor, where no white person would see their answers. Yet on the average more than half of them marked these statements of Negro inferiority as true.

These attitudes are often expressed by Negroes who are seeking favor with whites. Often the Negro supervisor makes trouble for Negro teachers through an effort to curry favor with his own white superiors. Most of what a Negro teacher says on controversial subjects is dictated by a desire to please the white man. He long since learned that this is the only way to get on. The Negro is dominated by fear. "You don't know what it means," one distinguished Negro educator told the author, "to live in constant danger just because you are a Negro. To this day if some one clapped his hands behind me and said 'scat' in a New York hotel where I know I am safe and welcome, I would jump out of my chair." For fear or favor, then, many Negro teachers simulate attitudes that deep in their hearts they resent. But many really feel inferiority. Others are resigned to their lot and believe that separation of races and quietly accepting a situation they cannot help is the best policy. One Negro supervisor says she believes the Southern Negro would not care about political or social rights if he could have eco-

---

40 Ibid., 23.
41 Interview with W. A. Robinson and the table of answers to his questionnaire; W. A. R. to H. K. B., July 24, 1934. See also W. A. Robinson, "As a Man Thinketh—," Crisis, XXVII (April, 1924), 275-276.
nomic security, justice, and a chance to live out his own life in peace. "Negroes with white blood in them suffer terribly," she says, "but a full-blooded black Negro has somehow learned not to take things as seriously as white people do. After all God knew when he made the Negro what the Negro would have to put up with, and He gave the Negro the faculty of laughing and not worrying too much over things he cannot help." 42 A North Carolina Negro educator said he believed "voluntary segregation or self-identification, but not necessarily isolation, was better for the Negro. If upper-class Negroes were absorbed into the white group, they would leave the other Negroes without leaders, and make the gap between the educated Negroes and the masses greater than ever." 43 Until the Negro can shake off his own slave psychology, he can never be free. How he can ever shake it off while he lives in the South is the great problem of freedom for a Negro teacher.

There are, however, encouraging signs. There are many indications that the white attitude is changing. Negro education was once opposed; now it is discriminated against but taken for granted. Vocational education was once all that it was possible to urge; now cultural education is becoming increasingly general. The first report of a General Education Board supervisor in Georgia in 1913 said it would be a waste to teach Negroes cultural subjects. Now there is one of these state supervisors in every state making a definite effort to provide and improve cultural education. Interracial committees and the study of the Negro in an increasing number of white schools have helped. 44 Many a white official or community has been won over by the quiet work of a good Negro super-

42 Interview in March, 1933; letter to H. K. B., Nov. 16, 1934.

43 Interview with H. L. Trigg; H. L. T. to H. K. B., July 24, 1934. One leading Negro educator's comment on this point of view was, "I am afraid Trigg is just trying to be tactful. But some day that attitude will make him a college president."

44 The work of R. B. Eleazer of the Southern Interracial Committee of Atlanta in promoting this study and the results which his correspondence reveal are illuminating; R. B. E. to H. K. B., July 16, 1934; letter to H. K. B., Oct. 20, 1934.
visor or teacher. Whites are beginning to favor Negro education on the theory that when you raise a Negro you raise a white man. All white men in interracial work and most Negroes testified that the white attitude is slowly but steadily improving. An increasing number of younger whites, a few of them teachers, are thoroughly emancipated from race prejudice. A few schools will now permit such a Southern white teacher to express his views. Furthermore, better Negro schools have succeeded in turning out many more educated and capable Negroes whom whites and Negroes alike can respect. Among the Negroes themselves are an increasing number who have ceased to wish to imitate white men and are building up racial pride of their own instead. They generally dislike Negroes who take advantage of their light color to pass as whites.

Washington was dominated by the slave psychology. Leadership has now passed into the hands of Washington’s opponents. The educated Negro does not like to talk about his inferiority. He is trying to throw off the slave culture. He objects to Negro melodies on expected occasions; he is embarrassed by shouting in church and by gaudy lodge costumes. He does not always want to be bothered with Lincoln because Lincoln once freed the slaves. He hates Africa and resents references to it. This desire to forget Lincoln and slavery leads Negro teachers to say “seditious” things about Lincoln.

Besides, the white indifference to Negro education has at least one great advantage among its many disadvantages for the Negro. Formerly, a chief difficulty was that Negro teachers had no ideas but the white man’s. Now, as a few are developing views of their own, they are discovering that the ignorance of whites about Negro life and Negro schools is an advantage. Few Southern whites really know Negroes as persons or personalities. Southerners know Negroes only as servants or members of a “class.” There are almost no intellectual contacts be-

---

between upper-class Negroes and whites. Teachers can believe and say and do all sorts of things that would not be permitted if the whites knew or cared about Negro schools. Negro teachers are far safer in criticizing cotton-mill conditions or community practices than white teachers, because in the Negro class is no relative of an operator or white business man to report what the teacher said. It is usually assumed that the Negro is too ignorant to know much about dangerous subjects that the more intelligent whites would not be allowed to discuss. Therefore on all controversial matters save the tabooed ones which are nearest his heart, the Negro teacher has more freedom than the white. The Negro schools are beneath the notice of many of the pressure groups. Even patrioteers do not bother Negro teachers, for there are dangers in making Negroes study the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary fathers. "You must remember," said one Negro teacher, "that we don't have sons of Board members, or powerful businessmen; we have no Jewish problem; and we don't have the U. D. C." Yet despite all this, one of the great Negro teachers of teachers said in 1933, "Every year I have less and less enthusiasm in telling youngsters to go into teaching. When one has to go around lying and repressing oneself all the time, it is not a happy work to help send new people into. I should rather be a ditch-digger than the average Negro teacher."

See, e.g., ibid., 183–184. William Pickens, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to H. K. B., July 23, 1934.
CHAPTER XXI

FREEDOM AND THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION

In the preceding chapters an attempt has been made to describe the situation of teachers in contrast to an ideal of complete freedom. It now remains to consider whether freedom is desirable at all. But before one can determine that, he must first decide what he desires education to accomplish. One great cause of disputation over freedom is the confusion even in teachers' and educators' minds over what the purposes of education really are. As one clarifies these objectives, he automatically solves many of the problems of freedom.

Originally religion, sectarian religion in fact, was the chief purpose of establishing schools. Then there was no chance for freedom in any of the subjects that touched religion. Where this remains the purpose there still is little freedom, though as we have seen, in schools like the Catholic parochial schools there are, within limits, possibilities of great freedom in teaching the social studies. In most public schools today, however, the religious purpose is not important. Where it does exist, it is non-sectarian and non-authoritarian and therefore not seriously restrictive.

Good character, formerly more often denominated morality, is another old and important purpose of education. When "morality" is the objective not much freedom is permitted, for morality usually means a rigid code of "musts" and "shall nots" to be learned and obeyed without questioning. Each generation tries to pass its moral code on to the next unchanged; in fact, each generation hopes to persuade the next to live up to an

\[\text{\footnote{See supra, 425-435.}}\]
ideal that its own generation never attained. Twenty-five states still have state laws requiring the schools to “inculcate morality.” Under this old conception a “good child” was an obedient one. Teachers and parents rarely took the trouble to explain the “whys” of good conduct. They merely taught children what religion or respectability dictated they must or must not do. Teachers and parents, themselves taught in this same way, often had never stopped to consider the reasons for conduct. Under a system in which morals were authoritatively imposed by elders, “freedom,” when men dared attain it, usually meant “license,” since no basis for freedom had been established and no better reasons for conformity had been “taught” than “thou shalt not” or “it isn’t done.”

Where “character building” in the modern sense of the word is the purpose of education, freedom for pupil and teacher alike is essential. Character in this new sense is based upon intelligent thinking and action of a free human being, capable of meeting new situations and making independent decisions in conformity with certain fundamental principles that he follows because he believes them reasonable. One “taught” morality. One “builds” character. Teachers of morality stressed obedience; builders of character emphasize freedom. Work of the sort that Goodwin Watson of Teachers College, Columbia University, is doing in developing programs of character building will, if successful, inevitably create freedom for teachers, because the kind of character he has in mind cannot be built except by free teachers in free schools. It is significant that in Omaha and Denver, which are favorable to this new mode of character building, there are liberal superintendents who have already created a high degree of freedom for teachers in their schools. “Lack of freedom,” says Goodwin Watson, “has had a bad effect upon character building. The fear of teachers to

---

2 Willard W. Patty, Legal Basis of the Public Secondary Education Program of the United States, 7-11.
3 In its Tenth Year Book the Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association presents a program of character building.
deal with love, sex, race, business ethics, and social problems has made adequate character training impossible.”

Opponents of freedom, realizing the important connection between character building and freedom, have tried in attacking the new education to make Watson the bête noire of parents.

To many Americans the chief purpose of education is practical: accumulation of factual information, the ability to earn a livelihood, increased community prosperity, greater efficiency of the working classes. One hundred years ago Horace Mann was winning support for a system of free public schools by convincing men of wealth that schooling would make their workmen more profitable to them. In 1846 he corresponded with employers and gathered evidence that the educated operative was much more productive than the uneducated. Later educators used similar arguments. In 1881 an official publication of the Federal Bureau of Education maintained the thesis that “education makes labor more skilful and more productive.”

In 1902 President Dabney of the University of Tennessee appealed to the South to develop its schools because industrial development and agricultural prosperity both awaited “general education of the people.” We have seen that it was on the appeal for industrial skill that Southerners were persuaded to supply schools for Negroes. Even parents of the middle and upper classes have sought education for their own children largely because of its advantage in enabling them to rise to a little higher economic level in life than had been possible for their parents. This “practical” purpose of education needs no freedom for its fulfilment. In fact, more efficient workmen, at least workmen better satisfied with low wages

---

4 Interview with Goodwin B. Watson, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, December, 1932.
6 See ibid., 230-231.
7 Emerson E. White, The Relation of Education to Industry and Technical Training in American Schools, 17.
and hard work, will be created under teachers who give them training in mechanical skills but do not teach them to think. A business leader, whose own education has not troubled him with a social conscience and has never set him to thinking about the social and economic problems of the world, will be more ruthless, more unscrupulous, and therefore more successful in a competitive business world than the man educated to think about fundamental values in life. Freedom for teachers is not only unnecessary but highly detrimental, if the object is to produce “practical” men, Babbitts, Rotarians, great bankers, brokers, and industrialists and their lawyers, equipped to pursue success in accumulating wealth by the ruthless methods of post-war prosperity even though their success plunged the world into depression and disaster.

If, however, the purpose of education is cultural rather than practical, then freedom becomes important. In these days, when depression has set men to thinking and given many a new sense of values, an increasing number of Americans are seeking an education that will provide more than material success that events beyond their control can demolish in a single year. A few Americans, even in the days of prosperity, looked upon education not as a means to material success but as a preparation for cultivated living, for richer use of the leisure that an industrial era was creating. Others now see that men who through their education acquired spiritual and cultural riches have not lost them in the depression. Furthermore, many have come to realize what a few urged before, that mechanical skill, wealth, industrialization, economic power can become a menace instead of a blessing, unless schools develop the intelligence and the desire to use them wisely. Many, who once talked of industrial training, now want schools to create a higher order of intelligence than that of the bankers and great captains of industry, whose power uncontrolled by trained intelligence and ethical standards led the nation blindly into disaster. In these days of confusion and of shattered faiths,
more men than usual are eager to find and understand the truth. To be sure, even in days of suffering, the average American finds it more comfortable to drink in whatever businessmen, high-powered advertisers, and political ballyhoo artists find it profitable to tell them. Yet more Americans than usual are ready to support schools that will provide not a means of livelihood but an ability to think out a way of life. Emerson once said, “The things which are taught children are not an education, but a means of education. The grammar and geography and writing do not train up the child in the way it should go, but may be used in the service of the devil. Education is the drawing out of the soul.” In discouragement he later declared, “The scholar seeks the ingenuous boy to apprise him of the treasures within his reach, to show him poetry, religion, philosophy, and congratulate him on being born into the universe. The boy’s parents immediately call to . . . ask him to procure him a schoolmaster’s situation.” A Boston School Committee pointed out: “He is not necessarily the best educated man, who is crammed with the greatest amount of knowledge. . . . But he is educated, in the true sense, whose mental habits enable him alertly and aptly to use his intellect, whose judgment is soundest, whose taste most discriminating, and whose affections are most loyal to the true and the good. Vigor of mind may be prevented by the overburden of acquired information.” Mill believed it was not “professional knowledge” that men needed from education, but “that which should direct the use of their professional knowledge, and bring the light of general culture to illuminate the technicalities of a special pursuit.” “The very corner-stone of an education intended to form great minds,” he averred, “must be the recognition of the principle, that the object is to call forth the great-

---

9 Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals* (1911), II, 412.
est quantity of intellectual power, and to inspire the intensest
love of truth; and this without a particle of regard to the re-
sults to which the exercise of that power may lead, even though
it should conduct the pupil to results diametrically opposite to
those of his teachers."\textsuperscript{18} At the time of the Allinson dismissal
the \textit{Cleveland Plain Dealer} declared, "The true line of edu-
cation is . . . in learning how to dig for, use and to suspect
‘facts,’ how to withhold final judgments, resist propaganda, see
problems in wider relations and perspective and behold our-
selves . . . as others see us."\textsuperscript{14} Schools cannot develop intelli-
gence, provide cultural equipment for the rich use of leisure,
and equip students to seek and recognize the truth, without
allowing teachers a high degree of freedom and cultivating a
love of freedom in students.

Development of “good citizenship” was the purpose of educa-
tion most talked of in the 'Twenties. Many states have laws
imposing this as a duty. Most educators agree that this should
be a chief aim of schooling, but when it comes to applying the
principle and deciding what good citizenship means, then there
is wide disagreement. There is the conservative group, which
seeks to use the schools to create unthinking obedience of laws,
community customs, and “public opinion.” This group be-
lieves a chief function of the schools to be passing on to youth,
unchanged, the attitudes of older generations. Good citizenship
to this group is static. One of its highest aims is preservation
of the \textit{status quo}. “The people as a whole,” says Professor
Counts, “lack the revolutionary spirit of their ancestors. They
believe firmly that the state should control the schools for the
purpose of making good citizens; but they regard the good
citizen as the man or woman who reveres the names of the
founding fathers, accepts the American form of government

\textsuperscript{18} Fred M. Campbell, “The State and the Higher Education,” \textit{National Ed-
ucation Association Department of Superintendence, Meeting at Wash-
ington, March 7-9, 1889}, 256.
\textsuperscript{14} “Allinson Hits Reaction in Educational Policy,” \textit{Cleveland Plain Dealer},
Aug. 30, 1931.
as almost divinely ordered, and performs honestly and, efficiently, but unimaginatively, the routine tasks of civic life."\(^{16}\)

The four heads under which the Department of Superintendence discussed "training pupils for citizenship" in 1919 emphasized negative qualities of respect, obedience, and duty: "(1) How to teach pupils that democracy involves duties as well as rights. (2) How to teach pupils respect for properly constituted authority. (3) How to teach pupils to respect the rights of others. (4) How to teach pupils faithfulness in the discharge of responsibility."\(^{16}\) There was no place here for progressive, reforming, questioning qualities, which would improve the institutions to which obedient respect should be given. The director of Yale's Psychological Laboratory stated in the late Nineties as a fundamental of his educational creed: "I believe that one of the prime duties of education is to train the child to obedience and self-control. It would be hard to say too much in favor of military drill for this purpose."\(^{17}\)

Under "the conception of learning which prevails most widely," says Professor Counts, "the major function of the school is to make certain that the child acquire in passive fashion" our "immensely valuable social heritage."\(^{18}\)

This conservative group makes patriotism a prime desideratum of citizenship, but its patriotism becomes unquestioning devotion to everything American just as it is. It wants the Constitution "taught," not critically to see wherein it can be improved, but with blind devotion to a document incapable of improvement. Patriotism means blatant nationalism—not analysis of national problems that the nation's policies may always be wise, but acceptance of Decatur's "My country right or wrong." It means flag salutes, lip service, denial of American liberty in the name of American liberty to any one who has

\(^{16}\) "Poisoning the Wells," *Nation*, CVIII (March 8, 1919), 340.
\(^{18}\) G. S. Counts, *op. cit.*, 127.
other ideals of patriotism. It means, above all, willingness to fly to arms without ever questioning whether the country's cause is either intelligent or righteous.\textsuperscript{19} When talking theoretically, many teachers do not accept this super-patriot definition of good citizenship. Yet, whether knowingly or unconsciously, the overwhelming majority teach this ideal. This is the "good citizenship" that the most powerfully organized promoters of citizenship lessons have in mind. Freedom for teachers is unnecessary, nay, incompatible with the inculcation of this ideal of citizenship.

Then there is a progressive group, whose conception of preparation for citizenship is the creation of independent individuals capable of intelligent judgments. This group wants to develop capacity for critical thinking. "I would try," says Rugg, "to develop in each youth the habit of using his own deepest convictions as to what is right in every personal and social situation which he confronts."\textsuperscript{20} Harry Charlesworth says:

The day must come when our pupils will be encouraged to gather all information from all sides concerning any topic under discussion and by a careful weighing of the evidence . . . come to a well considered and logical conclusion. Probably one of the greatest weaknesses of modern democracy is its inability to make well-considered judgments based on scientific truth. People's thought can easily be stampeded . . . Our schools can perform a great national service if they can remedy this situation, . . . [thereby providing] increasingly good government.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19} The supporter of this purpose in education, says Counts, "advocates with some feeling the teaching of sound economics and true history, meaning in each instance his own economics or his own history." G. S. Counts, \textit{School and Society in Chicago}, 29-30. For instance Judge M'Camant declares, "The chief purpose to be subserved in teaching American history is the inculcation of patriotism . . . I want our school children taught that our forefathers were right and the British were wrong." Harold U. Faulkner, "Perverted American History," \textit{Harper's Magazine}, CLII (February, 1926), 343-344.

\textsuperscript{20} Carleton Washburne, \textit{Remakers of Mankind}, 301; Jesse K. Flanders, \textit{Legislative Control of the Elementary Curriculum}, 1-2.

In 1927 resolutions of the council of the American Historical Association declared: In the study of the social sciences a scientific spirit and willingness to face unpleasant facts are "far more important objectives than the teaching of special interpretations of particular events." "It is not the business of education," said Payson Smith, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, "to tell people what to think. It is rather the business of education to show them how to think. The progress of American institutions does not depend upon one hundred per cent. agreement so much as it depends upon a sincere, honest and open mind." The American Federation of Labor's Committee on Education urged "that instead of emphasizing memory work and stereotyped judgments, the pupils should be given as large an opportunity as possible to understand forces and movements, to watch them actually at work, and to exercise their own critical faculties about social problems." Carleton Washburne says:

History and the social sciences in general should be directed not so much toward justifying or attacking past acts as toward approaching current problems in an open minded, objective manner and in the light of past experience. . . . Such an approach to the social sciences will inevitably lead to discussion of current problems. Not only should such discussion be permitted, but the lack of it should be recognized as a failure on the part of the course and of the teacher.

This progressive group insists that in modern industrial society conditions of life change so rapidly that a child cannot merely be given a fixed set of ideas and told to live by them. He must be equipped instead to adapt himself to a constantly changing world. Thirty years ago Paul Monroe said, "It is

---

33 Payson Smith, Radio Address, ibid., XIX (March 8, 1924), 275-276.
34 American Federation of Labor Committee on Education, Labor and Education Report . . . on Social Studies in the Public Schools, 9.
35 C. Washburne, op. cit., 336-337.
the power of adjustment to a changing environment, not the fixed adjustment in itself, that modern education seeks to secure for the individual as its highest product. George Mirick declared:

Democracy in education means not to impose upon others what we have and to make of them what we are, but so to influence them that they shall work out their own salvation, creating their own character, and developing their own conviction and ideals in the light of the achievements of the race. . . . The social order existing at any one time is but one attempt to solve the problem of adjusting individual aggressiveness and group interests. No principles have yet been discovered for solving this problem perfectly. Society is likely, therefore, to be always in process of change as knowledge and conditions change. The best interests of society require the acceptance of this point of view and the cultivation of a mental attitude of intelligent tolerance toward proposals for change and an intelligent participation in orderly changes. This attitude should be cultivated in children in and through their organized school life. It is possible to do this without weakening respect for and support of the present social order.

John Dewey warns educators:

The sense of unsolved social problems is all about us. . . . Unless education prepares future citizens to deal effectively with these great questions, our civilization may collapse. . . . H. G. Wells said, soon after the close of the war, that we were engaged in a race between education and catastrophe. Here in America, it might be truer to say that we are engaged in a race between a miseducation which will bear no vital relation to the needs and conditions of the modern world and a possible education which will face the future and which will defer to the past and its traditions only as far as the past gives us aid in effectively facing the future.

29 George A. Mirick, Progressive Education, 55–59. See also G. S. Counts, The American Road to Culture, 187–188; Superintendent Thralkeld of Denver quoted in C. Washburne, op. cit., 296; Professor Strayer of Teachers College, Columbia University, quoted in ibid., 293–294.
This progressive group wishes to create tolerance, international good will, social understanding. "The fundamental intellectual purpose of the school," says Rugg, "is practice in the tolerant consideration of the group problems of the community, the nation, and the world." In the Cleveland schools a committee of social-science teachers tried to work out a special course in which tolerance was the chief objective. There is great danger in this modern world of confusing indifference with tolerance. But in the class and international conflicts of an industrialized world, training in true tolerance assumes new importance. Carleton Washburne writes:

The development of a vivid and emotionally charged world-conscience is a major undertaking for education to-day. . . . The social-minded, world-conscious individual may safely be allowed to follow his conscience in case of apparent conflict between it and the state's command. . . . The safety of the state lies more in the check upon the majority or party in power by individuals and minorities which refuse to act in a way which seems to them fundamentally wrong, than in blind patriotism and obedience.

Peace and prevention of wars is another purpose of this progressive group. In 1931 the American Federation of Teachers adopted resolutions expressing this objective. A group of educators which included Charles A. Beard, William C. Bagley, Jesse H. Newlon, Frank E. Spaulding, James T. Shotwell, and Frank P. Graham issued an open letter declaring:

When the world war began, most Americans had little understanding of its underlying causes, for the conventional history courses in our schools had done little to give them an adequate understanding. Nor do most of them even now present with ade-

21 Wm. W. J. Dinwoodie, "Teaching Tolerance in the Public Schools," ibid., XXX (Nov. 23, 1929), 715-716.
22 C. Washburne, op. cit., 334-335.
quate realism the factors responsible for wars. Text-books in history and other subjects ... still reflect more or less the distortions of war-time propaganda. They fail to reveal that millions of citizens in all nations were moved again and again to acts of supreme idealism and unselfishness by propaganda of interested groups controlling national policies. Not yet has the selfishness and the falseness of much of that propaganda been exposed in history texts.

The duty of educators is clear. True patriotism is not served by ignorance and refusal to face facts and problems. ... Intelligent patriotism and consideration for our true national interests, as well as sound ethics, therefore, make it a professional obligation of the administrators of American schools to see that the text-books in history and other appropriate fields present truthfully and adequately the chief factors and influences operating in world affairs and producing the problems of peace and war, that they ... make it clear that economic crises and unemployment usually follow wars bringing insecurity and suffering to millions, and that they record the existence of a conviction on the part of many Americans that the United States has an obligation with respect to leadership in the reduction of armaments by international agreement. ... Only enlightened public opinion, based on accurate information and full and free discussion of facts and issues, can give to our nation real and adequate security. Dissemination of vital facts with honest discussion of the issues they involve is a major responsibility of the nation's schools. To aid in meeting that responsibility at this critical time is the high obligation of every teacher and school administrator in the nation.

Progress is an ideal of this group. But progress, to progressives, means not an increase of mechanization, speed, and the accumulation of wealth of individuals, but a solution of the social and economic problems raised by industrialization, in short, the creation of a better social order. Years ago Channing
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33 The N. E. A. in 1932 passed a resolution using almost exactly these words. N. E. A., Proceedings, LXX (1932), 673. See also supra, 52-53.
34 "A Professional and Patriotic Obligation," School and Society, XXXV (Feb. 27, 1932), 297.
averred, "The greatest truths are often the most unpopular and exasperating; and were they to be denied discussion till the many should be ready to accept them, they would never establish themselves in the general mind. The progress of society depends on nothing more, than on . . . the promulgation of principles, which are in advance of public sentiment and practice, and which are consequently at war with the habits, prejudices, and immediate interests of large classes of the community."  

Francis Parker declared, "I believe in universal salvation on earth through education."  

Dewey maintains, "The gaps between our machines and our ability to control them for human ends is widened because education has clung to old traditions and aims of culture in the face of the new industrial situation."  

George B. Logan says:

The first work of education is to pass on to another generation the best that has been thought and felt in the world; . . . education's still higher office is to evoke the creative intelligence that shall be able to mold society to a finer form. Hence it can never be erected into a closed system or expressed once for all in a formula; it must be fluid and experimental. If we are committed to the idea of progress we cannot get on without leadership; and we cannot have wise leadership without periodic revolutions in our ways of thinking. The youths we teach today will set new ideals of thought and action on which the education of tomorrow will build until the men it produces form still other ideals for the education of the day after tomorrow."

Du Bois raises the same issue:

Can we teach Revolution to the inexperienced, [he asks] in the hope that they may discern progress? No, but we may teach frankly that this world is no perfection, but development: that the

---

object of education is manhood and womanhood, clear reason, individual talent and genius and the spirit of service and sacrifice, and not simply a frantic effort to avoid change in present institutions; . . . the prime object of our training is . . . not the maintenance of present industrial caste but the development of human intelligence by which drudgery may be lessened and beauty widened. 40

In connection with the Allinson dismissal the Cleveland Plain Dealer suggested:

The higher, long-range objectives . . . of public education . . . are, concisely, the reinterpretation of the emergent ideals of American history, and their fearless application to the crowding problems of today; the salvation, or redemption, of democracy in the achievement of fuller economic justice and the conquest of unemployment; the reduction of a chaotic, competitive industrialism, in which warfare is implicit, to intelligible order and larger social planning; and the assurance of peace between classes and nations through the development of a conscious technique of co-operation in many fields, for the sake of the world commonwealth. . . . Such great ends as these are . . . to be sought . . . through the reconstruction, the thoughtful, fearless revision, of the major objectives, spirit and methods of public education. 41

An increasing number of educators are thinking in terms of social progress. "We in education," says Counts, "will have to develop some notion as to what the good life is and what a good society is, and make the schools an instrument for bringing this about. . . . Until the leaders of educational thought . . . grapple courageously with this task of analysis and synthesis, the system of education and the theory of education will but reflect the drift of the social order." 42 "I propose," says Rugg, "that the schools of each nation in the world should be regarded as agencies for social regeneration." 43 Kilpatrick wants history

40 W. E. B. Du Bois, Darkwater. Voices from within the Vale, 206.
41 "Allinson Hits Reaction in Educational Policy," Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 30, 1931.
42 C. Washburne, op. cit., 299; G. S. Counts, The American Road to Culture, 194.
taught "with the intent of developing such intelligent self-direction as will be able and disposed to criticize what we now hold dearest, and if possible, improve upon it."44 One of the great troubles, says Ellwood, is the popular view that the public schools are maintained for the convenience of the citizens, when they should instead be regarded as serving a great social purpose.45

These men hope that the schools will develop a social conscience. "The pioneer," says Hockett, "could safely be an individualist. Today when world integration proceeds with great rapidity, individualism is criminal. Young people must learn to think in terms of world progress, world coöperation, the welfare of all humanity."46 Kilpatrick hopes "to build such intelligent, conscientious, self-directing personalities that they will follow their best insight as against anything else, being at the same time, however, duly impressed with their own fallibility and with the essential need of coöperating to the common good."47 Rugg believes loyalty to the world community "the deepest social loyalty." "In case of an apparent conflict," he says, "between the two interests I would expect that youth would strive to its uttermost to reconcile the conflicting interests and achieve a peaceable solution in coöperation with the other people of the world. In case, however, youth was convinced that its national leaders were wrong, it should be willing to suffer in defense of its supreme loyalty to the world community."48

These purposes cannot be carried out unless teachers are free. Unhampered discussion, critical analysis, change, and reform are inherent in all of them. Freedom is their very essence. It is difficult to determine whether freedom creates these

44 Ibid., 305.
47 C. Washburne, op. cit., 300–301.
48 Ibid., 302–303.
ideals for the schools, whether acceptance of these purposes for education converts men to freedom, or whether these purposes and freedom merely grow up together in the same soil. In any case, the two inevitably go together. Fifteen years ago John L. Tildsley was persecuting radicals and pacifists. Today he is a leading advocate of freedom for teachers. Various factors wrought this change. It is significant, however, that now that he is a friend of freedom he is tremendously interested in certain purposes of education that could not be served except by free teachers. In an effort to make schools “create a body of citizens who will bring about a society in which our children’s children may live richly, efficiently, happily,” he recently issued to his teachers a circular letter describing the “qualities, attitudes, habits to be built up in high-school boys and girls”:

(1) The will to perfection; ... (3) the power and habit of analysis; (4) objectivity—the power and habit of arriving at decisions on the basis of evidence accurately valuated; (5) critical-mindedness—that quality which does not allow one to accept unreservedly a statement merely because it is in print or an oral statement merely because made by a reputed authority or person of distinction—not a denying attitude, never dogmatic, but merely “I wonder if”; (6) open-mindedness—a state of mind and attitude towards life which meets the strange and new with pleasant anticipations—the quality which leads one to survey one’s convictions in the light of other convictions resulting, it may be, in the revision of one’s own convictions; (7) tolerance—a positive attitude characterized by an awareness of one’s mind-sets and built up on the realization that everyone has something large or small in his experience that is worth while to another ... an eagerness to get the other person’s point of view, ... a willingness to credit the other person with honesty of conviction, and as a result of this process, the development of the power and habit of finding the best in other people; (8) the power to see things as they really are; (9) the courage of one’s convictions—intellectual and moral courage to carry into effect a decision intellectually arrived at, intellectual integrity, the willingness to be in a minority, to take a licking without loss of self respect, and not to be deterred from doing the right thing because of loss of prestige; ... (11) a highly devel-
opened imagination giving . . . the vision of an ever-enlarging universe; . . . (14) the sense of freedom achieved as the outcome of a long course of discipline; (15) resourcefulness—that quality which enables one to meet a new experience and deal with it; . . . (17) an inquiring mind—an intellectual curiosity which carries one constantly into broader, deeper, richer fields of experience; . . . (21) the capacity for continuing and endless growth; . . . (23) a highly developed spirit of cooperation; . . . (25) the ability to put one's self in the other fellow's place and not to take for one's self an undue share of the social product. 49

These purposes could not possibly be consummated without the high degree of freedom that Tildsley now wishes for his teachers.

These purposive issues resolve themselves into one fundamental question, which must be answered before the problem of freedom can be solved. Shall the schools indoctrinate 50 children with "correct" ideas or shall they equip children to do independent thinking? Shall their prime purpose be the preservation of things as they are or shall it be the training of children capable of creating a better social order? Most teachers have never given serious thought to this fundamental question. "No teacher is free," says Dean Holmes, "because we interpret education as a means of adjusting the child to the society which we have, instead of training him constantly to change society for the better." 51

A great deal of muddled thinking results from a glib use of

49 A mimeographed sheet of objectives sent by John L. Tildsley to the high-school teachers of New York City. See also New York Times, Dec. 3, 1933.

50 Professor Kilpatrick would restrict the term "indoctrination" to matters of dispute. He would limit its use to cases where one side would call the other unfair, to that kind of teaching which is meant to indoctrinate on other than merits. This is not the sense in which the word is used here. Here it means, what it usually does, planting ideas in children's minds by fair means or foul whether those ideas are controversial or generally accepted. Letter to H. K. B., July 23, 1934.

51 Interview with Dean Dwight O. W. Holmes of the School of Education, Howard University, June, 1933; D. O. W. H. to H. K. B., July 17, 1934.
terms without a clear analysis of their meaning. What, for instance, is the meaning of "teaching" itself? Great numbers of teachers and laymen insist that a teacher must teach "facts" and not venture into the realm of speculation. That is perhaps possible under certain conceptions of "teaching"; it may be possible in any case in grammar or mathematics. Yet even in science, where there is such popular devotion to "scientific fact," the evolution controversy indicates that there is not complete agreement on what constitutes a "fact." In the social studies agreement is impossible. There are certain "facts" that can be agreed upon, but the social studies would be not only dull and lifeless but hardly worth the trouble if everything but agreed "facts" were ruled out. One reason civics has bored countless thousands of American children into indifference to public problems has been that teachers have made them "learn" the "facts," namely, constitutional and legal provisions that tell how government should work and have avoided any contact with how it does work, because that leads into the realm of interpretation and ideas dangerous to the fact-worshipper. The minute one tries to study government at work disputes arise about "facts." The politician, the patriot, and the business man want the ideal theories taught, because to tell children realistically what actually happens would threaten the existence of things as they are. To them, therefore, "facts" become unrealities, which it is believed will inspire respect for political and business institutions. The reformer, the "radical," the realist wants children brought into contact with Tammany Hall, with business lobbies, with the many forces not mentioned in constitutions, which really govern us, in order that the child may know the kind of world in which he will live and may help improve it. But these are not "facts," says the conservative; they are opinions.

This generation has made a fetish of "scientific" study of the social sciences. "Scientific" has been a word to conjure with. Scientific method has increased the accuracy of the social studies,
but a series of accurately determined facts does not make scientific sociology or history. Most historians boast "objectivity," yet which of them does not write history from a definite point of view of his own? At least, they accept the premises of the capitalist order or go to the other extreme and, in becoming "objective," apply Marxian tests to all history. By the very rejection of geographic or economic interpretations of history, they mark out a point of view—frames of reference. It is merely not fashionable to admit this. When one deals with social subjects, which necessarily involve ideas, interpretations, and philosophies of life, to urge the teaching of "facts" only merely clouds the issue.

Most teachers say that they do not approve of propaganda in the schools. But what is "propaganda"? Most of these same teachers try to teach "right" attitudes or at least convey points of view about life. The Illinois Association of Elementary School Supervisors meeting in 1923 solemnly resolved: "We, an association of educational leaders, feel it our duty to defend ... American institutions, and to counter ... attacks ... upon a social order which it is one of the chief endeavors of the American school to build up." In 1934 Superintendent Campbell of the New York City schools pronounced it the duty of the schools to teach students "a right attitude toward American history and American traditions." These people would denounce "indoctrination," but to indoctrinate with "right" attitudes is merely teaching.

In a practice-teaching course in a university of Washington, D. C., a student recently reported on a visit to a current events class. The class had spent a school period discussing Karl Marx. The other students of practice teaching were amazed at the
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52 Resolutions enclosed in a letter of F. W. Rawcliffe to Chief Justice William H. Taft, May 14, 1923, Taft MSS.
temerity of a teacher who in Washington gave such prominence to this subject until, after a series of topics on Marx's life, the final topic assigned by the Washington teacher was announced: "Why socialism is not a remedy for our present American economic situation." One student of practice teaching objected that, if anti-socialist indoctrination was the object, this discussion method was not the best means of indoctrinating. With no discussion of the principle of "indoctrination," save only an aside that perhaps it would not be agreed without argument that showing children why socialism would not work was a desirable end, the professor of education spent the rest of the hour teaching these future teachers the best way to indoctrinate. Yet, both this School of Education and the officials of the Washington schools and probably the teacher in question oppose indoctrination—when it involves views they do not like. Snedden warns:

It is fundamentally important to recognize that contentious issues in the realm of the social sciences arise largely over interpretations of social values or worths. Only seldom are questions of fact, as the term is properly used in the natural sciences, in history, and in legal cases, involved. . . . The social science teacher can not avoid responsibility for the teaching of social "values," including those characterized by such words as right and wrong, just and unjust, honorable and dishonorable, moral and immoral, patriotic, humane, tolerant, honest, Christian, temperate, reverent and the like. . . . Successful teaching of social values necessarily means that the teacher shall be an advocate, a pleader, . . . a propagandist, a person believed by the supporting part of his public as of "sound principles." 54

Even reading lessons, through the selection of things suitable, inculcate a point of view. What teachers usually mean when they say they do not believe in propaganda is that they do not believe in it for the other fellow, or that no teacher should ex-

54 Interview with a member of this practice-teaching course, 1934.
press views not generally accepted. Whether they know it or not, these teachers daily propagate the ideas, prejudices, and conventions of the society in which they live. "In nine hundred and ninety-nine schools out of a thousand," Professor Strayer testifies, "the existing social order is being perpetuated." One really needs two words. If one limits "propaganda" to advocacy of changes in the status quo or the beliefs of some minority group, then many teachers would oppose propaganda who would favor indoctrination with community beliefs. In this form the question resolves itself into a choice between propaganda for new ideas or group interests on the one hand, and indoctrination with accepted attitudes on the other. Most teachers object to the former but practice the latter. Clear thinking on the problem of freedom is not possible until teachers become realistic enough to realize that, while they talk of impartiality and teaching "facts" or even of stimulating thinking, they are actually persistently indoctrinating children with their own and the community's points of view. It cannot be too often reiterated that it is only unconventional, progressive, or radical teachers who are not free to "teach" children what to think. If indoctrination is accepted as the purpose of education, then the question of freedom is whether those who do not conform to the views of the crowd shall have a chance to indulge in it. Shall the schools bulwark the status quo or shall they help create a new social order?

Still another point of view, however, is possible. Liberal educators may agree with conservatives that indoctrination with radical views is unwise, but insist equally that indoctrination with conservative ideas is just as unfortunate, and favor, instead, the training of children in independent thinking and the capacity to form their own judgments. If this is the object of education, then propaganda or indoctrination becomes undesirable, not because the teacher's ideas are unconventional or dangerous, but because propagandizing even for conventional

-- C. Washburne, op. cit., 293.
views violates the rules of sound pedagogy. In objecting to the contention that "the teacher would not be a teacher if he did not influence the children's conclusions!" Washburne declared, instead, that "he is not a true teacher if his mind is more focused on his own theories than on developing the child's power of thinking." The conservative teacher's belief in obedience and authority makes him more likely than the liberal to violate this principle. If independent thinking is the aim of education, then any teacher, whatever his views, must be free to express them in any form short of forcing them upon the pupil. On the other hand, if this purpose is accepted, then most teachers must be reformed, for most teachers, whether explicitly or unconsciously, regard their task as the imposition of these views upon children. Freedom for the child must be protected against arbitrary teachers as carefully as freedom for the teacher is guarded against the community.

Many educators are coming to hold this view of education. Emerson once said, "No truth is really our own until we have discovered it for ourselves." Froebel put it, "To have found one-fourth of the answer to a question by his own effort is of more value and importance to a child than it is to half hear and half understand in the words of another." Mill expressed it thus: "What the poor as well as the rich require is not to be indoctrinated, is not to be taught other people's opinions, but to be induced and enabled to think for themselves." Bode declares, "No teacher worth his salt can help influencing his pupils, but he shouldn't 'try' to do so. . . . The emphasis should fall on enabling pupils to develop an intelligent social attitude of their own." "I am more interested," Beard averred, "in getting children in the habit of demanding facts about situations and hearing all sides than I am in forcing any creed on them. In-
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telligent men and women well-informed can handle new situations as they arise." 61 The President of the University of North Carolina declared:

The business of education with men's minds is not to subjugate them, but to set them free; ... if men are to be educated men they must learn to respect facts, to weigh evidence, to reach conclusions based on facts and evidence, not on prejudice or preference; they must follow truth wherever it leads; in a conflict between authority and truth the higher allegiance is always to truth. 62

If this view of education is accepted, freedom for the teacher is absolutely necessary. This freedom can be attained, however, only if teachers and the public remold their conception of education. They must cease to look upon it as a convenient method of giving children the views and attitudes that teachers, parents, and powerful groups in the community wish them to have. When this is done, then freedom will be possible, but not before. Secondly, teachers must be protected against propaganda agencies of all sorts. At present children are not taught what educators or teachers or even responsible groups in the community choose, but what powerfully organized minorities are able to force upon teachers. Payson Smith, Massachusetts state commissioner of Education, warns:

The public school does not owe to business interests or to Labor interests or to special interests of any kind that there shall be constructed in the minds of young people attitudes and opinions designed definitely [by] and specifically helpful to those interests. ... Let the doors of the schoolhouse once be opened to the appeals of those who want economics or any other subject taught from the special viewpoint of a group of people, and they must remain open until the schools will be so crowded with the teachings of the propagandists that there will be no time or opportunity left for doing the work which is the primary responsibility of the schools. Moreover, the way to oppose the tendency in the direction of which I

61 Ibid., 305.
speak is not to meet propaganda with new propaganda. The right way is for all right-minded citizens to use their influence to keep the schools absolutely free from all propaganda of every kind and description."

This problem is not easily solved. The schools obviously must pass on to children the experience and the rich cultural heritage handed down from the past. Furthermore, children must be guided. They lack capacity for forming their own judgments. Few who talk of freedom for teachers and independent thinking for school children overlook these facts. Often, however, adults, also, lack the capacity to think. What advocates of freedom hope is that they may produce a new generation capable by the time they become adults of forming intelligent judgments. One cannot tell a child what to believe through high school and then expect him suddenly to begin to think for himself. Then, too, if a better social order is desirable and possible, children from their earliest schooling must be differently trained. Teaching under theories of freedom in education is not easy. "It is very hard to refrain from propagandizing," writes one teacher who is by no means a radical, "and one feels almost justified in issuing a little pacifist and socialistic propaganda to counteract the abundance of militaristic and capitalistic propaganda that the schools have employed for so long. It is a pity, that, as a rule, high school and grade pupils hear only conventional and prejudiced views on controversial subjects. . . . I think that a teacher should not propagandize . . . in class."** Freedom for teachers need not entail any propaganda whatsoever in the sense in which outside groups try to practice it in the schools. Indeed, free expression of opinion by teachers must not be undermined by allowing opponents of freedom to mislabel it "propaganda."


** Letter to H. K. B., June 28, 1933.
Shall the schools pass on the views of the older generation and help maintain the *status quo*, or shall they develop independent thoughtful citizens capable of solving the world's problems, or shall they themselves seek to create a new and better social order? That is the primary question of education. If the first, freedom for teachers is unnecessary and detrimental. If the second or third, freedom for teachers is so necessary that it will follow automatically upon the acceptance of one or the other of these purposes.