

and there her sterling qualities and genuineness, persistent endeavor to accomplish the best, kind considerateness and appreciation of the endeavors of others, marked her as a leader.

In 1918 she entered the stronghold of conservatism, the old College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., to give the first course offered to women there and to establish a department of home economics. This was pioneer work indeed; but after two years, at the call of the University of Pennsylvania, she left a well established department which would serve city, state, and country. One week before the close of summer school she was stricken, while hard at work. She expected then to be able to return at the opening of the fall session. Two months later she had gone. We in the work are left with a larger share of work to do because of her going, but with memories which will spur us to greater effort and will call forth our best.

SARAH M. WILSON

(Editorial from the Feb. 1922 *Journal of Home Economics*.)

VII

QUOTATION

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

It is not difficult to understand how those unfriendly to public education in America might look with disfavor upon efforts to stimulate and strengthen it by national leadership and assistance, but it is hard to see how President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, who has long been one of the inspiring leaders in that field, can assume such an unfortunate attitude.

There seems to be but one possible explanation: Dr. Butler does not fully understand the proposal he attacks. He has made a splendid case against an awe-inspiring straw-man and has delivered admirable Quixotic thrusts at menacing windmills, but his force has been wasted in combating a phantom evil.

A reply to President Nicholas Murray Butler's criticism of the proposed Federal Department of Education by the Public School Association of the City of New York, 8 West 40th Street, Howard W. Nudd, director.

He says, for example:

"It is now proposed to bureaucratize and bring into uniformity the educational system of the whole United States, while making the most solemn assurance that nothing of the kind is intended. The glory and success of education in the United States are due to its freedom, to its unevenness, to its reflection of the needs and ambitions and capacities of local communities, and to its being kept in close and constant touch with the people themselves."

Now, the Towner-Sterling bill, by which this proposed Department, with a Secretary in the Cabinet, is to be created, specifically provides:

"ALL the educational facilities ENCOURAGED by the provisions of this act and ACCEPTED by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered EXCLUSIVELY by the legally constituted STATE and LOCAL education authorities of said STATE, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise NO AUTHORITY in relation thereto; and this act shall NOT be construed to IMPLY FEDERAL CONTROL of education within the States, nor to impair the FREEDOM of the STATES in the conduct and management of THEIR respective school systems."

It does not require, we believe, even a modicum of that "broader scholarship," resulting from the "renaissance of the classics" for which Dr. Butler pleads, to grasp the limp meaning of this provision. The States can accept or reject any aid proffered by the Federal Government, but having accepted it they have full control of the expenditures, provided that they are used for the specific things for which the funds are granted.

What are these specific things? They comprise: the removal of illiteracy; Americanization; physical education, including health education and sanitation; the training of public school teachers; and the equalization of educational opportunities in the States. Dr. Butler says, however:

"The major part of any appropriation that may be made will certainly be swallowed up in meeting the cost of doing ill that which should not be done at all."

Does Dr. Butler mean that these things should not be done in a democracy which depends for its very life and progress upon a strong, healthy, and intelligent citizenship, capable of understanding, defending, and

perpetuating our American institutions? Does he mean to assert that such essentials of national safety and integrity are not matters of national concern, even to the extent of encouraging the States to accept financial assistance for carrying out exclusively under their own organization, supervision, and administration the facilities in their respective school systems, essential to achieving these ends?

Is it a waste for the Federal Government to offer \$7,500,000 to the States, on the foregoing conditions, in a land where over 5,000,000 persons ten years of age and over cannot read or write any language and over 3,000,000 more cannot read or write the basic language of the country?

Is it a waste to offer \$20,000,000 in Federal aid for physical education in a land where nearly one-third of the men examined for military service, who represent, no doubt, the average citizenship, were disqualified by reason of physical defects, ninety per cent of which could have been prevented by a knowledge of simple health rules?

Is it a waste to offer \$15,000,000 in Federal aid for the training of public-school teachers in a land where 300,000 out of the 700,000 public-school teachers have no professional training whatever; in which 200,000 have less than a high-school education; and in which 30,000 have no education beyond the eighth grade? The great university over which Dr. Butler has the honor to preside, has the greatest teachers' college in America. What, then, does he think of this lamentable showing throughout the nation? Would he like to have had his children taught by one of the 100,000 teachers less than 20 years of age who are largely the product of the meager school facilities in which they are now teaching?

Is it a waste to offer \$50,000,000 in Federal aid for equalizing educational opportunities in the States, when it is well known that the greatest need for improvement in education is found where there is least taxable wealth? The wealth of one State, for example, is \$14,000 for each child of school age, while that of another is only \$2,000. Abraham Lincoln said, "To all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life." Is it not to the interest of wealthy industrial States to promote education in backward States and thus make better markets for their goods?

And is it not essential to the safety and welfare of the Nation as a whole that there shall be no weak spots in its civic armour?

Dr. Butler views with horror the prospect of "inspectors roaming at large throughout the land," who "will not only fail to accomplish any permanent improvement in the education of the people, but will assist in effecting so great a revolution in our American form of government as one day to endanger its perpetuity." This would indeed be a calamity, and it is fortunate that these nomadic pests are but figments of an overwrought imagination. There is no authorization in this act for the appointment of Federal inspectors and supervisors. On the contrary the bill specifically forbids Federal control of education within the States. Not one penny of the money appropriated to the States will be used for administration of the act by the Federal Department. It does provide, however, for \$500,000 for administration of the department *per se* and for studies and research in fields of education that will be of assistance to the States in formulating their own policies and programs.

There are but three statutory requirements which a State must establish and enforce to obtain this Federal aid:

1. A public school opportunity of not less than 24 weeks.
2. Compulsory attendance at some school, public or private, for at least 24 weeks in the year, of all children between 7 and 14.
3. English as the basic language of instruction in all schools, public and private, in the common branches.

Does Dr. Butler consider these requirements excessive? There is nothing mandatory about them, remember. The bill does not say that every State in the Union *MUST* maintain these standards. It simply says that no State can receive Federal aid which does not maintain such meager educational facilities. Any State is free, therefore, to decline the Federal proffer and go on serenely exercising its rights in blissful ignorance.

As we said at the beginning, we can understand how those who are unfriendly to public education might oppose such a proposal, although there is no just ground for such opposition, as the act does not interfere in any way with the entire liberty or management of private and parochial schools. It has to do entirely with PUBLIC education.

It would seem, however, that a measure for the financial aid and encouragement of public education could not but stimulate all other educational agencies, whether private or denominational.

Our real surprise, therefore, is Dr. Butler's ire. Here is a proposal analogous to the early Federal land grants to the States for education and to the more recent grant of approximately \$100,000,000 a year to the States for promoting good roads. This proposal scrupulously safeguards the principle of State rights while expressing in tangible form the interest of the nation in the dignity and importance of public education as "the bulwark of democracy." It seeks to help, rather than to rule, in the task of educating children, in the same way in which the Federal Government has assisted in conserving mines and forests and in improving our National resources in cattle and swine. It assumes that, if the Nation can spend billions on the machinery of war, it can afford to spend a few millions on the machinery of peace and on preparation for personal efficiency if war should unfortunately come. This proposal provides also for an Advisory Council, which is to meet once a year at the call of the Secretary, for the purpose of inter-changing ideas and experiences in the field of public education. This Council is to comprise: the forty-eight State Superintendents of Education, twenty-five educators representing different educational interests, and twenty-five other persons not educators.

This is the horrible thing which Dr. Butler attacks. How can he reconcile his opposition to it with his splendid professional idealism?

VIII

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

EDUCATIONAL HYGIENE

The new and desirable term "Educational Hygiene," gives the broader meaning to the development and possibilities of the health movement through the schools. The subject-matter is presented in five divisions: medical supervision, physical education, school

sanitation, teaching of hygiene, and hygiene of instruction. In addition to explanatory chapters on each phase of the subject by the editor, the work contains most valuable chapters by seventeen well known specialists, each dealing with some recent development in the health movement related to his department. The various views are organized under the topics: Part I, Health Sociology; Part II, The Administration of Educational Hygiene; Part III, The Divisions and Practice of Educational Hygiene.

The text as a whole gives a very definite notion of our national health problem, what has been done up to the present time and what some of the possibilities are for a national health movement and its relation to educational development.

Dr. Rapeer brings out the idea that our public health improvement is being introduced by many agencies and by various methods, and that unless these agencies are systematized and brought together under a permanent standard, worthwhile results will not be obtained. He suggests that all these different agencies be brought together under a Department of Educational Hygiene. A suggestion of tentative standard plan is made, accompanied by a four-year course to be given for the training of the educational hygienist.

We wonder, however, whether these plans might not be more economically and efficiently worked out as a development of some already established four-year department, such as the four-year Physical Education Department, which is already including many phases of this work. Dr. W. S. Small, specialist in School Hygiene and Sanitation, U. S. Bureau of Education, states as his belief that the person who should undertake the health teaching is logically the teacher of physical education; and "the concentration of all physical welfare interests of college students in the Department of Physical Education," he states, "is already an accomplished fact in most colleges."

This very timely book, we believe, is in close touch with much of the best thought in its field, and should prove a most interesting and valuable addition to the literature on the subject.

ESSENTIALS OF EDUCATIONAL HYGIENE, edited by L. W. Rapeer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 448 pages. (\$2.75),

ALTHEA L. JOHNSTON