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FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1932

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT
FOUNDATIONS AND COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS.
Washington, D.C.

The select committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:05 a.m., in room 1301, New House Office Building, Hon. Brooks Hays presiding.
Present: Representatives Hays (presiding), O'Toole, Forand, and Cox (chairman).
Also present: Harold M. Keele, counsel to the committee.

Mr. Hays. The committee will be in order. We are very happy to have with us the president of Brown University, Dr. Henry Wriston. Dr. Wriston, Mr. Keele will conduct the examination, but you probably would like to make a preliminary statement. We would like to have you identify yourself and give any matters of official interest that we should receive as formal testimony.

STATEMENT OF DR. HENRY M. WRISTON, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. Wriston. My name is Henry M. Wriston. My present occupation is president of Brown University.

I think perhaps for the record I ought to say that as far as I know I am the senior college president of the United States at the present time, being now in my twenty-seventh year.

At different times I have been a professor at Western University, a lecturer at Johns Hopkins, then president of Lawrence College in Wisconsin, and for the last 16 years president of Brown.

While I was in the small-college world I was president of the Association of American Colleges for a time, president of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which extends from the Alleghenies to the Rockies, and then became the first president of the reorganized Association of American Universities, preceding Mr. Middlebush who was your witness yesterday. I think that perhaps identifies me enough.

Mr. Hays. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Mr. Keele. Dr. Wriston, we have asked you to come down here today to tell us something of the contribution made and the impact made by the foundations in the area of education. In that regard we are going to just give you your own lead on that. We would just like to have your views in such manner as you would like to present them.

Mr. Wriston. Well, I perhaps ought to begin with the thing with
which I have been most closely associated for a long time, and that is the question of pensions.

As you probably know, the colleges in a certain sense were ahead of the game on the matter of pensions. Somewhere around 1905 Mr. Carnegie was a trustee of Cornell and he asked what retired professors lived on, and nobody could tell him, and he therefore set up the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching. Its principal business was to supply pensions.

It is an interesting thing that Mr. Carnegie was so naive that he thought $10 million would buy anything, and he therefore gave $10 million to set up this pension system. There was no actuarial work done at all. There was very little known on the subject in those days, and by 1915 it was clear that they couldn't meet their obligations.

I was extremely sensitive to that since I had begun teaching the year before and was therefore one of the last names on the closed list. I lost my pension when I moved from Lawrence to Brown, but I have followed it ever since.

And the upshot was that Carnegie Corp. began to make grants to meet those terms, and finally made provision for a loan of $15 million so that in that field the foundation has spent many, many millions, I can't tell you offhand but my impression is it is well over 50 millions that they have paid out in pensions.

They will have to pay out many millions more, and the Carnegie Corp. supplemented what the foundation could no longer do by giving grants to it, and then set up an insurance company, the Teachers' Annuity Insurance Association, usually known as TIAA, of which I am the trustee of the stock and the senior in that. That is an insurance company for colleges and universities.

The capital was contributed by the Carnegie Corp. It was then turned over to a group of trustees of the stock. For some reason it was made a stock company and seven people served without compensation as the trustees of that stock to vote it, and that is now worth perhaps $350 million, and it provides annuities for the professors in many institutions, perhaps 150, maybe more.

Like all other businesses engaged in annuities, it found that with the advance of medical science and with the falling interest rate, it was in danger of not being able to meet all its commitments. Therefore, the Carnegie Corp. has made gifts to it of about $13 million.

It is now in good shape and has recently launched a new type of retirement called the College Retirement Equities Fund. In other words, long before social security, here was activity which had to be capitalized and could not be capitalized by anyone save by a foundation. And it has been a pioneer in learning what to do and what not to do and what succeeds and what fails.

Perhaps it is fair to say that one of the most important things, contributions of the Carnegie Foundation, was the fact that it became insolvent. It will become solvent again under the court order sometime after the year 2000.

We were allowed to spend all of our principal down to $10 million, which we could not spend below. We were still short, and so we borrowed $15 million without interest from the Carnegie Corp.

It hasn't been all borrowed yet but it will be in the course of about 12 months, and we will still be $21½ million short of meeting the reduced commitments, and I think that can be taken care of if we don't
get reversed by market depreciations or else we will have to go begging again to the Carnegie Corp.

Perhaps I ought to say, because I read Mr. Hollis' testimony, that while this is usually called a Carnegie enterprise, and it is in the sense that it was launched by the corporation, our dealings with them are arm's-length dealings and we have to go to them as any other group does. They have, however, I think some feeling of moral obligation because it was on estimates supplied to them that this organization was set up.

As I say, today the TIAA, as it is called, is in very sound financial condition.

That, then, is one of the first activities of foundations with which I became acquainted when I began to teach in 1914, and I have followed it of course ever since, either as a professor or as an expectation of benefits, and more recently as a trustee of the stock of the Teachers' Annuity Insurance Association.

Mr. Keele. May I interrupt you one moment, Dr. Wriston?

Mr. Wriston. Certainly.

Mr. Keele. Would you tell us something of the effect of that program of pensions on educational institutions generally in this country?

Mr. Wriston. It had the effect of stabilizing them enormously because, especially after the First World War or during the First World War, we suddenly discovered that professors had a market. Nobody had supposed up to that time that if you are a professor you could do anything else, but I was then a young professor getting $2,200, and in the course of the war or at the close of the war I was offered two jobs, one at $7,500 and one at $9,000.

If I had had no expectations of benefits ultimately I would have been greatly tempted to get solvent at that point. Instead I went back to my $2,200, because at that time the assumption was that I would get half my salary when I retired. As it turned out, I get none of that, because by moving to Brown I lost those benefits. You have to stay in a so-called institution on the Carnegie list in order to maintain your benefits.

Mr. Keele. Well, didn't they find that in applying pensions they had to determine what was a college or what was a university; and as a result of that, didn't they determine that they must have a certain level of teachers or average of teachers to students; and thereby wasn't the general level of education raised in the country?

Mr. Wriston. Yes. Mr. Carnegie in his deed of gift specified what he regarded as a college, and that was something which was independent of religious control. He had no idea, I think—I think the record is clear—as to what chaos there was in the matter of colleges.

The thing called college which gave an A. B. degree might be equal to a high school or might be equal to a university. One of the first problems that Mr. Pritchard, who was the first president of the Carnegie Foundation, faced was to determine what is a college. He has sometimes been given credit for what he didn't do.

The college entrance examination board had been formed in order to see that people who went to college had some background, and he worked with them, and I think it is a lively question as to which was the hen and which was the egg, but together they worked out that for admission to college you should have 4 years of high school, you should
have so many subjects—I think they said 10—and those had to be pursued a certain length of time.

This caused at the beginning a great deal of tension, particularly in the South. The interesting and significant thing was that when it was suggested that those should be eased, it was the southern educators who said, "Don't ease them, it will help us in improving our own situation if you do not."

And as a consequence of that, as you probably know—probably other people have testified to it—the general education board has put most of its money in the South.

More recently the grant-in-aid program had been wholly in the South, of the Carnegie Foundation, and still more recently there has been a grant, a rather rare thing in recent foundation history, of several million dollars to Emory on terms to strengthen its graduate program, and there have been grants of $1,200,000 to other southern universities to strengthen their graduate programs.

All of this stems from the fact that when they tried to determine what is a college, they found such chaos. It was also one of the factors which led to the formation of these regional groupings.

The Association of Colleges in New England, the Association of Colleges in the Middle States, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the one I spoke of earlier, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which has been a bellwether and a great leader in the matter of improvement of standards, and then others farther to the west, so that all of those things grew out of this grant in the sense that when you tried to determine what is a college, that dramatized the fact that there were such disparities as to amount to chaos.

The second thing upon which I can testify with some cover of authority is with regard to a recent grant.

At the close of the war the colleges found themselves in a very unstable condition. They had had most of their men students taken away, some had military units and some did not. When you had a military unit you didn't know whether it was going to stay there or not.

At the close of the war there came a flood of students and there came inflation. As a consequence, in October of 1947, a conference was held at the Rockefeller Foundation in order to see what might be done to stabilize college finance.

They appointed an exploratory committee, of which Provost Buck of Harvard was the chairman, and it made a preliminary report in October 1948. That proposed that there should be a genuine and thoroughgoing study of what was wrong with college finance, and the grant was made, two grants were made to the Association of American Universities, and I testify on this because I was then president and had the appointment of the heart of that commission.

Four hundred thousand dollars came from the Rockefeller Foundation and $50,000 from the Carnegie Corp., and in July of 1949 the commission was organized by five persons, of whom President Middlebush, who testified yesterday, was a member. They expanded that number to 12, 8 people from universities and colleges, and 4 laymen, and I was one of those.

That commission finished its work the day before yesterday and published its report, which consists of nine volumes. It is the first
comprehensive study that has ever been made of both public and private educational finance.

We published the first Atlas of American Institutions of Higher Education which has ever been published and which had somewhat sensational revelations in it. At least they were sensational to me. It showed, for example, that 80 percent of the students of college age live within commuting distance of some college, which has a great deal to do with the availability of higher education, obviously.

The central report was written by the commission itself, a very rare experience, but the 12 men undertook to draft their own conclusions, and those have been published.

Also they published a volume of great importance to higher education on who should go to college, and that I think is perhaps one of the greatest contributions, because there has been more myths about who went and who didn’t and why he went and why he didn’t than about almost any other thing.

And it showed—and I confess this was to my own surprise, and I mention that because one would expect being in this business as long—that he at least would know the elements of it, but we all learned an enormous amount about that, and we have discovered—that of the 25 percent of intelligence which certainly should be college trained, far too small a percentage goes to college. We also discovered—and this was a surprise to us—that financial reasons were not apparently the primary reason why they do not go to college.

And this was demonstrated by the fact that of this top 25 percent, a very substantial number did not graduate from high school, which was free. And obviously if costs were the determinant, they wouldn't have dropped out of that.

We also discovered that of the top 10 percent, which are among the very bright indeed, not much over 60 to 65 percent went to college, and a good many of them didn't graduate from high school. And of those who went to college, a good many didn't graduate.

When you get to the top 2 percent, which is almost at the genius level, there still were considerable numbers who didn't go to college. And we sought the reason for this, we found that the principal reason was lack of motivation.

One of the striking and I think shocking things is that that lack of motivation stems partly from family influences. There have been racial groups in the United States which had large families and liked to have them go to work early so as to have kind of a social security for the parents.

That doesn't prevail in anything like the degree it did 30 years ago. But the worst thing from my point of view was that many of the schools were defeatist about these students going to college, and did not either prepare them or profoundly encourage them to go to college. And that, I say, I think is a shocking waste of manpower in the United States.

It is something that makes you tremble. It is a reform which wouldn't cost anything except the exercise of intelligence and leadership in the educational world to make a great recovery.

Now I mention this because this was a costly enterprise. We had 10 full-time members of the staff and 11 consultants.

One of the other books which is of very great importance is three independent studies of the British experience in this. As you prob-
ably know, in Britain the universities are now supported to the extent of about 66\% percent by the Government. This includes even Oxford and Cambridge.

And in the so-called red bricks, the newer universities, it sometimes rises to 80 or 85 percent of all their cost, and I think in Wales it rises about 90 percent of the cost.

The question immediately arose as to whether in the United States there could be a grants committee on the part of the Federal Government which would ease the pain of financing higher education. We asked Prof. Lindsay Rogers, a political scientist of reputation and skill, to make a study. We asked Prof. Louis Hacker to make a study. He is an expert in another field. Then we asked President Harold Dodds, who knew most of the vice chancellors, and they each wrote a memorandum which is published in the book by the commission.

And arriving at their conclusions by different routes, by different methods and seeing different people, they came to the same conclusion, namely, that what worked in England was not exportable to the United States.

The other great conclusion of the commission which I think is of first-class public importance, is that there is no reason for hostility between the public and the private institutions. There is a healthy rivalry, of course, just as there is in all competitive enterprises. But they have exactly the same problems, and it is almost as hard in some States to get enough money from the legislature as it is for the private institutions to train the president to a sufficiently expert beggar to increase the endowments.

We did find, of course, that the obligations of public and private are not exactly uniform, but we found such a degree of harmony among them, so far as their inertests were concerned, that I think this report will go far to persuade the public that it isn’t either public or private. We need them both and both need each other.

Now, this as I say, was an expensive problem. The 12 members served without compensation. They had 18 meetings, the shortest of which was 2 days. Two of the meetings took a week. None of them got a dollar out of it. It cost them money, and they put in 3 years of very hard labor on it.

But the basic finance, the $450,000, could not have come, so far as we know, from anything except a foundation. If this study is as good as we hope it is—and our executive director, Dr. Millett, proved to be extremely competent—it will have a lasting effect on improving higher education in the United States. I don’t want to exhaust you. There are one or two other points I could make with which I have had some first-hand connection.

Mr. Keele, I think we would like to hear them.

Mr. Hays, I think so, Dr. Wriston, please.

Mr. Wriston, the next has to do with libraries. The library is the most expensive part of any university, not excluding its scientific equipment.

People think of the cost of a book when buying one for a library. That is only the beginning. You have then to accession it, you have to catalog it, and every book takes about 12 cards to catalog it, because the fellow who want to know something may not remember the name of the author, may not remember the title, and he has to
know a little about what it is about, but we try to build a catalog so that if he knows anything, he can jump into the middle of it.

One of my friends calculated that when you have bought the book, a modest-priced book, and have accessioned it, cataloged it, and shelved it and bought the cubic space for that book, the shelving for it is about $16 a book. One of the disheartening things is the better the library, the worse your problem.

If you have 50 books you can remember them. If you have got a thousand books you can remember them, but when you get a million books, you have to have extremely expert work. And even if a person gives you a book, you have to search the files to see whether you have it, whether you want it, and what disposition to make of it, and one librarian told me it was more costly to have a book given to them than it was to go buy it, because they never bought it unless they wanted it, whereas when it was given to them they had to find out whether they wanted it.

Now, this is a problem of such great importance that the foundations have given money to the American Library Association, they have given money to library schools, to have better trained librarians, and they have given grants to college libraries.

With one of those I had an experience when I was president of Lawrence College in Wisconsin. We had a small library of about 50,000 volumes, and the Carnegie Corp. made a grant to perhaps 100 colleges of only $15,000 apiece. That doesn't sound like much money to buy books with, but they also published a book by Mr. Shaw, the librarian of Swarthmore College, which was an up-to-date bibliography of the best books for instructional purposes, not textbooks, but basic books in the fields in which the colleges of liberal arts should buy.

And as a young man in the business and a beginner in college administration, that gave me the key for remaking that library as a teaching instrument. They also made a grant to the Association of American Colleges of which I was then president, for a book on how to teach with books, and Mr. Branscomb, who is now chancellor of Vanderbilt University, was commissioned to do that, as a matter of fact, I commissioned him, and that book called Teaching With Books is still very, very widely used.

In other words, this is a case where relatively small amounts of money and the grants in the library field, I think, run to perhaps $7 or $8 million—and that is considering the whole of American higher education a relatively small amount of money—has had an impact out of all relationship to the sum of money in building up, first of all, the concept of what a library should be, second the substance of what a library should be, and third, the use to which a library can and should be put.

One other field where a relatively small amount of money has, I think worked a revolution, is in the teaching of art. We are a practical people in this country, and when I was in college there was no course taught in art, and that I think was true of most of the colleges in the country.

It was extremely difficult for country colleges and even for universities to acquire the materials for the teaching of art. They couldn't go out and buy Rembrandts and other great paintings. Most of them
are far from the great museums, and the cost of travel has always been a serious matter.

And one of the foundations, the Carnegie Corp., purchased a collection of teaching materials. They got, for example, Rembrandt etching, the original plates, and had them steel-faced and made copies. They had first-class reproductions of the great paintings. They gave a catalog and then a basic small library for teaching art.

In this, I think, they spent about a million and a quarter, as I remember it, and it produced a total revolution in the teaching of art in American colleges across the country. It took a field where instruction was starving, and gave it a start.

Just one other interesting thing, and I think a quite striking thing in connection with art, with which I was also connected because at Mr. Keppel's suggestion I went on the board of the American Federation of Arts and served for a considerable period of time. He poured an enormous amount of money—I say, an enormous amount, a couple of millions—into organizations of that and other kinds.

And then at the close of those grants he had what he called an audit of experience, and one of the most illuminating books I have ever read was his candid explanation of how he had failed in his objectives in that end, as he said, the money could have been spent better if he had been wiser.

That failure again was important, because it explains one of the relationships which the foundations bear to institutions of higher education.

If I want to conduct a great experiment in teaching, I have already a staff and commitments which run me to a deficit, and I don't have what I call gambler's money. The foundations, on the other hand, have very small staffs relative to their resources, and they can supply that kind of risk capital which makes it possible for you to engage in experimentation. And that is what happened in art.

And, like all risk capital, one small investment, namely, in the teaching of art in colleges, pays dividends out of all relationship to the amount, and another investment in the organization of art pays no dividends at all commensurate with the investment.

In other words, it is the perfect demonstration of what a foundation can do. It should furnish leadership, analysis, and boldness, but not speculation. And I think those words I am quoting come from Andrew Carnegie when he got the conception. That is, it is risk capital, and like risk capital you occasionally lose it and occasionally you make a great hit. The last point with which I have been connected for a great many years is the growth of testing.

One of the greatest problems in American education is if you go to A college, how do you stand with reference to the graduates of B college? We had all kinds of measures of that, none of which have been very successful, historically speaking, the crediting which is in a state of chaos and arguments and boasts and charges, and so on.

A grant was made through the Carnegie Foundation for a study of the 48 colleges of Pennsylvania, and it studied first of all the level of intelligence of those who are admitted, and then it developed objective tests to follow them through for 4 years. The problem was to see whether there was a way in which we could eliminate teacher favoritism, toadyism, the polishing of the apple, all of the other
devices of that kind, cheating, and find out who got an education and who did not.

That study went on for 10 years, and I think has had a permanent effect upon thinking about higher education. It led directly into the so-called graduate-record examination which was an effort to find out whether the people were ready for graduate schools.

It showed a rather astonishing thing, namely that the accredited list of the Association of American Universities, those of the colleges on the approved list of that association, supplied only about half the graduate students; that the nonaccredited colleges supplied about half, and then when you looked at the record when they finished their graduate school, the people from the nonaccredited colleges often did as well as from the accredited colleges.

That of course did not mean that they were better colleges or as good colleges. It might have meant that, it might have meant that the graduate schools were more careful in their selection from those colleges. It might have been that those colleges were more careful in their nominations for graduate work.

But it did have this effect, namely that the Association of American Universities went out of the accrediting business and dropped it, and now the graduate-record examination is taken by applicants for admission to graduate schools almost across the country.

These were experimental things and had to come to an end. The question was would they die. And so a commission was appointed of which I happened to be a member, under the chairmanship if I remember correctly of President Conant, of Harvard, and they studied this whole problem and set up a nonprofit corporation, the Educational Testing Service, and that had to have some capital, so those who had been in the testing business before like the American Council of Education and the Carnegie Foundation, turned in what they had and then a grant was made by the Carnegie Corp. so they had $750,000 of working capital. And the Educational Testing Service has since served the Navy, served all the Armed Forces. It serves many of the scholarship programs of industry and so on, and it is now a nonprofit cooperative service available to all types of higher education. And that could not have been started, there wasn't capital enough to start it, unless there had been a foundation grant.

Now I don't want to weary the committee, but here are a series of things with which I have had a personal connection over a good many years, and all of which required either capital or stimulation or help from the foundations in order to perform a service for education in the United States.

Mr. Keele. Dr. Wriston, you said that you had found that with reference to those students in the higher brackets who had not gone to college, that in part it was due to lack of motivation, and you even found that the high schools had failed to encourage them. I wonder if you found out why they failed to encourage them.

Mr. Wriston. Well, generally speaking, take one great city which I have in mind which I would prefer not to identify because I might do a disservice. The different regions of that city have different levels of income and of ethnic origin and so on.

We know that cities tend to group in that way. And high school A at one end of the city sends probably 70 percent of its graduates on to institutions of higher education, and high school B in another
section sends 50. But high school C at the other end of the town
doesn't send 25.

I think it is because of the view of the principal or of the superintendents that this crowd isn't likely to go. It is what I call defeasism. I think you get just as high intelligence from people who are poor as you do from people who are rich. I hope you do, in the light of my own economic history. I think you get just as good people from one racial group as another.

I see no excuse whatever for differentiating high schools along those lines. And I think that one of the great reforms which ought to come is to begin to determine way back at the ages of 10, 11, and 12 that the persons who have a high I. Q., as we occasionally say—intelligence quotient—which is not a stable factor, as you know; the great studies of Dr. Stoddard, now president of the University of Illinois, has shown there are changes in that. It is one of the great pieces of research in our time, but we could identify in the schools, could identify by modern testing devices way back then the people of high intelligence.

And then every influence ought to be brought to bear upon them and upon their parents in the interests of their public well-being to see that these people of high capacity should go forward.

I may say that I think—and here I am in the realm of opinion on which I have some right to express an opinion but where you would get contrary opinion—that there has been a strong tendency to feel that you ought not to give people of high intelligence special attention, but that you must give people of low intelligence special attention.

We all know that there are remedial classes in most everything, but they become afraid that psychologically you would give an inferiority complex to the bright people.

That, I think, is a classic error because we all like to compete in our own class. It is foolish, for example, for Siwash College to play the University of Michigan. That is silly. We should all say so immediately. Why if they don't feel any hardship in playing in their own class shouldn't a boy play intellectually in his own class?

And we have had many retarded classes, but have given up advanced classes.

Let me give you an illustration. In the days when I was in grammar school we often skipped a grade. You held a boy back or you advanced him. If, for example, he came from a family where they read and where his mother taught him a lot, why hold him in lockstep? That has, I say, pretty largely disappeared.

Second, in an effort to graduate everybody so he has a diploma, or graduate as many as possible, quite often the senior year in high school is virtually a review which bores the good student to death, reduces his motivation, discourages him with the educational project, whereas the dull student is kind of eased along to give him a diploma.

Make no mistake, I am not opposed to helping the slow student. I think a great many solid citizens have come from the people who are not topflight in brilliance, and I wouldn't have it understood that I think they are waste material. Far from it. They make good citizens. A lot of people who can never do research have got common sense.
On the other hand, with the problems of the United States and the present world what they are, it is just as bad to waste the brilliant material or to slow it down or to hold it back or to discourage it, as it would be to call the others a bunch of dummies and throw them out. This I find one of the most puzzling things today in all education, is why with our manpower needs what they are—

The CHAIRMAN. Do not feel a necessity for abbreviating your remarks on that particular subject. It is quite interesting.

Mr. WELSTON. Well, I think if you want a little bit more of what I regard as the historical background, during the depression there was the American Youth Commission which had a grant of, as I remember it, $800,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation, of which Mr. Owen D. Young was the chairman and of which Mr. Rainey, who has been president of Franklin College, Bucknell, University of Texas, and more recently Stevens College, was for a time the director, and then Mr. Floyd Reeves, who came from the University of Chicago, then was with the Tennessee Valley Authority, was head of the personnel and education section and is now again at the University of Chicago as the director.

At that time we had a great many unemployed, and there was a certain amount of defeatism. I remember Aubrey Williams, who was a head of the National Youth Administration, which was an offshoot of the Harry Hopkins thing, and whom I knew very well, because he had been the executive director of the Council of Social Agencies of the State of Wisconsin when I had been vice president of that. He said that the graduates of our high schools would probably never find employment in sufficient numbers, and that we taught them intellectual skills and then threw them out on the waste heap, there to be destroyed by rot.

In other words, we went through as a nation—I am not singling out Aubrey Williams for personal denunciation. He represented a trend of thought—a period of disillusionment and alarm about overeducating the public.

As soon as the Second World War came, we found that we had a great shortage. In order to illustrate this, let me speak of a book which was published, a pamphlet by the superintendent of schools of Pittsburgh for the American Council on Education, entitled "What the High Schools Ought To Teach," in which with a good deal of elaboration he made fun of teaching mathematics, on the ground that when he was a boy he had been taught to figure the square yardage of carpet in a room of such a dimension with a bay window on an angle, and he said, "When I grew up, we had scatter rugs."

That kind of reasoning was used. And then came the war and the Armed Forces found that we were a mathematically illiterate people.

I remember very amusingly when I was on the executive committee of the American Council and this had come up, I suggested we reprint it and give a million copies away. It almost went through before they saw the joke.

But the tragic thing is that thing was reprinted and sent as part of our good-neighbor policy all over Latin America, in order to destroy their educational project.

Now, it was that kind of defeatism, you see, that became ingrained. And like all other things in reform, reform always lags behind the
necessity. And I think as time goes on, people are going to realize that we have in war or peace, in prosperity or otherwise, need for trained brains.

And, therefore, that mood of defeatism was revealed in the studies of the American Youth Commission, which I call the "statification" of a mood; they were discouraged, and they gathered the data which justified their discouragement.

I suggest if you ever went back and read that today you would be shocked at the conclusions to which they came, honest people, earnest people, loyal people, but it was the mood of defeatism.

Now, today our mood is different. We have the feeling we must economize on manpower, and I hope that one of the reforms that will come will be in a great drive to identify the people of capacity, and then speed them on their way.

I am fully convinced that we waste at least a year, and maybe two, in the education of most of the bright people of the United States. We just hold them back.

The Chairman. Then standardization in the interest of equality is a mistake in the educational world?

Mr. Wriston. Standardization in the interest of equality of achievement is a mistake. I am all for equality of opportunity, but I suggest that it is not equality of opportunity when you hold a bright boy back in order to achieve another type of equality. Do I make that point clear?

I am a deep-dyed convinced adherent of democratic philosophy. I think we have sometimes misinterpreted democratic philosophy as being equality of everything and not equality of opportunity.

I don't think today that the students in that high school C that I spoke of are getting equality of opportunity because they are not given the incentives that the students in high school A are given.

The Chairman. Doctor, you made an observation that interested me, and it was that you may with reasonable satisfaction expect talent in every racial group.

I am wondering if you have not observed that there is a greater development and advancement being made by some of the racial groups, minority groups, than you find elsewhere. In other words, there is one minority group that I have in mind, and I have observed since I was a boy that all members of that group always manifested a great thirst for knowledge, probably under the feeling that there was some discrimination against them. They have generated a drive that has carried them to the forefront and kept them there, so much so that where you find the necessity for real talent and mental equipment, you find that particular group furnishing more people than perhaps all of the others combined. You know what I am talking about.

Mr. Wriston. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Now, take another group. Let's take the Negro. I have observed in my part of the country a willingness on the part of the colored, the Negro, you understand, to pay more for the opportunity of self-improvement than you find among others, and as a result they are probably advancing more rapidly than the other groups in education. Now, I see that. What is your observation on that?

Mr. Wriston. Well, I am in entire agreement with you. First of all, we discovered that two of the groups which are economically in
an adverse position, namely, the children of preachers and teachers, go to college despite the fact that they haven't any money.

Second, in this book under the title "Who Should Go to College," which bears the author's name, Byron Hollingshead, there is in the back a study which shows that Italians and Jewish people and one other racial group send very disproportionate numbers to college, the Jewish group being by far the highest.

This is not, however—and this I think—we have to emphasize—a difference in ability. This is a difference in motivation.

And you spoke of the Negro group. There again people in an adverse position tend to get a high degree of motivation and drive at it, and this accounts for the fact that I knew as a teacher that often the wealthy boy who had had every advantage nonetheless wanted to turn college into a country club.

So that one of the problems that we face in the United States is to make an analysis of those groups and see why it is. I think you put your finger on the reason. If a group is discriminated against, it compensates by its energy.

Now, I think, however, we need to go at the other groups where there is just as much talent but not the same motivation, and see if we can encourage them to see the value of this.

I mentioned, for example, one I wouldn't call it a racial group, but one group of national origin which always had very large families and a man who couldn't retire at 50 just wasn't fertile. He had a social security which was very great.

Now those days have gone. With the emancipation of women, the girls don't any longer want to support their father, and the boys go out and get married and that family tie is broken up. But I can well remember that as a boy.

I think that the thing you are now describing is in process of being resolved. As we develop our tolerances and as discrimination is reduced, we are going to get much less distortion by ethnic and national origins than we have had in the past. But with your observation I am in complete accord.

Mr. Keele. Dr. Wriston, will you comment on the relative importance of foundation grants to the total income of educational institutions.

Mr. Wriston. Yes. I would say it was in figures almost trivial. I don't have my figures with me, but my memory is that we spend about $2^{1/4}$ billion a year on higher education or some very large sum of money through the universities and colleges of the country, and I would be surprised if all foundation grants from every source all put together in any one year would be as much as $100,000,000.

Now those are figures more or less out of my hat, but I think they represent the ratio very well, that is to say the foundation grants are the margin so far as solvency is concerned. In fact, they don't contribute much to solvency.

I might say that there is some in this Commission Report on Financing Higher Education, some criticism of the foundations at this point, that in giving money for special projects they don't give money for the administration of those projects or for their space, and therefore they sometimes increase your overhead, and don't take care of it.
One of the recommendations of the Commission is that other foundations follow that of the Polio Foundation, which does make a grant for the invisible costs, but many of these special foundations for research in medicine, or in disease simply make a research grant, and many universities and particularly medical schools are what we call research poor, because you tend to support a special activity at the cost of the general activity, and that has been true of almost all foundation grants.

Mr. Keene. Another question which has suggested itself to the committee and to the staff on a number of occasions is the extent to which the educators and the educational institutions lead the foundations, or in reverse, the extent to which the foundations tend to lead the educators and educational institutions, in other words, the influence that is exerted.

Mr. Wriston. I think it is a mutual influence. For example, I have just made a suggestion to one of the foundations where it can spend some money.

It won't do me a bit of good, but arguing from what happened in the field of art, I said, "Here is a field which is presently neglected. It is being followed in a few institutions. Why don't you do something about it?"

And the president of the foundation said he thought it was a grand idea, he would. I remember I went in on this book on it, Teaching with Books, and said, "Why don't you do something in this field?"

Also on the other side the foundation officials go around the country and talk with you, and I remember, for example, one of them came to my institution and said, "What are you doing in the general field of the new synthesis between anthropology, sociology, and political science?" And I said, "Nothing." Then he said, "Why not?"

"Well," I said, "poverty."

Now they have not made any grant in that field at all, and yet it started the group in my faculty thinking about that, and I think we are going to do something useful in developing those new fields, I would call it cross-fertilization.

I have never known a foundation to shove any money at anybody, because they get 10 times as many requests as they can grant. I think much more the colleges lead them.

There is one field in which I think the foundations took a position with which I am in disagreement, and therefore I think it was not healthy. I can understand but not agree with it, and that is that in the early days of the foundation, they made many grants to endowment.

Well, in the depression, as you know, there came a defeatism about permanent funds, and there came to be a saying that every generation must pay its own bills. It hasn't followed it out on the debt side, but they seem to think they ought to do it on the asset side, and they ceased to make grants to capital, the reason being that their resources, great as they appear, absolutely are too small to make an impact on the capital funds, and they therefore went to what is known as the project method.

We in this Commission on Financing Higher Education are arguing that they should now reverse that policy again and make capital grants.
As I have already indicated, they have done it in the case of Emory University, for example. I think it is $6,000,000 that was granted there outright. Of course, Emory has to raise $15 or $20 millions to get it, but that is all right. That gives the incentive.

There are now so many foundations that if we could encourage them to give permanent funds, I think it would be a useful change. Some can, some cannot.

Mr. Keele. That might answer the criticism which has come to the committee from thoughtful and reputable persons that, in their opinion, there has tended to be a centralization, an inflexibility in the grants of foundations which would be eliminated if they would make the grants to the university generally rather than to special projects. What do you think of that?

Mr. Wriston. That, of course, raises two equal and opposite problems. Do you give money to strengthen the strong or to prop the weak?

Now, broadly speaking—and I don't want to be regarded as critical in this—the South after the Civil War had a great deal to catch up with and their institutions were not as well financed as the northern institutions, and as I say, the general education board and all the foundations have shown more eagerness to help in that new field, in other words, to strengthen a place where by reason of economic conditions and the war and one thing and another, they needed help.

The other thing—and that also is done in the grant that I mentioned for libraries, that went to the small colleges which didn't have resources, and that was in a sense a capital grant. The same was true in the art grant.

Of course, on the pensions, the greatest help was to the weak institutions. The strongest institutions and particularly the State institutions can take care of it by State retirement funds.

The other theory, of course, would be put your money on the winning horse, on the strong one. This is an interesting thing.

Fifty years ago it was a common statement we had too many colleges. You will find that the first president of the University of Chicago was a great man, both as a great scholar and as a great thinker. President Harper took that view.

You will find that, of course, in the report of the American Youth Commission. You will find it even in the President's Commission on Higher Education published a few years ago. You will find it in the early correspondence of the Carnegie Foundation.

That overlooks two things. First, that the demand for education has consistently outrun the growth of population. The growth of population itself would have a marked effect, but the demand has far outrun that.

And therefore, far from this being a period of demise of colleges, the last 20 or 30 years have seen more colleges founded than any other like period in history.

To take one group, for example, which is sensational in its growth, is the Catholic institutions which have increased in number and in strength to an amazing degree in that period.

The second thing it tends to overlook is that an institution which today seems contemptible to the somewhat condescending observer may in 15 or 20 years become a strong institution. And we have to bear in mind that there is this quality of growth, there is also quality
of decline. And if you look at the history of higher education, you will see that all the people who said we have too many have been consistently wrong so far, every one of them.

And all of those who have denounced colleges for being weak have overlooked the historical growth, so that today some of the ones that were most seriously pointed out as people who ought to go out of business are strong and vigorous institutions.

I don't therefore see at the present moment any tendency toward centralization. I see much more evidence of an enormous resurgence of faith in higher education and of energy going into it.

Mr. Keele. To what extent in your opinion should foundations in making grants supervise or police those grants in following through to see what is done with them?

Mr. Wriston. Well, this is an extremely sensitive subject and here I speak as a customer.

Mr. Keele. By the way, I don't believe we made it clear at the beginning—some of you know this—you are on the boards of some of the foundations; are you not?

Mr. Wriston. Yes, sir, I am on the board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which as I say is insolvent. I am also on the board of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which has about 10 millions, a relatively small endowment, and which is not much in the granting business, at least I have never gotten a grant from them.

Mr. Keele. I would just like to identify this a little more. You are also, I believe, on the board of at least one of the large life-insurance companies of this country.

Mr. Wriston. Yes. I am on the board of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Milwaukee, and I am also now the senior member of the trustees of the stock of the Teachers' Annuity Insurance Association, so I am a capitalist by deputy.

The Chairman. Now give us your views as a customer.

Mr. Wriston. As a customer, that is to say as a recipient of grants.

I recognize that we have to be audited. For example, I know of an instance right now. A number of small grants were made and they were very small. They were designed as what you might call yeasts to institutions to encourage them to have their faculty people take on scholarly projects.

We must remember that of the people who get Ph. D.'s, for which I have, let me say, a limited respect, relatively few ever after do any truly creative scholarly work.

They go to places that don't have library facilities or laboratory facilities, or they are burdened with too much teaching or they have to earn money outside, and they just don't do it. That tends to make them dry up in middle life, to lose the fire and enthusiasm without which teaching becomes sterile.

And so an effort was made in this group of colleges to encourage the members of the faculty to do research, and it was given into the hands of the faculties themselves. It wasn't given to the presidents or the deans. It was given to the faculties.

And the idea was that Professor So-And-So wanted to do, we will say, a book on Longfellow. He hadn't been able to do it because he had to work summers. So they make him a grant equal to his summer pay, in order to let him spend the summer in scholarly activity.
Well, now in one institution the president began to spend that money. The foundation which gave the money simply had to say “No, you don’t do this. It was given to the faculty, and the man’s colleagues are to determine that. You cannot use it.”

Now the reason was clear of course that the president would be likely to substitute that for a salary payment, you see, and they wanted to keep it clear away from the administration.

Now there was a case of supervision. That is what I call auditing.

But when it comes to, let me use the familiar word, “kibitzing,” and looking over your shoulder and saying ‘How are you doing, Bud?’ I don’t like it and have been free once or twice to say so with great vigor, never in my own institution. I have never had the slightest interference in my own institution.

I think therefore we have to make this distinction. On this Commission on Financing Higher Education we had to account for every penny we spent, and one day there turned out that there was $37.12 that wasn’t properly accounted for, and it took 2 weeks to find it. We had to find it. I think that’s right. But when it comes to the substance of your work, they ought to leave it strictly alone, and generally speaking they have.

Mr. Keefe. That was my next question. Have you observed any tendency on the part of the foundations to try to control the results of the work?

Mr. Watson. No, I have never seen any part of that.

In another of my activities as president of the Council of Foreign Relations in New York, we received grants for special projects, and we have never had a comment from any of the foundations as to how we spent that money.

Sometimes it is a lot of money. For the book on the Coming of the War by Langer and Gleason, there was $150,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and $10,000 from the Sloan Foundation. We had the book prepared and published and sent them a copy, and at no time did they ever ask us a question about it.

I am now the chairman of a group which is writing a book on Anglo-American relations. Having been chairman of that group for 2 years, I have made two trips to England to confer with the Royal Institute there. At no time has anyone ever asked a question about when is it coming or what are you doing or what is your approach or anything else. In my observation I see no tendency to try to dominate the results.

Mr. Keefe. You have told us something of the value of the support given education by the foundations. Would you comment as to your views as to the continuing need, the present need, shall we say, and the future need for foundation support.

Mr. Watson. Of course to a man with a deficit that need is instant, urgent, and overwhelming. That is to say I now have a project.

It is so far out of my field that I can only give you a kind of a dim view of what it is they are trying to do, but we found now that American boys are steadily finding themselves in cultures utterly alien to our own, like Korea, like the Middle East, Iran, and Iraq.

We have been very backward, as you know, in learning foreign languages. It is rather striking that despite all the money we have spent abroad, we have great trouble in finding anybody who can speak foreign languages.
Now when a person, let us say, by an airplane accident, having to bail out, or for any other reason finds himself suddenly pitchforked into an alien culture, he must make a very swift adaptation, learn to get something to eat and to drink, if necessary, to hide.

One of our professors of linguistics who has been extraordinarily original in making analyses of language, said he thought we could give a general course for undergraduates which would reduce this fear of a foreign language and this sense of dislocation in the foreign culture for those people.

Now that is pioneering in the field in which I, for example, have no skill whatever, and of course the professor himself has no experience. I couldn’t possibly do that.

It would take a lot of money, and with 2,500 people on the payroll of the university and 100 buildings to maintain and all the other financial pressures and, as I say, a deficit, I would have to say “No.”

We go to a foundation on that. He goes to the foundation. All I did was endorse it. It is from that point of view that I think you have this experience.

Let me take another field where it is extremely important. Africa is to be, I think, one of the most sensitive areas of the United States in the next 20 years. We already see that with the dislocations today in South Africa, with the quarrel with the French in north Africa, with the troubles of the British in Egypt and the Sudan, and with the feebleness of the successor state to the Italian colonies in north Africa, not to speak of the heart of Africa, the Mau Mau trouble that is going on. And yet I think I speak by the book. In no American university is there any comprehensive systematic study of the problems of Africa, and yet for better or for ill the United States is involved in every one of those directly or indirectly.

We have got the bases in north Africa, we are dependent for industrial diamonds on South Africa, for many of the critical materials we are dependent on the heart of Africa, and to think that linguistically, culturally, economically, and in a dozen other ways there is no concentrated attack upon that problem is, I think, very serious.

Now, somebody has got to do it. The capital has to come from somewhere. It isn’t the kind of a thing that a private individual, a rich man, is likely to give you money for. It is the kind of a thing that a foundation might give for a 5-year pilot study, with a view to testing out whether it can be done.

Take another field with which I happen to be familiar by reason of a temporary appointment. If we only knew what really went on in the minds of the Kremlin, how much better off we would be.

We have a picture of them, they have a picture of us. Now, somebody has to finance cold objective scholarly studies which may not reach any conclusion, but which put in the hands of policy makers in Government data, which was hitherto unavailable to them. We can’t depend on one or two or three or four experts. We need a large number.

Now, in one great university one of the foundations is spending about $1,200,000 in 10 years, and the Air Force is spending, I think, around $400,000 for studies of that vital area.

Because of, as I say, a temporary appointment to review it, I had to look at their books, and within the limits of my competence, which is modest, I found nothing tendentious in them at all.
They were cold factual appraisals of what goes on in the Soviet Government, in its party structure, in the relationship of Mao to communism in China, and in Soviet law and justice, and I think that there is laid before the people in the Government in the policy-making things data which couldn’t be found elsewhere.

That university, rich as it is, that is, rich in the sense of total assets, couldn’t have undertaken it. That comes, as I say, partly from a Government contract, partly from one of the great foundations.

I am also connected with the research center for international studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I don’t know how large the Government contracts are there. They are tremendous, I know, but the Ford Foundation has recently given them $1 million for these studies.

It required, because of the Government aspects, clearance, which I had to get. The other day the director of that center came down to go over with me what they were doing. There again material is being gathered which is not available anywhere else, and which is essential to the work of the policy makers.

Now, here is a combination in both of these instances of the Government on the one hand and foundations on the other. I see this as one of the things, speaking now for a moment as a scholar, at least in retrospect, which will have to go on.

It is just like cancer. You have to study it. You are going to waste an awful lot of money studying cancer because you have to follow every conceivable line, hoping you will hit the right one.

The same way in studying anything as complex as alien and as disagreeable as Russia, you have to make long studies. And the same I feel with Africa. That is the best answer I can give you on that.

Mr. Keele. That leads to another question. There we have a partnership, as it were, between the Government and the foundations in financing certain projects, is that right?

Mr. Wriston. It amounts to that.

Mr. Keele. One supplementing the other.

Mr. Wriston. That’s right. They are done through the institution and without any collaboration, so far as I know, conference, or collusion between the Government and foundations, but it comes to that in substance.

Mr. Keele. It seems to me I once heard you talk in Chicago about the problems arising from colleges and universities accepting Federal subsidies for projects and so forth; maybe the word “danger” is a wrong word to us, but at least the problems.

It has been suggested in these hearings that the work of the foundations might tend to balance to some extent the problem of Federal subsidy. I would like to hear your views on that.

Mr. Wriston. Well, the problem with Federal subsidies does not arise on the part of anything wrong with the Government subsidies. In all my dealings with the Government contracts, I have never seen any tendency along that line.

The problem there arises from the fact that they are not only temporary. They can make only extremely short commitments, usually for a year. But we have to keep people employed.

If you want, for example, to do something in the field in which my own university is perhaps the leader, in the field of applied mathe-
matics, I can't go and get applied mathematics at the corner drug store. I have to find somebody and give him the hope that he is going to stay there.

But the support is only for a year. What do I do if he doesn't get a renewal of that contract? How am I going to pay him? It becomes a dead weight. That is from the university point of view the greatest danger.

To get out of my own field, let me take one of the great State universities in the Middle West. I remember the president of that university told me he would not appoint a person to work on a government contract whose appointment didn't expire with the contract. But in 8 years he had never had a contract which wasn't renewed or which wasn't followed by another one, so that those people were employed. The upshot was he never had to drop a man because of the expiration of the contract.

Now he said, "The man has been in my community for 8 years, and under the principles of academic tenure I can't very well let him go. He has cut his other lines. What happens there if the Government drops out?"

Now, that is the greatest problem that universities face in dealing with the Government. It is nothing the Government can do anything about so far as I know, unless they follow the British system of making an informal commitment for 5 years. But with our particular legislative set-up and our method of authorization of appropriation, that is pretty difficult to do.

Now, at that point the foundations can come in. I, for example, have just built two buildings for a problem in atomic physics, and the contract expired just as the building was finished. What will I do if it isn't renewed? You don't want to junk the buildings, you don't want to drop the thing, and yet the expense is such that no university could carry it.

There isn't a physics department in the United States that could operate at its present level for 2 years without Government expenditures. But in making the cushion transition, foundations could be of assistance. That is the best answer I can give you, that there is a place here where they can make cushions and make the overlap.

The only restriction or the only qualification I would put on that is, generally speaking, their interests are rather different from the Government's, that is to say, as the Government has gone into the physical sciences, the foundations have tended to pull out.

There is a very great overlap in the public health grants, I think, some of the atomic-energy grants, and some of the specialized foundations for special diseases.

Mr. Keele. One of the most frequently heard criticisms that we have gotten, and one which this committee is concerned with, is the question of whether or not the charge that the educational institutions under grants from the foundations have been giving study or have been engaged in projects, the effect of which was to undermine our system of free enterprise, or the so-called capitalistic system. I wish you would give us your views on that.

Mr. Wason. Well, let's take the ones on which I testified of my own knowledge. I think one of the greatest reassurances of the capitalistic system is a fair arrangement for pensions and retirement.

The idea that a man is thrown out when his usefulness is over is a
-desperately bad thing. Of course, you have called attention to the
fact that I am a trustee of an insurance company. I think they are
among the greatest of our capitalistic enterprises, first in this matter
of giving security to persons, and second, in their investment policies.
They can't invest contrary to the capitalistic system and still survive.
And, therefore, in the grant to the TIAA in setting up this whole
pension system, it is, I would say, a reinforcement.

Second, in the grants to science, it is inconceivable that there would
be any hostility to free enterprise. In the grants on the subject of art
and music and libraries I see no danger. I am not familiar enough
with the grants in the field of economics to testify as an expert. I can
only give my impression, having been around a long time and seen
them.

They have financed projects which I think were critical, but I would
never think of them as subversive. I think free enterprise thrives
upon a steady drumfire of criticism which calls attention to excesses
and deviations and weaknesses, which give us a chance to correct
them before it runs to excess.

I don't know of my own knowledge, having observed this now for
nearly 30 years, in fact fully 30 years, of any grant which would have
that tendency.

The Chairman. How about the grants made to Owen Lattimore?
Would you classify that as being a proper grant, to conduct his revo-
lutionary activities in the Far East?

Mr. Wurston. Congressman, I would class that as an error in judg-
ment. Now, as it happens, I don't agree with him. That is one of
those things. I don't know him personally, so I can't express a judg-
ment at first hand as to whether I think he intends to upset us or not.

The Chairman. Doctor, somewhere along the line I want to ask
somebody the question as to how it was Alger Hiss was put at the
head of the Carnegie Foundation.

Mr. Wurston. Just for the record it is the Carnegie Endowment.

The Chairman. If you would rather not answer that—

Mr. Wurston. I have no objection to answering it. I have never
held a Government office. I am a private citizen, and I had never
met Mr. Hiss; in fact, never heard of him except as I read in the
papers that he was the Secretary-General of the San Francisco Con-
ference. I never heard of his being at Yalta until afterward.

Sitting as a member of that board of trustees, I did what any
member of the board of trustees would do. I took the recommendation
of the nominating committee, which I think was John W. Davis.

Mr. Keele. And Arthur Ballantine.

Mr. Wurston. Arthur Ballantine. I have forgotten who the third
one is.

What I think, if you want my opinion, and I am perfectly willing
to give my opinion, is that he tried to disassociate himself from his
past, and did it so successfully that his past was concealed. Certainly
I had no suspicion even after he took command.

I well remember the day he was elected, and he came in and his
first two nominations for members he would like on the board were a
couple of capitalists certainly, and his program was a program which
had no relationship to anything that would be subversive.
Of course, when he came to that he lost all contact with confidential material, and I simply think that like all of us, like sheep, were led astray. We had no suspicion of this at all.

The moment that any suspicion arose we suspended his activities. I was not only a party, I was active in continuing his salary on leave. I did that on the ground that he had been accused but had not been tried. I understood he didn't have any assets, and I thought he was entitled to a fair trial and a living while that trial was held.

Mr. O'Toole. May I interrupt you at that point, Doctor?

Mr. Wriston. Certainly.

Mr. O'Toole. Didn't General Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles feel just about the same as you did about a man who had only been accused?

Mr. Wriston. Yes. General Eisenhower was not at that meeting, as I remember it. That body meets twice. We meet at dinner the night before as a kind of a general canvass of the situation, and it was at that that the lively discussion took place, and I think neither John Foster Dulles nor General Eisenhower were present that evening.

Mr. O'Toole. John Foster Dulles probably knew more about Mr. Hiss' background due to the fact that they had worked together—

Mr. Wriston. I think that is altogether likely. The moment that there was any indication that he was guilty of perjury, he was dropped. The moment the charge was made, he was suspended.

He was supported with his salary during that interim period before he was brought to trial. I fully associate myself with that without at all associating myself with his ideas. I would do that for anybody.

Mr. Keele. I would like to attempt to phrase here a proposition which is the embodiment, so far as I can accomplish it, of a number of charges which we have received. I am stating this without stating it as an expression of my own opinion, but merely as, shall I say, distillation of a number of charges, and I would like to hear your comments on it if I may state the proposition. In substance, it is this:

That the training of teachers for secondary schools is such that the training they have received in the schools of higher education, in colleges, in other words, for their work, is so occupied with methodology or methods of teaching or how to teach, that there is little or no time for them to learn what to teach or to receive what we might term to be a general education, with the result that when they go out to practice the profession of teaching, they themselves have not become educated persons.

And that as the result of that, their students do not receive the benefit of education from educated persons, so that the materials which they get or the training they receive is not of what we would call first-class composition, and that that leaves them as easy prey—I am talking about the students—to any fadism or theories which are presented to them.

The net result of that has been to make the propagation of subversive ideas an easy matter, a comparatively easy matter, with those students.

Now, the only connection with the foundations is that it has also been charged that this program of teachers' training has been financed or supported by the foundations, and to that extent the charge is that the foundations are furthering a system of education which makes subversion a comparatively easy matter.
Mr. Wriston. Well, in fairness to the committee, I must first say I am a biased witness because I have been all my life a violent proponent of the liberal arts, and the only contribution I think I have ever made to educational thinking in literature was a chapter which I wrote on a theory of disciplines which laid emphasis upon the necessity of training people in the methods of thought, the discipline of precision which you get from mathematics and from foreign language, the discipline of hypothesis, which you get from science where you have to project and form a theory as the basis for your experimentation, a discipline of opinion which is not guesswork but it is a study of political science, and the forming of responsible judgment, and a discipline of appreciation, which is learning to hear music and to see art not in a snobbish esoteric way, but appreciably so that you get some enjoyment out of it.

That is heresy to the so-called educationists. I have all my educational life fought against this tendency to teach people how to teach things that they don’t know.

The classic case that came to my attention about 25 years ago was in one of the great Midwestern universities where a person flunked mathematics and got a hundred on how to teach mathematics. It was a real, actual case that came under my observation. And it showed this terrible split that you have discussed between methodology on the one hand and substance on the other.

I think it is a thing which has fastened on us textbooks, for which I have a very strong allergy, because a textbook in which opinion is concealed as fact. When you read Adam Smith you know what you are reading. If you read Karl Marx’s Das Kapital you know what you are reading, you know his bias, but when you read Joe Doakes’ textbook, you never heard of Joe Doakes and you don’t know what his bias is.

So that as far as the substance of your criticism is concerned, I associate myself with it fully. I have worked with these people in the field of education a great deal and see many of their points of view, but on that I hardly disagree.

I think work in education ought to be a graduate study, and that beneath it should be a sound experience in the discipline.

I may say that this is partly a function of the financing of the schools, because for example in most of the States of the Union when you get a teacher’s certificate, you have a certificate to teach anything, so that even if you started out studying history, we will say, if they have a shortage of somebody in French, why they will have you teaching French whether you know any French or not, and they will have you teaching science even if you never had any. That again makes the teacher utterly dependent on the text. And the text, as I say, is one man’s opinion stated in dogmatic form. So again I think this has been a very bad thing in American life.

Now when it comes to the foundations’ relationship to it, I think it is very tenuous. There have been only a very few institutions with teachers’ colleges in private hands. One of course is Columbia which I think has changed enormously and I think is now almost all graduate work. I am not in close touch with it, but I think that is true, instead of undergraduate work. Certainly the vast majority of its work is in graduate work.
The second was Chicago which gave up its school of education. It has only a department of education, and that is now all at what they call the university level. They have a different system there as you know, and give the A. B. at a different time, and their whole graduate work is organized differently from anybody else. And also Peabody in Nashville. I think Harvard, for example, has also been a graduate division.

But the great teachers' college development has been by the States, the State normal schools, and then the schools of education in the great State universities.

This particular development of which you speak tended to come at what we used to call the normal school level and then became the teachers' college level, and is now generally speaking called the State college level. And I don't know of my own knowledge of anything the foundations have done to stimulate that.

There have been grants—I remember one grant made at the teachers' college to Dr. L. L. Kandel, for whom I have the highest respect as a scholar, on testing. And there have been many other grants on teaching of citizenship and that kind of thing, of which I don't have enough familiarity to speak.

But so far as developing the type of education that you are speaking of, I would say that was about \(90\%\) percent the work of the States and the foundations had only a trivial impact upon it.

Whether we are making headway, I think the answer is "Yes." The original normal schools were for training primary teachers in the three R's; that is where this "How To Teach" became important, because they knew how to read, write, figure to the rule of three, and spell.

It was when that process crept upward and these normal schools became State teachers' colleges and began to train people first for the junior high schools and then for the senior high schools and did it at the undergraduate level, that this overaccent on methodology at the cost of substance became, in my judgment—and as I say, on this I am a biased witness—a great evil.

Mr. Keele. Is the Ford Foundation's experiment in Arkansas an effort to alleviate that situation, a State-wide project of teacher training?

Mr. Wriston. I don't know enough about it to give you an intelligent answer, Mr. Keele. I am sorry.

I am familiar with the Ford Foundation's effort in certain colleges, both private and public, to cut out a year of high school and short-circuit that, and have heard reports at first-hand from some of those institutions.

I am also familiar with their countereffort to balance it in three great private institutions and three great private preparatory schools, to see whether they can skip the freshman year of college.

I also understand they have a project, I think it is in New Mexico, in trying to get these racial groups, of which the Congressman spoke, who don't go to college, to be stimulated to go to college, but I don't know the Arkansas situation.

Mr. Keele. In substance what they are attempting to do, as I understand it, is that they are getting the State teachers' colleges to cooperate with them in a plan whereby they are going to give prospective teachers 4 years of general education, and then a fifth year of intensive
training in teaching and methodology largely on the interne system.

Mr. Wriston. Well, that of course would have my hearty blessing.

Mr. Keele. Of course, it has been seriously challenged, as I understand it, from what I can read—I am sure of it—by the educational hierarchy in this country who say that it is not a revolutionary experiment but is a reversion to the training of the Medieval Ages.

Mr. Wriston. Well, I would have to identify the hierarchy, but if it is the group I think it is I am in just a thousand percent disagreement with them.

That is to say, there has been almost a pressure group on this teacher training showing what seems to me hostility to breadth and laying so much emphasis on methodology as to in effect give us uneducated teachers.

Mr. Keele. The charge has come to us both from persons who have been to see us, written to us, and from those we have talked with—and some of those persons are themselves professors of standing, teachers of standing—that the National Education Association and related bodies, what I might call the educational hierarchy who have for the most part backed the so-called progressive education, have such pressure groups that anyone who criticizes or who attempts in the teaching profession to criticize that method suffers from the sociological and sometimes the economic pressures which they are able to exert, and it is all part and parcel of this general thought that I expressed or attempted to express a while ago.

Mr. Wriston. Well, I sit in the outer darkness so far as that group is concerned. I am on some kind of an index I should judge, so I am not a good witness on that because I have never had any part of it.

Again any reputation I have is based upon so vigorous a defense of the liberal arts that people who take the other point of view simply write me off as beyond redemption.

Mr. Keele. Well, isn't it true that in the higher educational institutions there is comparatively more freedom of thought ideologically and otherwise than in the secondary schools?

Mr. Wriston. Oh, yes. That certainly is true, and I think that is the nature of higher education. I think at many levels indoctrination is not only right, it is necessary. I myself can't go along with this business of teaching people without any critical faculties having been trained to be critical of everything under God's green earth, because I don't think that they have the equipment to do it.

It is the specific function of course of higher education to train people to think and to be critical and to form evaluative judgments, and that is what distinguishes the two.

It isn't the mere matter of age. It is a matter of maturity, and we want our mature people to exercise judgment.

We want our young people to begin to have judgmental exercises, but the basic thing is we want them to know something, how to read, write, and spell and know their history and not be lost in the world.

But I think, as I say, the specific difference between secondary education and higher education comes in this area of critical thinking.

The Chairman. Doctor, is radicalism in the colleges and universities on the increase or is there evidence of a falling off?

Young men come back from the bigger universities, fellows that I know and in whom I have had an interest since they were small boys.
I question them and you probably have observed already that I am what you might call an ultraconservative.

They come back and tell me that radicalism is the thing that is just running away with these colleges and schools, and that the problem of the young fellow who wants to stay in the center is either to conform or to be ostracized. And the notion is pretty general that radicalism has been rampart and probably still is in our fine educational institutions.

Mr. Warriston. Well, can I tell you a story which I think illustrates my point. When I was in Wisconsin, I had one trustee who was continuously worried about this, though I saw no signs of it myself. But someone, when I was on a visit to New York, said, "Is so-and-so still a single-taxer?" And I said, "Come again." And he said, "Why, when he got through college he was a wild-eyed single taxer."

I went home and I didn't say anything to him, but the next time he jumped me about instruction in the college, I said, "Are you still a single-taxer?" He flushed a moment, and he said, "Where did you hear about that?" He said, "Of course, I am not." I said, "When did you get over being a single-taxer?" And then at last he put a smile on his face and said, "When I bought my first piece of property."

Now youth is a peculiar thing. As Dean Hawks of Columbia once said, what the older generations see as red is really green, and there is a real point there, that they have training in their critical faculties but they cannot have perspective.

I remember when I was beginning to teach American history the chairman of my department said that nobody should teach American history until he was 50 year of age. Well, it annoyed me. Hadn't I just gotten graduate training? Didn't I know it all?

And when I got to be 50 I knew what he was talking about, namely, that everything I had learned from books had been tested in watching life go on, and it therefore was not mere critical faculty, it was experience.

And I think that there is a great misunderstanding about the young people in this thing, that they always want to go back and shock the parents. I believe the word for that now is "communication." I never have understood what communication was, but they like to go back and scare them to death.

But this is what I find: That when they are 5 years out they are in banking and they are in business and they are all over that aspect of the thing, and I think that is just what Dean Hawks was talking about. They always have a tendency when they don't have to do anything about it, to take the new view.

On the other hand—and the Congressman sitting beside you knows this very well—when it comes to action, they are the most conservative crowd in the world. There isn't any group that is more dominated by tradition that that.

And when I tried to make what I regarded as a minor reform in fraternity life at Brown, it blew the top off the university for about 5 years, and I had to go in and out of town by the subway. But I myself don't feel any alarm about this matter.

I will say this, and I wrote an article on this which has been republished many times, and I won't bother you to give the speech. But there has been a detachment of the teaching profession from the economic system.
Let me explain that in a very few words. When we had the depression, all teachers’ salaries were cut, and in many a Midwest college they didn’t get any salary except what was left over when the other bills were paid.

I knew many, many colleges—I was then very active on the North Central Association and on its board of review, and I visited them, and the faculty had no salaries except what was left over when the coal bills and other bills had been paid. They therefore suffered by economic reverses.

But when there is a boom, and particularly when there is inflation, they don’t profit. And there has been a steady detachment of the teaching profession from our economic system.

And without being in the slightest degree critical—and I must emphasize that because I believe heartily and wholeheartedly in State education, because the private institutions cannot carry the load—it is pretty hard for a professor who draws all of his income from the State, to be too critical of Government activities. I mean he becomes predisposed to things——

The Chairman. You are saying it is difficult for a beneficiary of a grant from a foundation to criticize the foundation.

Mr. Wriston. That is right, although if you will read this book on The Economics on Financing Higher Education you will find that however difficult it is, we did it.

We put some facts in there and opinions which we don’t ask them to love us for, but we thought it was for our own good.

But broadly speaking——

Mr. Keele. Will you pursue that point you were making there about the fact that they are dependent upon the State, the natural consequences?

Mr. Wriston. Well, the natural consequences are that they are not going to bite the hand that feeds them. And when you find, as you do find now, that the balance is changed and the people in the State institutions almost all have special grants for inflation, emergency increases, the whole balance of payment has changed so that in the public institutions the salaries are higher than in the private institutions. And as a consequence, there is a steady drift to a continuing dependence of the professoriate on Government.

That certainly is true in science. I remember in one of the great institutions a man said we could run our cyclotron 3 days on the assets of the university. It runs every day of the year on the Navy Department.

Now you are not going to get the man who has that experience to say that Government activities should be greatly curtailed. It isn’t human nature.

Now I think it is a serious matter. I haven’t got a ready solution for this except that people should give us lots of money, and that is the solution for all problems, but what I called the detachment of the teaching profession from the economic system is a very serious matter, because they suffer in depression and they don’t profit in boom.

They can’t go on for a century without having a certain attitude of mind, and you see it, of course, in Britain. Sixty-six and two-thirds percent, as I said earlier, of the university income in Britain comes from the Government.
I don't think it is any astonishment, therefore, that generally speaking, the professors belong to the Labor Party. I would think it was abnormal if they didn't, if that goes on 30 years.

Mr. Keele. And your point is that this dependence upon state funds tends in the end to emphasize in their minds the importance of subsidization or at least assistance from the Government, which in the end tends toward a socialized state?

Mr. Wriston. That is right. Now one of the great contributions of the British institutions is to maintain that balance, and that in this report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education is emphasized, that if we can keep a lively balance between over-all governmental or over-all private, it will be a very healthy thing.

This, from my point of view, is one of the great merits of the tremendous surge that I spoke of in the growth of Catholic institutions, which incidentally the President's Commission on Financing Higher Education totally overlooked.

Now, they do not have a direct dependence upon the economic system, but they have a system of discipline of their own which doesn't make them either dependent upon the Government, you see. And I think that has been one of the healthiest things in the last 30 years.

People are sometimes surprised that I am so enthusiastic about Catholic education, being a Protestant, but I have observed it over the years.

Mr. Keele. I think you want to correct a point. You said the President's Commission on Financing—

Mr. Wriston. I beg your pardon. It is the President's Commission on Higher Education.

Mr. Keele. It is not to be confused with this study that has just been made.

Mr. Wriston. Not at all. That was appointed by the President of the United States. It made a report perhaps 5 years ago in five paper-bound volumes, the principal part being in volume I.

The Chairman. Doctor, what percentage of top-flight people in the field of education agree with you on the views to which you have in part given expression this morning? It makes me wonder if I didn't make the mistake of sending my four grandsons to the wrong school.

Mr. Wriston. Well, I think that perhaps others might be a little less candid, but the fact that I have held office is indicated by the fact that I am not a deviationists, so to speak.

Broadly speaking, if they are totally out of sympathy with your ideas they don't trust you, but I think that across the country—and I can speak best for the private institutions—there would be very strong agreement with most of the general points of view that I have given.

Mr. Keele. Have you any further questions?

Mr. Forand. I have one question that I would like to ask. It is on a statement that the doctor made earlier when he was referring to the pension system under the Carnegie set-up.

I may not be using your words.

Mr. Wriston. That is all right.

Mr. Forand. But the statement was to the effect that people have to remain in Carnegie colleges in order to retain their pension status.

Mr. Wriston. That is right.

Mr. Forand. Would you explain that a little clearer for me, please?
Mr. Wriston. Yes. Mr. Carnegie gave first $10 million and hoped that would buy pensions for professors in selected colleges. And then later—this is a measure of how poor we all are as prophets—he gave $5 million to take care of the professors in State institutions.

Now, as I say, at that time there had never been actuarial studies on annuities, and I think I am speaking by the books when I say that all insurance companies who went into annuities ran into heavy weather for two reasons.

In the last 50 years the expectation of life has increased by 20 years, due to better medical education and better hygiene and vitamin pills and what not, and we also found that people on pensions live longer. They have a sense of calm and peace which tends to make them live.

The second thing was that they all had certain expectations of the interest rate which over a hundred years had not varied greatly from 4 percent, but with war finance it dropped down to 2 at least, as you know.

The upshot was that most of the insurance companies had to throw in very heavy reserves to take care of their accumulated obligations.

Now, the Carnegie Foundation therefore closed its list of colleges and of participants in 1915, and it became one of their rules that the man did not carry his pension with him if he moved from one institution to the other, unless the other one was on the Carnegie list.

Well, when I moved from being a professor at Wesleyan, which was on the Carnegie list, to being president of Lawrence, which is on the Carnegie list, I carried it with me, but Brown had refused to go on to the Carnegie list back in 1905, in a great battle over whether to change the charter. They had insisted that they wouldn’t change it.

Mr. Forand. Typical Rhode Island independence.

Mr. Wriston. That is right. As a matter of fact, after we had lost the approximately $2 million we would have gained by joining the list, we did change the charter.

Mr. Keele. But you were under no compulsion to do it?

Mr. Wriston. No compulsion to do it, and no bribery to do it.

Now, with TIAA, however, it is different. That is just an insurance policy that goes with the man to whatever institution he goes. The other was a free pension. You made no contribution to it at all; and, therefore, you had no contract. You had what was known as expectations of benefits.

And those were attached not to you, except as a teacher in one of the colleges on that list. Of course, it has ceased to have any importance practically now because there are only—I looked yesterday in connection with my work as a member of the executive committee of the foundation—there are less than a hundred people of my age or younger who are on the list who have not yet got their pensions.

Most of them are all drawing their pensions. But this was a measure, of course, of the failure of Mr. Carnegie’s calculations to see what it would cost.

Just as a rough guess, I would say he didn’t foresee, first of all, the growth of the colleges and of the rise in salaries; and, if you are going to give a man half his salary and you don’t know what it is, it could be a fantastic sum of money, and I doubt if you could have done with $500 million or a billion what he thought he was going to do. As you knew, the leverage is tremendous on this. That is what I meant.
If you move from a Carnegie institution to a non-Carnegie institution, as I did from Lawrence to Brown, that free pension is lost. But my insurance policy with TIAA is my own, and I carry it with me.

Mr. Forand. You have cleared up the point very well. Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. Keeler. I have only one other question, I think, Dr. Wriston. Do you feel that education would benefit from more experimentation?

Mr. Wriston. Oh, yes. There are so many new things in the world, for example, in science. You can't stop that.

The moment that atomic physics came in, you had an enormous range. Of course, in medicine we have only scratched the surface of the antibiotics and of these chronic diseases. In the field of economics we have one of the most difficult and complicated problems in the world.

They talk about trade, not aid, but we have followed a certain policy for a long, long time with reference to tariffs, and so on, and only a doctrinaire thinks you can change that overnight.

I heard yesterday one of the greatest economists in the country say he had always been a free-trader but he didn't know how to change in that direction now. There needs to be enormous study on that.

Even in the field of insurance we have need for vast studies. I can't see any field—I have mentioned Africa, I have mentioned Russia. The Middle East needs study.

Point 4 launches us upon something we haven't any idea of the political consequences of economic aid, and yet we all know from our own experience with the Indians that you can destroy a culture but it is awfully hard to alter a culture.

So that, speaking as a professional, I can see no end to research, and that is basically dependent on experimentation.

So far as teaching is concerned, the curse of good teaching is you learn it and then turn to follow your routines and go down; and, if you don't bring refreshment and enlightening experience in, then you get to be a pendant instead of a teacher. And so from my standpoint as a professional in the field of experimentation I think we are just on the threshold.

Mr. Keeler. And that must come largely, under existing conditions, from foundation aid; is that right?

Mr. Wriston. So far as the pioneer things are concerned, they are trail blazers.

Mr. Keeler. If there are no further questions, I should like to say before Dr. Wriston is excused two things: One, I had the privilege of attending Brown for part of my academic days and am very proud of our president.

The Chairman. He is a very extraordinary fellow.

Mr. Keeler. Secondly, this committee is very indebted to Dr. Wriston, not only the committee but he has helped us greatly in our work.

The Chairman. He is a man of stature and deep understanding; there is no question about that.

Mr. Wriston. I have a serious feeling that this committee can perform a great service really in bringing before the public and making available for future research the work we need to know.
The Chairman. We appreciate the assistance you have given us, Doctor. We hope you won't leave us and will continue to help us in the future.

Mr. Forand. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make this statement at the outset of the hearing this morning, but I make it at the close. Dr. Wriston is one of the outstanding men of our State, and we are very proud to have him here.

Insofar as his contribution to the committee is concerned, I say to you right now that it is minute as compared to the contribution he has made to the welfare of our State of Rhode Island and to the educational system of Rhode Island. We are proud of you, Doctor.

Mr. Wriston. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Forand. The chairman has just suggested that I announce that the committee will now rise and we will meet again on Monday, at 10 a.m., in this same room.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the select committee recessed to reconvene at 10 a.m., Monday, November 24, 1952.)