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(ABSTRACT)

The study examined the following questions in relation to federal policy
and social practice in education which contributed to the disadvantage of
African-Americans:

1. Did federal policy and social practice in education contribute to the
   conditions and struggles of the disadvantaged African-Americans?

2. Why did vocational education become a part of public education?

3. Did federal policy and practice play a role in maintaining the
   conditions of the disadvantaged in vocational education?

4. How was the focus of vocational special needs education achieved
   leading to the 1963 Vocational Education Act?

Societal conditions and federal policies of the late 1800s and early
twentieth century, produced adverse conditions which prevented Negroes
from obtaining adequate education. During this period, the education system
of the early 1900s could not adequately lend itself to the structure and practice
of the economic system. This was realized by the leaders and policymakers and
they called for the federal government to enter into partnership with the
states in making vocational education a part of the public school system. Its
manifest objective was to relieve those conditions conducive to poverty,
economic stagnation and disadvantage by training the youth. Because of
the interpretation of the federal mandate, the Smith-Hughes Act (P. L. 64-347),
by the policymakers, certain segments of the population did not prosper, the majority of whom were these African-Americans.

By late 1958, conditions brought about a change in philosophy relative to the concerns of the poor and the disadvantaged and a different emphasis in education began to emerge. The leaders and policymakers realized that it was necessary to focus their attention on the disadvantaged through vocational special needs education. This focus brought about the legislative process which produced the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210).
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Early in the 1960s there was a sizeable number of poor and disadvantaged American citizens in the affluent society. The condition of many of these persons, as assessed by a federal government directive, showed that a special type of vocational education was needed to alleviate their condition. Earlier in the century similar conditions existed. The policies and practice in the public schools were blamed for economic and social conditions. This led to criticism of the public school and resulted in the inclusion of vocational education into its program.

The 1963 conditions brought a wave of social protests criticizing the educational, economic and social conditions persistently faced by certain ethnic groups, many of whom were Negroes. Harrington (1962) mirrored their condition in his book, *The Other America*. They were at the bottom of the social order in educational attainment, economic opportunity and social class. According to O'Neil (1971), early in 1963, Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, viewed the conditions of Negroes and informed the President that great poverty existed among them; they were behind in education and had a very low per capita income. According to Barlow (1976), they were disenfranchised, had fallen through the cracks of the social structure and their civil rights became the object of national concern.

Negroes represented only one ethnic group of the disadvantaged; however, it was their situation that was of paramount importance to this study. Barlow (1976), Harrington (1962), and O'Neil (1971) showed that they were conspicuously represented among the disadvantaged. While the factors related to how members of the other ethnic groups became disadvantaged
were also of concern, the decision not to include details of their experience was a limitation of this study.

The study took a cursory look at the role of the education institution from the 1800s to 1963 in view of the assumption that external pressures on the education institution and the delivery system of the institution itself exacerbated many of those conditions which created the disadvantaged. The record of how this occurred appears in Chapter 2.

The entry of vocational education into the public schools in 1917 was to alleviate a similar condition as that of the 1960s; it was expected to broaden opportunities for all working class youth. By policy and practice, however, most Negroes, as well as other ethnic groups did not profit fully from it. The record of why vocational education became a part of public education is the content of Chapter 3.

With vocational education as part of the public school program, it played a role in special focus education, a federal mandate intended to alleviate the conditions of the disadvantaged beginning in 1963. The record of how this occurred appears in Chapter 4.

Background of the Problem

The thrust toward industrialization, commercialization and unionization in the late 1800s, resulted in the development of certain economic, education, social and political problems. These conditions kept pressing the nation towards building a functional equitable education system to give the working classes the necessary preparation to function within the changing economy and to obtain a share in the advantages and advancement of the industrial nation. In much of the discussion related to the problems of the period, the existing structure of education was blamed.
Because of social unrest and political turmoil, there was a mounting wave of criticism regarding the elitist posture of the public high school. The educational tradition which set boys to conjugate Greek and Latin verbs for six or seven years was ridiculed (Woodward, 1887). In a period when private and public secondary schools combined served only 6.7% of that age group, and colleges served only 1.5% of the age group, the apparent failure of the public school system had become a burning issue (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

The dropout rate in the early years of schooling was deplorable. Not only did students leave without an adequate general education, but they also had no special training to fit them for work (Barlow, 1976). H. E. Miles, chairman of the Committee on Industrial Education, suggested that if the school system were submitted for judgment to an international panel of impartial experts, it would be shown that it rested on theories instead of realities (National Association of Manufacturers Proceedings, 1911).

In this struggle, the concept vocational education was advanced and became a focal issue for debate, since it was seen by some as an opportunity for the individual and for the economic development of the nation. The leaders and policy shapers of the nation then began to realize that a restructuring of education to include vocational education in the curriculum of the public secondary school might be a means of addressing these conditions. The pressing societal problems rendered many people both economically and academically disadvantaged. Woods and Kennedy (1922) noted that the 1893-95 depression which created great concern for the entire economic structure also sharpened the misery of slum dwellers and people became particularly sensitive to the problems of the youth age 12 to 16 as they left school and looked in vain for work. As industrial processes became more
complicated, employers grew increasingly reluctant to hire these untrained individuals. They were the last hired and the first fired. They drifted from job to job and could look forward to a lifetime of marginal employment. The discontent and rebelliousness of boys in this category became apparent since many youth felt the need for additional training, but found no help in the public schools. The apprenticeship system was in disarray during this period and was failing to function as a system of education and training (Seybolt, 1917; Douglas, 1921).

By the late 1890s, there was increasing evidence in the nation that a different curriculum, vocational education, would be necessary. Wirth (1980) noted that during this period, the issue of industrial education came into prominence. Both labor and management realized that the traditional method of apprenticeship was irrelevant to the factory system. Moreover, the new industrialism resulted in a need for a new kind of work force. New machine processes were continually introduced to the workers. At the same time, there was an increased tendency among workers to move from factory to factory and city to city. The person who possessed only one routine skill could be lost. The new worker required a general knowledge of the factory system and higher skills to move within it, including the ability to read blue prints and complicated instructions, to do shop mathematics and to practice safety and hygiene rules (Wirth, 1980).

The social processes which existed in the society in the period 1800 to about 1906, did not include, to a large extent, persons defined as disadvantaged. But who were the disadvantaged? They were defined by such concepts as ethnicity or race and by signs of deprivation. The terms minority and disadvantaged frequently merged to include Negro, Native American, Spanish,
Mexican and Puerto Rican populations as well as the poor Appalachian rural dweller. The essential point of the concept of disadvantaged is that there were social, cultural and economic circumstances which systematically discouraged, prevented, or deprived people in certain geographical places and with certain environmentally imposed constraints from obtaining adequate education, income and dignity (Evans and Herr, 1978).

The Need for the Study

Because of interpretation and social practice, vocational education had difficulty in meeting the needs of all youth as recommended by the 1914 Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education. The administrators and policymakers of the initial vocational education statute, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, interpreted the law as not encompassing all youth but only those who could profit from vocational education. Therefore, there was need to communicate and assure that in 1963, special efforts be made by policymakers in vocational education to change the philosophy which caused certain persons to be excluded and that a different approach to vocational education be mandated with a special needs focus.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine economic and social factors associated with the disadvantaged in education and the involvement of federal vocational education policy in creating, as well as, alleviating their condition.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the data collection and analysis:

1. Did federal policy and social practice in education contribute to the conditions and struggles of the disadvantaged Negroes?

2. Why did vocational education become a part of public education?
3. Did federal policy and practice play a role in maintaining the conditions of the disadvantaged in vocational education?

4. How was the focus of vocational special needs education achieved leading to the 1963 Vocational Education Act?

Methodology

Historical research methodology was used in this study to describe, explain, and thereby understand actions or events that occurred in the past. This type of research is especially useful in obtaining knowledge about previously examined questions and in reexamining questions where the answers are not definite as desired (Hopkins 1980). This historical research was, therefore, conceived to examine those factors related to the creation of the disadvantaged and the history of vocational education’s role in educating them. Therefore, a decision was made to examine the historical records and to define as an integrated narrative those past events or facts relative to the problems of the disadvantaged with special reference to Negroes.

An extensive review of the literature covering the period 1821 to 1963 was conducted to answer the research questions. Primary and secondary sources were examined. Primary sources were those which contained only data which were collected by the issuing organization. Secondary sources were those which contained data compiled by organizations other than the ones responsible for its publication.

The primary sources were obtained from government documents at the university libraries and the Library of Congress. They included the U.S. Congressional Record, the Congressional Quarterly, the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, U.S. Senate hearings, and the U.S. House of Representatives hearings. These documents contained details of bills, public
hearings in subcommittees of both the House and Senate, reports of committee executive sessions of the House and Senate, reports from floor debates, and conference reports.

The secondary sources were found in university libraries, the Library of Congress, and the American Vocational Association. They included documents such as the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968), the Panel of Consultants report *Education for a Changing World of Work* (1963), *Coming Apart* (1971) by O'Neil, and *The Other America* (1962) by Harrington. These sources dealt with societal conditions, events and information leading to legislation affecting the disadvantaged, the making of policy decisions, commentaries on these legislative outcomes and policy decisions, and provisions mandated for special focus vocational legislation.

**Summary**

This chapter introduced the problem of the study. It stated the motivation for its undertaking and gave the background related to the conditions and behaviors resulting from the problems of the 1893 depression and its effects which brought about a change in education philosophy and new programs to correct the situation. It explained the need for the study and presented the questions and the methodology which guided the collection of the data.
CHAPTER 2

EDUCATION POLICY AND THE DISADVANTAGED
NEGROES: 1800s TO THE 1950s

The 1800s to 1929

When the first public schools appeared around 1821, they excluded Negroes. American Indians, many of the newly immigrated peoples and the children of many farmers who valued their offsprings' productive labor over their schooling (Rudy, 1965). However, in pre-1850s, Negro children attended segregated schools in Massachusetts (Alexander and Alexander, 1980).

In Roberts v. City of Boston (1850), the Massachusetts court ruled that in accordance with school policy, Sarah Roberts, an elementary school pupil, must bypass five elementary schools for white children to reach the Smith Grammar School, which an evaluation committee reported was in poor condition and inferior to many of the schools which she passed (Roberts v. City of Boston, 1850). The total effect was that by 1863, there were four million Negroes without schools, mainly in the South, where 90% of them were illiterate (Good, 1962).

By 1875, Congress enacted the first significant civil rights law granting certain rights to Negroes. This law was poorly enforced and although in accordance with the law, bills to provide federal aid to education for Negroes were prepared, none passed and educational opportunities remained meager. In 1883, the Supreme Court declared the Civil Rights Act of 1875 unconstitutional and southern states began to enact laws to segregate the races. In accordance with state policy, the appropriations for the education of white youngsters were ten times higher than that of Negro children. Because
of social custom, discrimination became the rule (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

There were great difficulties arising from radical reconstruction and the advancement of schooling was curtailed to the extent that by the late 1800s, expenditure per pupil for public education was as low as $3.38 in South Carolina (Woodward, 1951). In spite of this situation, little action was taken to improve the public school and whites felt that Negroes should pay for their own school. It was this situation which brought the religious missionaries to the South and influenced philanthropists, such as Peabody, Slater, Jeanes and Stokes to contribute endowments to Negro education (Good, 1962; Rippa, 1967). Through the efforts of these philanthropists and missionaries, a limited number of Negroes were fortunate to receive training. These teachers then sought employment in the segregated public schools. According to the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968), "no distinction between Negroes who had graduated from Dartmouth and those who had graduated from the cotton fields" were made. (p. 214) Thus, the limited number of Negro teachers who were privileged to receive training from such schools and obtained employment in the public schools had the unpleasant experience of receiving lower salaries than white teachers even when their training and experience from the best religious schools were similar (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

In 1899, the Supreme Court in Cumming v. the Board of Education of Richmond County, Georgia, decided that the county had the right to order a school designated a high school for Negro children, closed to these high school pupils without reassigning them to another school. The United States Supreme Court held that in this matter the only interest of the federal
judiciary was to see that all citizens share equitably in the tax burden, but that
the matter of education and how it was conducted, supported by that taxation,
was solely a state concern (Cumming v. the Board of Education, 1899).

Under these conditions, between 1900 and 1910, Negroes moved north in
substantial numbers. There they realized that equality of treatment did not
exist in Massachusetts, New York or Illinois. Even though some Northern
states enacted civil rights laws in the 1880s, Negroes received similar
treatment in the North as they did in the South. Many of the Negro
professionals in education who migrated from the South to these northern
areas and sought membership in organizations associated with their
professions were rebuffed.

Between 1910 and 1920, the National Association for the Advancement of
Colored People (NAACP) fought unsuccessfully to prevent school segregation
in northern cities. Gerrymandering of school boundaries and other devices by
boards of education were fought with written petitions, verbal protests to
school officials, legal suits, and in several cities, school boycotts (Report of the
National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

Since 1900, the social efficiency educators called upon the high schools
to adjust themselves to increasing numbers of students of allegedly low ability
who were storming the doors. In the early 1920s, high schools were being
asked to make changes so that more youth could be enrolled (Krug, 1972). For
the social efficiency educators, it was important that all youth be served in a
universal, custodial environment in interest of national unity, cohesion and
common loyalty. Negro children, however, were strikingly underrepresented
in the high school population of the 1920s. While they comprised slightly less
than 10% of the total population, they made up only 1.5% of the students in
public high schools. In 1930, they represented 3% of the high school enrollment. It was sometimes assumed that these figures were offset by the large numbers of Negro students in private secondary schools, but in 1920 there were only 9,526 such students compared with 27,631 in public high schools, and in 1930 only 9,868 compared with 118,897 (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1920; U.S. Office of Education, 1930).

The underrepresentation of Negroes was a result partly of de jure segregation in the South. Segregation, of course, existed both North and South, but under de jure segregation Negro youth went to the segregated high school, if there was one, or to none. High schools for Negroes in such states were largely developed after 1920; they were developed mainly in cities. In the late 1920s, there were 282 counties in 14 states with de jure segregation. One-eighth or more of the high school age population were Negroes. Thousands of these youth in these states, especially rural youth, had no public high schools to attend (Favrot, 1929).

In 1920, only 15 out of every 100 Negro children in the South progressed beyond the fifth grade; and only 1% of the 2,500,000 students enrolled in high schools was Negro (Good, 1962). According to Harlan (1972), in North Carolina, a high school for Negroes was first reported in 1917. In this same year, while the high school enrollment for the entire state was 15,469 students, only 19 of these students were Negroes. Negroes comprised 35.3% of Virginia's school age population at about the close of World War I; they represented only 7.1% of the high school pupils and only 1.9% of the high schools were designated for Negroes.

While the social efficiency philosophers and educators called for universal containment of high school students during the 1920s, the schools
openly discriminated against Negro students. Students were placed in old, overcrowded buildings, given the most aged and out-of-date materials, and district boundaries were gerrymandered to keep them out of white schools. Schools constantly pushed these students into tracks that would prepare them for their place in society. The contention was that Negroes had their place in society and the school's duty was to prepare them to occupy that place. The rationalization was that it was not in the interest of Negroes to be prepared for jobs from which their race was currently excluded, but that it was the school's duty to prepare them for tasks society allowed them to perform (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

In the 1920s, acceptance of Thorndike's intelligence testing in which Negro students were assessed to be less intelligent than white students in high school led to a policy decision by the Gary, Indiana public school system. Because of Thorndike's findings, the school system placed several Negro students, presumed retarded, in a trade school. Albert Fertshe, guidance director of the school, discovered several of those students assessed as retarded to be normal and highly intelligent, thus they were transferred to the high school (Krug, 1972).

Before 1917, there were voices calling for a greater number of students to be enrolled in school since many students did not attend and the dropout rate was high. The enactment of Smith-Hughes in 1917, gave support to the effort of World War I and provided a brighter picture for education and educators. The economic boom which resulted from World War I began to decline by the late 1920s and the former conditions in education, such as low attendance and high dropout rate, began to reappear.
The 1930s

During the depression there were incidents of budget cutting in education in several areas, especially in the large northern cities of the nation to which significant numbers of Negroes had fled. In these areas, several local government policy decisions led to decreased teachers' salaries, reduced teaching staff and increased classroom size. The separate \textit{de jure} Negro schools in the segregated South were also victims of this financial debacle (Krug, 1972).

As the 1930s commenced, many educators were convinced that a solution to the education problem was a custodial approach to teaching. In this period, students were taught to have respect for authority and schools continued to worry about students' social life, sex, drinking and lack of appreciation for studies (Fisher, 1943). According to Williams (1937), teachers were monitored for signs of advocating communism in their teaching and many were required to take loyalty oaths. According to Church and Sedlak (1976), during the depression, unconventional methods of teaching were introduced into the education system by the New Deal Administration and the influence of this administration carried over into World War II.

The 1940s

In spite of their experience, especially with vocational education during World War I, teachers of the 1940s viewed this whole situation in education, recalling the period just prior to the commencement of the depression. Confronted with this situation, the educators felt that they should not be saddled with college preparatory courses in high school. School people then focused on those they considered neither college preparation nor vocational education appropriate. They again viewed themselves and their
schools, especially the high schools, as primary custodial institutions which kept youth off the labor market, but they pledged to prepare these students for life. In this context, life referred to less than earning a living and more to areas of concern like family, child-rearing, spending habits and leisure-time activities (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

During this period, there was a lack of an accepted philosophy of secondary education which resulted in several negative outcomes, among them was the school attendance statistics. One-third of the school-age students did not attend; however, of those who attended, only 50% remained to graduate (Good, 1962).

Although in 1935, the NEA and its Department of Superintendence created an Education Policies Commission to clarify the purpose and role of education in the American democracy, an effort originating with the Committee of Ten in 1918, it was not until 1938, this commission concluded that the purpose of education was to teach self-realization, human relations, civic efficiency and economic competence. This was to have profound influence on the 1940s. With these guidelines, the schools continued to emphasize personal relations and the strategies of everyday living rather than academic or vocational skills. This emphasis as the basis for secondary education, fostered through the Education Policies Commission, led to a demand by school people for an official position on their secondary school curriculum. Therefore, in 1946, the U.S. Office of Education established the Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth based on the philosophy of the Education Policies Commission. This established the theoretical base for the curriculum taught in the secondary schools (Krug, 1972).
The commission's concern was with the adolescent youth who dropped out of school because their needs were not met realistically. The commission felt justified in initiating the life adjustment program, if it could thereby lure back into the schools those who did not want to be there in the first place (Bestor, 1953). The pattern of dropping out continued since the years of the depression and was not confined to secondary students. Good (1962) described the progression of retention of students who completed the ninth grade from a group of 1000 who began together in the fifth grade and continued through the twelfth grade and to graduation. For each four-year period beginning in 1930 and ending in 1938, there was a significant decrease in the number of students who began in the ninth grade. Of those whose four-year period ended in 1938, more than 50% of the number which began dropped out of school.

The dropout rate of these secondary students led to conclusions about why, who and what contributed to this situation. Among the factors were the lack of completion of secondary school by parents and the effects of the low socioeconomic status of such parents. The parents of these students were farm laborers, unskilled laborers, tenant farmers and domestic servants. The dropout students were characterized as individuals who were incapable of dressing as well as the average student, unable to meet the incidental school expenses, and not accepted by fellow students (Douglass, 1952).

The theoretical basis of life adjustment education was that its curriculum should keep students enrolled in school. The students of the 1940s targeted for this curriculum were recent Latin American immigrants living primarily in congested slum areas and Negroess in the southern rural and northern and western urban areas (Douglass, 1952).
The concern of the Life Adjustment Education Commission was that the needs of these adolescent youth, who dropped out of school, were not realistically met. It was from this perspective that the life adjustment theory was officially unveiled on June 1, 1945 at the end of a two-day conference on Vocational Education in the Years Ahead sponsored by the United States Office of Education. The participants were not quite sure what they had agreed upon. The chairperson called upon Charles A. Prosser to summarize the sense of the meeting. Prosser's summary, expressed as a resolution, was accepted by the group. Embedded in it was the new term, destined for a decade to elicit much applause and subsequently to become the scapegoat for the shedding of pedagogical sins (Bestor, 1953). The following is an account of Prosser's summary:

It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20% of its youth of secondary-school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare 20% of its students for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60% of our youth of secondary-school age will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens—unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a comparable program for this group. (Krug, 1966, p. 131; Proffitt, 1946, p. 6)

The Life Adjustment Education Commission explained the concept life adjustment education to mean equipping all American youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as home members, workers and citizens, but with special concern for those who were less well served in the schools than the college-bound or vocational group. The program of life adjustment education was ethical and moral living,
physical, mental, and emotional health; fundamental skills; and wholesome recreation. Schools were asked to experiment with the concept (United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 4, 1954).

The Life Adjustment Education Commission's model school—the Illinois Secondary School—published a curriculum study listing aspects of its life adjustment education program. It included dancing, party stunts, improvement of personal appearance, selecting a dentist, and boy and girl relation (Bester, 1953).

This theory of Life Adjustment Education established as a policy by the U.S. Office of Education for 60% of the American youth became the symbol of modern education. The underlying theme was that schools had no real role in preparing them either for productive work or productive leadership, but rather should seek to prepare them to garner whatever personal satisfaction they could during their lives. The primary thrust of innovation in schooling in this period then, was directed toward the 60% majority, those deemed marginal rather than those who promised to assume a major productive or leadership role in the society.

By the late 1940s, a series of criticism regarding life adjustment education began to appear in writings. Mortimer Smith published And Madly Teach (1949), Bernard Bell, Crisis in Education (1949), Albert Lynd, Quackery in the Public Schools 1953, Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands (1953), Robert Hutchin, The Conflict in Education (1953) and Mortimer Smith The Diminished Mind (1954). Although these critics were very different from each other, they all had a central theme of criticism—the aimlessness of public education. They all called for a return to the basics—more grammar,
mathematics, algebra, trigonometry, classical literature, languages and history and less civics (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

The 1950s

By 1952, criticisms began to undermine the general reputation of life adjustment curriculum as triviality, soft pedagogy, and the neglect of intellectual aims (Krug, 1966). With the outcry against life adjustment education and the knowledge of America's situation vis-a-vis the launching of the Russian satellite, the effort for general change commenced. In 1954, the members of the Supreme Court realized that the question of the separate-but-equal doctrine could not be resolved merely on whether or not the segregated schools were equal in such tangible factors as buildings, curricula, and the qualifications and salaries of teachers. Delivering the opinion of the Court, Chief Justice Earl Warren noted that the Court must look instead to the effects of segregation on public education, for only in this way can it be determined whether segregation in public schools deprived these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

The Court decided that education was probably the most important function of state and local governments. Education was the foundation of citizenship, cultural values, preparation for professional training and adjustment to the environment. Separate schools were inherently unequal. Segregation had a detrimental effect on Negro children because the policy of separating the races was usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of Negroes (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954).

The Brown decision should have been a climax to decades of educational aspiration among Negroes. Instead, it turned out to be another source of frustration and the beginning of a rapid deterioration of their faith in
education's power to improve their lives. The nation's unwillingness to implement the Court's demand for integration deeply disappointed Negroes. Southern school districts fought to frustrate the law at every turn. In 1955 and 1956 the southern states adopted the policy of massive resistance, and strategies rendered ineffective the new law (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

Southern lawyers strained to find constitutional support for the right of states to override Supreme Court decisions, especially on local matters like education. States passed laws and constitutional amendments that required segregated schools, or guaranteed white parents the right to have their children educated in all-white schools even if their local school was integrated, or made local referenda totally binding with regard to the racial composition of the local public schools. State and local school authorities sought to delay action by fighting each desegregation petition brought by the NAACP through every legal avenue of appeal. Some localities and states tried to convert their public schools into private institutions and then established, with tax money, enough scholarships to cover tuition for all the district's children (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

Less than two months after Brown I was handed down in May 1954, the first White Citizens' Council was organized in Indianola, Mississippi, for the express purpose of resisting desegregation in the interest of preventing the "mongrelization" of the white race. Over the next months a citizens' council movement spread across the South, dedicated not only to maintaining segregation, but also to purging schools of liberal teachers, books and, more generally, purging the South of the NAACP.

Southern governors and legislators, led by Senators Harry Byrd of Virginia and James Eastland of Mississippi, revived John C. Calhoun's pre-Civil
War doctrine of interposition, which held that the states had the right and the
obligation to nullify unjust federal laws by interposing themselves between
the federal government and the people, and simply defied the Supreme Court's
rulings. In addition, they enacted scores of laws intended to ensure the
continuance of segregation--laws abolishing compulsory schooling, denying
state funds to biracial schools, providing tuition grants to students who chose
to attend segregated private schools, and permitting districts to establish
elaborate mechanisms for classifying, assigning, and transferring pupils.

In 1955, a Federation for Constitutional Government was established to
coordinate the fight against the Court and its desegregation mandates; and in
March 1956, 101 southern congressmen and senators issued a Declaration of
Constitutional Principles denying the validity of the Brown ruling and
declaring their intention to resist enforced integration by any lawful means.
In the wake of this massive resistance, as Byrd and his allies called it, violence
and intimidation against Negroes and moves to disfranchise them intensified.
The border states proved more amenable to the Court's rulings because they
had smaller percentages of Negroes in their population and encountered less
virulent white fears of Negro domination. Baltimore, Wilmington, San
Antonio, Washington, St. Louis, and Louisville moved promptly to eliminate
their dual school systems, in part by redistricting and assigning children to
the schools nearest their homes, in part by permitting students to transfer to
schools of their choice. Other communities followed more or less swiftly,
depending both on the racial composition of their population and on the
attitudes, the firmness, and the quality of leadership of state and local school
President Dwight D. Eisenhower endorsed the *Brown* decision several days after it was handed down; but he was a gradualist by nature and believed not only that the process of desegregation would take time but that it would only be hampered by extremists on both sides. His hand was forced, however, by events in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1957. There, the doctrine of interposition was invoked in a pivotal test of the nature of American federalism. The Little Rock school board, under federal district court order, had adopted a plan to desegregate the schools gradually, beginning in September with the admission of nine Negro students to Central High School. Governor Orville Faubus, claiming he was acting in the interest of public order, called out the Arkansas National Guard to prevent the entry of the Negro students. The school board, joined by the mayor of Little Rock, maintained that it was the governor who was creating the problem, while the federal court ordered the governor to cease interfering with its order. The governor withdrew the guardsmen, but the confrontation had attracted a mob of white supremacist demonstrators; and, when the school actually opened and the Negro youngsters entered, the superintendent of schools became fearful for the youngsters' safety and sent them home in police cars. President Eisenhower, insisting that mobs would not be allowed to flout federal court orders, federalized the Arkansas National Guard and sent units of the 101st Airborne Division to Little Rock to enforce the court's decrees (Cremin, 1988).

In the North, however, the exact opposite occurred. Public schools in northern cities grew more segregated, rather than less, as urban whites fled to the suburbs just as fast as, if not faster than, Negroes migrated to and within the cities. The overall proportion of Negroes attending school with whites actually decreased fractionally nationwide since 1955. Although in some cases
northern school systems gerrymandered district boundaries to segregate Negroes into their own schools, in most cases racial segregation in northern schools simply reflected racial segregation in housing. Such de facto segregation fell entirely outside the scope of the Brown decision. That decision declared it unconstitutional to separate deliberately schoolchildren by race but said nothing about segregation that occurred because of residential patterns or political boundaries. For almost two decades civil rights advocates and educators sought legal redress for the victims of this kind of scholastic deprivation (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

In 1957, the same year of the Little Rock incident, an outcome of Russian advances in education brought immediate reaction throughout the country that the United States had fallen behind because of its education program (Krug, 1966). An immediate response to Russia's education potential brought about a proposal to change the purpose of education in American schools since America's technological lag was attributed to the schools' failure to emphasize academic subject matter (Fantini and Weinstein, 1968). Yet, a further example of the effort to deprive Negroes from an education occurred between 1959 to 1964 when, by policy, Prince Edward County in Virginia shut down its public schools for four years in order to avoid integration as mandated by the Supreme Court (Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 1964). While this Virginia case was in litigation, the social ferment erupted and activists, underemployed and unemployed workers, women's rights groups, and tax-reform advocates in several quarters of the country began to demand change (Finch and McGough, 1982).
Summary

Although the study was concerned mainly with the situation of disadvantaged blacks, the literature search was not limited to looking at the whole spectrum of disadvantaged people. It was clear from the literature search that a preponderance of information focused on blacks as the largest and most conspicuous deprived group of disadvantaged individuals.

The data researched for this chapter revealed that at the commencement of the expansion of public education about 1821, groups later defined as disadvantaged were refused acceptance to public schools. By 1862, there were several millions of these disadvantaged peoples who were illiterate and without schools. By 1875, Congress enacted the first civil rights law giving Negroes an opportunity for education. However, bills prepared to effect this never passed; therefore appropriations were never made. In 1883, the Supreme Court declared the 1875 Civil Rights Act unconstitutional and Negroes continued to struggle for equal rights to education. This struggle continued well into the beginning of the twentieth century when the condition of education was such that non-attendance and high dropout rates occurred. Academics for the professionals dominated the education scene. Both education and economic stagnation forced a change in the education program of the public schools. This change brought about the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. Its emergence was important to the nation's involvement in World War I. The economic and education changes, which took place because of World War I, brought a very positive face to the nation but faded somewhat with the depression of the 1930s.

In that period, efforts to correct economic and education situations led to certain unconventional approaches in education. The after effects of World
War I and the depression, marked by the New Deal administration, came to bear upon the educational philosophy of the 1940s. The dropout rates and low attendance in secondary schools resulted in the decision that only 20% of the nation's youth was academically oriented and that 20% could be prepared vocationally. It was from this premise that the Education Policies Commission of the Department of Education decided that the orientation of 60% of the nation's youth must be life adjustment education. The writers and critics of the late 1940s and early 1950s criticized the delivery of life adjustment education as a time when 60% of the nation's youth were wasted. As the nation came to realize the situation, plans were laid for overall changes. About that time, the Supreme Court decided in Brown v. the Board of Education (1954) that the struggles of Negroes in segregated schools and classrooms must come to an end. After this decision was made, a concentrated effort to maintain the segregation status went into effect and the struggles of the traditionally disadvantaged become more intense. By 1963, efforts were in progress to correct the situation. The history which recorded how this was done is the subject of chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3
FACTORS LEADING TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AS PUBLIC EDUCATION: 1893 TO 1917

Economic Factors

Many manufacturers had been ruined or badly shaken in the depression of 1893-1894. Thus, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) was organized in 1895, at the time when American industry faced an urgent need to take stock of its condition. The men who came together to form the new Manufacturer's Association were motivated by a clear desire to survive economic depression.

Perceptive businessmen and bankers saw that the promise of large profits lay in high volume, low unit-cost production. This led to a rapid increase in use of the corporate device. Combinations of business units occurred on a wide scale. The trend was in the direction of larger plants with more modern, efficient machinery, and larger labor forces. The response of manufacturers to a decline in prices was to cut costs. Wage costs were reduced by layoffs, longer hours, or changes in hourly pay rates.

Each new move solved some problems and introduced others. Thus investment in new machinery increased fixed costs, which could lead to peril in times of depression. Complicated equipment required more highly trained operatives, and they were hard to find. Moves to lower labor costs were resisted by the unions. Many manufacturers were unable to adapt to the swift flow of changes that followed one upon another (Wirth, 1980).

One year before the economic collapse of 1893, the Committee of Ten of the National Education Association proposed that the college preparatory track, giving heavy emphasis to the study of the classics, should be the
standard curriculum for all high school students. Through a series of
meetings with many subgroups, the Committee of Ten, headed by Charles W.
Eliot, President of Harvard, developed a model high school program with four
major areas of concentration: classical, Latin-Scientific, Modern Language and
English (Law, 1982).

By 1902, the importance of vocational education to economic
development commanded the attention of President Theodore Roosevelt. The
President stressed that as a nation, America contended for the markets of the
world; but its most formidable competitors were the nations in which there
were the most highly developed business ability and skill. The prize would be
won by the countries of greatest industrial efficiency. However, the American
public school system failed to give the industrial training which fits a man for
the shop and the farm. High quality schools were developed for the men at the
top with engineering schools ranking with the best in Europe, but almost
nothing was done to equip the private soldiers of the industrial army—the
mechanic, the metal worker, the carpenter. An education which provided
industrial intelligence would add dignity to labor, provide protection against
immigrant job competitors, and provide for workers and farmers formal
educational programs equivalent to those already available to professional and
managerial groups (National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education,
Bulletin No. 3, 1907).

At this time came voices from the NAM declaring that if American
manufacturers were to lock horns with veteran industrial giants, they would
have to learn to improve the technological quality of their products. This was
possible only through formal technical training of workers. If American
workmanship was to be improved, America’s schools, colleges and universities
would have to devote more attention to teaching technical and scientific knowledge (National Association of Manufacturers Proceedings, 1898).

The apprenticeship system, which originated in the handicraft age of production, was adequate for an ever-shrinking percentage of workers. It was irrelevant for most purposes of the new manufacturing. The skill needs of modern industry could be met only through formal education. The manufacturers realized this and turned their attention to the public schools (National Association of Manufacturers Proceedings, 1903).

In this situation, the NAM decided that the education crucial to its existence would be obtained in an expanded system of trade school education. The AFL decided upon a series of investigations through education committees between 1904 and 1906. In 1906, a resolution was passed to authorize the committee on education to conduct investigations into the subject of apprenticeship, the career lives of graduates of the trade schools, manual training programs, and schools of technology (Wirth, 1980).

The dissatisfaction with public schools was growing among the new businesspersons and industrialists since the Civil War. In Massachusetts, Yankee manufacturers were nervous about their ability to meet international competition. At the World's Fair in Paris in 1867, English and American manufacturers discovered that their wares were inferior to those produced on the continent. They pointed to the lack of skill in drawing and other "arts of design" by American workingmen (Wirth, 1980).

Social Factors

The general social situation which developed in the country just prior to 1900 and led to the discussion of the role vocational education was to play, brought groups with humanitarian concerns as well as interests in education
into the widening discussion. In the cities were squalid conditions of slum and slum dwellers and they were ignored by prominent and respected citizens (Wiebe, 1964).

The schools in the cities were undergoing an unprecedented expansion. They were confronted with new waves of impoverished, non-English-speaking immigrant children and with multiple pressures to retain more children in the school longer. The public school was cast as the great immigrant assimilating agency and the prophylactic for crime, vice, pauperism, juvenile delinquency, and the other social ills of the city. It was seen as a major agency in its program for the amelioration of slum life (Cohen, 1964).

In New York City, the disorder and discontent of the 1890s forced attention to the plight of urban slum inhabitants. The 1890 New York census showed the city to be the home of 1,500,000 people of whom 80% were foreign born or of foreign parentage. The new immigrants were largely Russian and Polish Jews, Italians and newcomers from the Balkans or Eastern Europe (Wirth, 1980).

More than a million Puerto Ricans migrated to the continental United States in search of better job opportunities; three-quarters of them lived in urban slum ghettos in New York City. There were approximately five million Mexican-Americans, or Chicanos, in the United States. Many came as legal or illegal immigrants; others were descendants of the people who occupied the Southwest United States for over four centuries and who were involuntarily included into the society by conquest. Their position as a Spanish-speaking, Catholic people in an English-speaking, predominantly Protestant country was a difficult one, and their problems were aggravated by a tacit assumption
that they were not really Americans at all, but rather Mexicans (Robertson, 1977).

Up to the turn of the twentieth century, ex-slaves migrated primarily to the towns and cities of the South. Thus, in 1900, about nine out of every ten Negroes were residing in cities and towns of the South. Between 1900 and 1920, 15% of the Negro population moved to Northern cities (Smith, 1966).

Because of this situation, two humanitarian groups became visible. Both were concerned with the onrush of change. The Populists, primarily a rural small-town phenomenon, having viewed the effects of the onrush from the rural areas were antagonistic to the new urbanism. The second group, the Progressives, on the other hand, were prepared to accept urban life as inescapable reality. They were ready to battle ugly aspects of cities and to transform them so that they could embody once again beloved values of older American communities (Wirth, 1980).

**The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education and Other Interest Groups in the Informal Agenda**

In 1905, the Massachusetts Legislature created a Commission on Industrial Education to inquire into the advisability of establishing industrial schools (Woods and Kennedy, 1922). The Commission reviewed the inequities of the existing public school system and saw it as too literary in its scope and method (Barlow (1976). The report of the Commission was distributed nationwide and increasing numbers of people viewed the problem in national and international dimensions. As a result, in 1906, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE) was founded (Bennett, 1926; Cremin, 1961). Two educators, Charles R. Richards of Teachers College, Columbia University, and James P. Haney, director of the New York City public school
manual training program were credited for organizing the NSPIE (Venn, 1964).

Within a few years of its formation, it brought together many of the original contenders, who viewed the necessity of vocational education since the depression of the 1890s. It enlisted the support of organized industry and labor, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), and the American Federation of Labor (AFL) to work for public vocational schools. Soon after the Society’s first meeting, individuals and organizations of almost every type began declaring their support for industrial education. Significantly, many organizations committed themselves to the general principle before concrete proposals were clarified. In 1907, the NEA called for the establishment of trade schools (undefined), at public expense whenever conditions justified their establishment (National Education Association, 1907). NSPIE began to publish a series of bulletins which carried its ideas throughout the country, including an important symposium on industrial education. The symposium elicited responses to eleven questions from a list of business and labor leaders. (NSPIE Bulletin No. 3, 1907). The results helped to clarify the issues between the two groups. An agreement emerged that some kind of industrial education was a legitimate item of public expense (Wirth, 1980).

By 1910, the drive for industrial education reached a new stage. The NAM, influenced by its own cost accounting studies, dropped its earlier allegiance to private trade schools. It accepted the idea of trade training at public expense. The NSPIE leaders decided to conduct a massive survey in order to obtain a perspective view of the advance of industrial education. The urge to get results intensified between 1910 and 1912. Several factors were
responsible: the appearance of Frederick Taylor's *The Principles of Management* (1911), criticizing economic inefficiency of the schools; the muckraking journals which criticized social and economic inefficiencies and urged the application of Taylor's principles to school administration; and the professional education journals which also featured articles by leading educational administrators like Frank Spaulding, Franklin Bobbitt and Ellwood Cubberly urging the application of scientific management to education (Taylor, 1911).

By the end of 1911, the stage was set for the ambitious NSPIE leaders to take advantage of the new efficiency mood. James Munroe, a leading Boston industrialist and then President of NSPIE, took up the challenge at the November meetings arguing that the addition of industrial education throughout the elementary school could certainly reduce the inconceivable waste of our human resources (NSPIE Proceedings, 1911).

The NSPIE was ready to move into various school systems, survey their programs, find them inefficient and out of touch with the needs of industrial society, and then urge them to reorganize with vocational education at their center. The Society then began to conduct school surveys across the country in places such as Richmond, Virginia; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Richmond, Indiana.

From the time of the very first NSPIE convention in 1908, its objective was to secure federal funding for vocational education. Delegates voted to transmit to the President of the United States and Congress a report prepared by Henry Pritchett of MIT. It called special attention to the importance of this whole matter from the standpoint of our national and economic welfare. An important decision was made by the NSPIE in 1912 in accordance with its
efforts to obtain federal legislation. This decision was the hiring of Charles Prosser as executive secretary of the Society. Prosser headed the pioneering education program in Massachusetts under the general superintendency of David Snedden and proved to be an effective and powerful lobbyist while he held his Society office between 1912 and 1915 (Wirth 1980).

Also prominent among the leaders of these groups was Robert Woods. Another was Jane Addams who promoted the cause of industrial education. She found a sympathetic audience in the Superintendent of Schools, Ella Flagg Young, who in the nineties was Dewey's chief advisor on elementary education at his University of Chicago Laboratory School. The NSPE leaders realized that differences within the Society's membership had to be confronted and resolved. The period between 1907 and 1910 was a time of interaction and consensus-seeking (Wirth, 1980).

Legislation

Early in the life of the National Society, committees worked on plans to submit to Congress. There was simultaneous effort on the part of other groups to influence the participation of the federal government in vocational education. The AFL, after much study of the feasibility of vocational education, wrote a bill for Congress based on its findings. The Federation sought to have the bill introduced in Congress by Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, who agreed. The bill was introduced in the Senate in January 1910. A companion bill was introduced in the House by Representative Davis. The Dolliver-Davis bills on vocational education made some progress in Congress during the first half of 1910, but Congress adjourned on June 25 without taking action on either. By 1912, Senator Page of Vermont began to champion vocational

Bill S-3 was cosponsored by Senator Page and Congressman Wilson of Pennsylvania. At the time the Page-Wilson bill was introduced, a deadlock arose between supporters of the Page-Wilson Bill—providing federal aid to industrial, agricultural and home economics education in secondary schools—and supporters of the Smith-Lever Bill, providing federal aid for the extension training of farmers and their families in agriculture and home economics. Both groups supported a common cause—democratizing practical education for working people. The two bills advocated were not antagonistic to each other. They did not compete for the same students, nor for the same courses, nor for the same appropriation. However, the deadlock lasted for three years while a Republican Senate refused to vote favorably for the Smith-Lever Bill, and a Democratic House invariably voted against the Page-Wilson Bill. One explanation of the deadlock offered by an official of the National Society was that the supporters of each bill feared that only one bill could be passed.

After the congressional election of 1913 gave the Democrats a small majority in the Senate, Senator Smith, in spite of his fine leadership, still found it difficult to secure a senate majority for the Smith-Lever Bill. He favored the appointment of a national commission to study the difficult problems involved in a national system of federal aid to the states for secondary education which were not encountered in the system providing aid for land grant colleges. He was aware that the office of the NSPHE also favored this plan.

A gentlemen's agreement was reached between Senator Smith and officers of the Society. The Senator promised that if the Smith-Lever Bill were
adopted, he would offer a resolution creating a commission to study the unsolved problems of the Page-Wilson Bill. The following events took place: adoption of the Smith-Lever Act in January 1914, defeat on the same day of the Page-Wilson Bill in Joint Conference Committee, and the tendering of a resolution the following day by Senator Smith (Hawkins et al, 1951).

On January 20, 1914, Congress took a formal approach to include vocational education on the federal agenda. It approved a joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a commission to study national aid for vocational education. The resolution provided that nine members of the commission report to the Congress not later than June 1, 1914. The commission organized on April 2, 1914, and elected Senator Smith of Georgia as chairperson.

It took less than 60 days for the Commission to produce a two-volume report of almost 500 pages. It covered virtually every phase of the many problems involved in a comprehensive study of national aid to the states for the new education. The Commission presented to Congress its findings and recommendations for a federally aided system of vocational education based on state aid and cooperation. The Report outlined many of the principles and arguments which gave both Congress and the public an understanding of the obligations to provide vocational training as a joint responsibility of both the state and the nation (Swanson, 1962). The Commission stated that the immediate need of providing vocational education for this country was well illustrated by the size of the problem. The 1910 Census reported that there were 12,659,203 persons in the United States, both male and female, engaged in agriculture. It was probable that less than 1% of these had adequate preparation. Engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits and allied
industries were 14,261,376. It was equally correct to say that not one out of every hundred of these workers had, or was having any adequate chance to secure training (Swanson, 1962; Venn, 1964).

The Commission also expressed that there was an urgent social and educational need for vocational education. Apart from its report to Congress on its findings, the Commission also presented a proposal for legislation including a draft of a bill for vocational education (Barlow, 1976).

The Commission then stated that the kind of vocational education most needed at that time was that designed to prepare workers for the more common occupations in which the great mass of our people find useful employment. Vocational training, to be most effective and thoroughgoing, should be restricted to persons over 14 years of age. Because of the kind of workers to be reached and the character of instruction to be given, this vocational education should be of less than college grade (Swanson, 1962).

Following traditional procedure, the Commission's proposed bill was referred to Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education, and to Congressman Dudley M. Hughes, chairman of the House Committee on Education. Both were members of the Commission; they were staunch supporters of free public vocational education; and were skilled in congressional procedure. They copied verbatim the Commission's Bill providing federal aid and introduced it to the respective committees as the Smith-Hughes Bill. They used the original draft of the bill to make corrections, adjustments, concessions, and compromises where necessary before finally putting the Smith-Hughes Bill on its passage through Congress (Swanson, 1962).
The National Commission report received a good press, and plans were made to push passage of the recommended legislation when Congress convened in 1915. For reasons not altogether clear, the National Aid for Vocational Education bill lay in congressional pigeonholes for a couple of years, despite the variety and extent of favorable testimony and committee reports. The Chamber of Commerce ringingly endorsed the measure in 1916. The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, as promised, drummed up rural support for the measure. Labor, management, social work, political, child labor and military conventions passed strong resolutions in behalf of the bill. Leaders of the National Society combed cloakrooms for votes, and President Wilson sent messages to Congress on behalf of the bill.

Late in 1916 and early 1917, talks became frequent about the need to catch up with the Germans in the training of workers for a war effort and the vocational education bill became a national preparedness factor. In this setting, the bill was passed in February 1917 with only one dissenting vote. It was signed by President Wilson just two months before the United States entered World War I (Venn, 1964).

Summary

The data search for this chapter revealed that there was a breakdown in business, commerce and industry in the late 1800s, and that the central cause, as agreed by the leaders of the period, was the failure of the public school to undergird these essential institutions in a developing industrial agricultural economy. By early 1900s, the nation realized that it was behind the Europeans in education preparation for world leadership especially in areas of business, commerce and industry. The policymakers, realizing the social and economic
effects on the youth and working classes and their implications for the country as a whole, set as their objective the inclusion of vocational education at public expense to the program of the public school. This objective was accomplished in the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.
CHAPTER 4

THE EMERGENCE OF SPECIAL FOCUS LEGISLATION

The outcry against life adjustment education in 1957 coincided with the nation's concern of the launching of Sputnik I and II, thus a plan for a new approach in education was fully on the way. The chief objective of this new educational approach was America's hegemony as the country faced the U.S.S.R. and the Cold War. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower and members of Congress, the nation decided that its educational objective was to satisfy America's leadership in educational and technological advancement. Plans were immediately laid to select the best minds to be prepared in the fields of science, mathematics, language and technology. The legislation which gave authority to fulfill this need was the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Although, the technological feat of the Russians may not have posed any real threat, the policymakers seized the opportunity to bring together defense and education in support of their objective.

President Eisenhower, who for a long time sought to relinquish the federal government's responsibility for vocational education, insisted that vocational education must not be a part of this new program, but agreed that technical education was necessary. It was time for the renewal of appropriations for the George-Barden Act of 1946, and through the insistence of Congressman Carl Elliott and Senator Lister Hill and some other members of Congress, the George-Barden Act was retained as Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act (Bestor, 1953; Church and Sedlak, 1976; Clowse, 1981; Elliott and D’Orso, 1992; Hutchin, 1953; Smith, 1949; U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2nd Session, 1958, Part 3).

Throughout the Eisenhower administration, no major initiative was taken to eliminate poverty. There were few voices heard among the poor and
youth of the period (Combs, 1985). When poverty was recognized, it was regarded as characteristic of minorities in segregated pockets and slums (Grantham, 1976). The mood for this condition was maintained by President Eisenhower to whom minorities and their problems were generally invisible (O'Neill, 1971).

Even when the outrage against the life adjustment curriculum of the late 1940s and that practiced through the 1950s began in earnest, many policymakers and educators retained their views that a significant segment of the youth could not be prepared to be productive workers and leaders in the society (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

The Awakening

Just before the beginning of the 1960s, the importance of academic emphasis as the vehicle for combating international communism began to wane. The comprehensive picture of the effects of educational philosophy and practice and the maintaining of segregation and poverty began to be made clear by such writers as John Kenneth Galbraith in The Affluent Society (1958) and Michael Harrington in The Other America (1962). Americans then demanded that schools attack the problems of poverty, ethnic and racial discrimination. The concern with academic achievement and college preparation did not cease; so much of the work of the curriculum reform came to fruition in the 1960s. By then, action shifted to problems that seemed far more pressing than that of raising the intellectual capacities of the children who were selected for scholarships and loans in 1957 (Church and Sedlak, 1976).

Those leaders who saw vocational education as crucial to the economic prosperity of the disenfranchised, did not relinquish their efforts of 1958 to
maintain and broaden vocational education within the federal program. They also realized that Eisenhower opposed federal appropriations and partnership for vocational education that would assist the common people. He frowned upon federal involvement with the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts as well as Title VIII of the NDEA (Clowse, 1981).

**Antecedent**

As the Eisenhower era was ending, John F. Kennedy emerged as the leader with presidential stature, but also the politician who was never much interested in civil rights or civil liberties (O'Neill, 1971). Kennedy was well positioned, however, to assess those factors leading to the disturbances of the 1960s and to judge the needs facing the country. In 1946, he was elected congressman from the eleventh district of Massachusetts; the next year, he witnessed from that position the efforts of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) to test the Supreme Court's interstate busing mandate. Kennedy spent three terms in office as congressman before he was elected to the senate in 1952 (Meyers, 1965). As senator, he observed the resistance to the Brown decision, the Alabama bus boycott of 1955-1956, the 1957 Tuskegee boycott of local merchants and the efforts of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Kennedy was on the verge of becoming president when the sit-in strategy to end segregation began in the South by college students in the winter and spring of 1960 (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

In his political campaign for the White House, Kennedy was also alerted to those factors which affected the rural poor (Barlow, 1976). Having observed much of what troubled the nation, Kennedy viewed vocational education with much the same perspective as those other leaders who saw the value of
vocational education to the country. They believed that the social climate demanded its expansion. Senator Kennedy, unlike President Eisenhower, viewed the federal role in vocational education as essential; thus, on becoming president, one of his first priorities in relation to vocational education was the relief of the poor in the rural or depressed areas of the country. Prior to his decision to deal with the rural problem, President Kennedy took the attitude that the need and place of vocational education in our society should be reviewed.

Initiative for Special Focus Legislation

To raise the sensitivity of the leaders of what he saw in Appalachia, the President stated in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961 that "if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich" (O'Neill, 1971, p. 29). One month after he took office, he requested the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) to convene a panel of consultants on vocational education to assess the existing laws and to give guidance to future approaches (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963; Levitan, 1963).

During the late 1950s, vocational education leadership realized expansion was needed to include persons who were not necessarily well served. The Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education (hereafter referred to as The Panel) began its work on November 9, 1961 with concerns about youth with special needs. This diverse special needs group included the physically handicapped, minority youth, potential dropouts, as well as youth who could be characterized as any of the following--disinterested, reluctant, alienated, delinquent or culturally deprived (Barlow, 1981).
Such priority was given to the needs of the rural areas, that before the Panel could be installed, steps were taken to meet the needs of the rural poor. Through the influence of the administration, Congress gave priority to this group by passing the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (P. L. 87-27). In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act (P. L. 87-415) was enacted to provide similar but much broader training across the country generally, rather than only in depressed areas (Levitan, 1963).

Several social factors, some associated with education, hindered the progress of the disadvantaged and the nation. Once elected, Kennedy was forced in 1962 to send troops to Oxford, Mississippi, to assure the admission of James Meredith, a Negro, to the University of Mississippi under a federal court order, and that only after two men were killed in a riot at "Ole Miss." In April 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr. led the Negroes of Birmingham, Alabama in demonstrations to end discrimination in restaurants and jobs, and the nation viewed on television the brutal use of dogs and fire hoses by Police Commissioner Eugene "Bull" Connor and his men against men, women and children engaged in nonviolent protest. In June, Medgar Evers, the NAACP state secretary for Mississippi, was murdered. In August, there was the great "March on Washington," in which almost a quarter-million people, blacks and whites, gathered before the Lincoln Memorial to demonstrate in support of equal rights. In September, after the Birmingham schools were desegregated under court order, a dynamite blast erupted at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church directly after the conclusion of a Bible class, killing four Negro children (Cremin, 1988). This period of social stress also saw the burning of cities, student revolts and riots, but the nation was further embarrassed by its apparent lack of social consciousness (Barlow, 1981). These events provided
President Kennedy with the stimulus for sending a spring civil rights bill to Congress. It was also in the context of these events that special focus legislation, with a people approach, became more apparent (Cremin, 1988).

From the outset, the Panel realized that there were four million unemployed people in the United States while at the same time there were four million unfilled jobs (Education for a Changing World of Work, Appendix III, 1963). Prior to the 1950s, high-quality vocational education was generally maintained as a right of the white middle-class citizenry. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities faced discrimination and structural unemployment or underemployment resulting from inadequate opportunities to receive a broad spectrum of offerings in vocational education. In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court decided to eliminate the accepted doctrine of "separate but equal" education for Negroes. Yet there continued to be discrimination against Negroes, other minorities and women, thus there was an increase in the demand by these groups for equal rights and opportunities (Finch and McGough, 1982).

The Panel considered a range of factors in relation to employment, unemployment and the role of vocational education. It studied the history of vocational education, its advantages, weaknesses and its strengths. It looked at race relations in vocational education with reference to training, employment and unemployment. It considered the effects of advancing technology on youth unemployment in general and the role of appropriate vocational training in relation to horizontal mobility. The objective of the Panel was to assess these factors with the aim of suggesting new legislation and policy decision. The Panel observed the effects of the long and sustained periods of deprivation encountered by the disadvantaged poor--youth with special needs.
The situation of youth with special needs convinced the Panel that new vocational education legislation was necessary. After long discussions and consultation with many persons and groups, the Panel recommended that vocational education legislation be enacted to provide specifically for people (Barlow, 1981). The Panel recommended the participation of persons (a) attending secondary schools, (b) who wanted to extend their vocational education beyond the high school level but left high school before completion, (c) in the labor market needing further training to hold their jobs, to advance in their jobs, or to find suitable and meaningful employment and (d) for the first time, persons with academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps. These disadvantages or special needs prevented individuals from succeeding in the regular vocational education program. This decision revealed a growing sensitivity to the need for a vocational program that reflected human welfare and its emphasis upon the people who needed skills rather than upon the occupation which needed skilled people (Evans, Mangum and Pragan, 1969).

As a result of the Panel's investigation and its knowledge of the migration of large numbers of youth to the large cities, it was able to present a case for the program. Great differences in education delivery were apparent in the various states and in the small and large communities of the nation. Youth in the small towns had either little opportunity to get preparatory training for industrial occupations, or restricted choices. The rural high schools concentrated their efforts on agricultural and home economics programs (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963). The conditions of migrant families and their children also called for special needs vocational education (Kemp, 1966). This large influx of blacks, Mexican-American and
Puerto-Rican migrant youth arrived with the triple educational handicaps of segregated, southern and rural schools (Evans et al, 1969).

Youth unemployment concerned the President and policymakers as the public demanded change. There were beneath the unemployment situation, the education policies and practices which led to structural unemployment. The Panel revealed that while the potential for jobs was present, the traditional patterns of a closed narrow range of vocational education delivery existed. The Panel discovered that relationship between unemployed out-of-school youth and teaching in several large cities affected both teachers and students. Teachers were not well trained, parents were uncooperative and time, equipment and facilities were limited.

At this point the Panel distinguished special education and rehabilitation associated with "the physically handicapped, the blind, the hard of hearing, the crippled and a host of others" from the group of disadvantaged or special needs students. The Panel sought at this juncture to make clear that its concern was for the disadvantaged group which included minorities, migrants, whose patterns of behavior were labeled as dropouts or potential dropouts, disinterested, reluctant, alienated and culturally deprived (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963).

**Stressing the Need**

Having distinguished the two groups, the Panel presented data relative to recommendations it was making for the disadvantaged, not special education students. Using Cleveland's Unemployed Out-of-School Youth Survey, the effects of the lack of appropriate training on unemployment and structural unemployment were shown. The unemployment figures of a sample of 1,200 youth age 16 to 22 revealed that approximately 63% of the out-of-school youth
age 16 to 21 were unemployed; 33% of these unemployed were high school graduates and 53% completed the ninth grade. The highest percentage of unemployed youth, 67%, were non-graduates. Sixty-seven percent of all unemployed expressed the feeling that they could obtain employment if they were trained in school. In the areas mainly populated by black youth, 71% of those unemployed had no training; they expressed the desire to be trained, if they could obtain training in a school. Confronted with the result of this study, the Panel posed several pertinent questions:

1. Why was unemployment so prevalent in communities populated by Negroes? Was racial discrimination a major cause factor?

2. Could these unemployed youth pull themselves up by their own bootstraps? Do they want to? What were the obstacles which prevented them from helping themselves?

3. What could be done to improve the employability of the unemployed? What services could be established to enable the unemployed to help themselves?

4. Was the school curriculum realistic? How were the staff and the facilities of the school to be utilized more effectively to prevent further accentuation of the problem?

5. What were the roles and responsibilities of industry, labor and social agencies in relation to the growing armies of unemployed youth?

6. What did the widespread unemployment among youth mean to the community in terms of responsible citizenship, productivity and growth? (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963).
While formal apprenticeship training played a role in preparing skilled workers, disadvantaged blacks and other minority groups, age 16 to 22, were precluded from entering apprenticeship training (Levitan, 1963).

By the late 1950s, the suburban school systems surrounding the large cities changed their educational objectives with the intent of offering high school education for all. In this context, their program was designed for college-bound students. In the suburbs, vocational programs hardly existed. With the establishment of the suburban communities came the necessity to select America's youth with intellectual ability and the potential to fulfill the nation's demand for individuals capable of carrying the weight of America's defense and security.

Alerting the Administration

Just before the Panel made its recommendations, President Kennedy indicated to Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, his wish to go beyond the legislative accomplishments of the first half of his administration. "Give me facts and figures on the things we still have to do. For example, what about the poverty problem in the United States?" (Cremin, 1988, p. 314). The poverty problem was not high on Kennedy's agenda nor on the nation's, but it was high on Walter Heller's. Heller was persuaded by a series of memoranda prepared for the Council of Economic Advisers by Robert Lampman. Kennedy gradually became aware of the problem; but as a political realist, he was also aware that there was precious little political capital in antipoverty efforts. The impoverished as a political constituency were at least a powerless and inarticulate minority. Yet the civil rights movement began to alter that fact, as Kennedy and the public became aware that a disproportionate number of blacks were among the poor (Cremin, 1988). The
President became even more aware of the special needs people as the Panel and the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, among others, revealed their findings and made their recommendations.

Among its recommendations, the Panel called for vocational preparation for high school students preparing to enter the labor market, with special emphasis on youth with special needs who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the usual high school vocational education program. It emphasized the need for the delivery system to provide adequate services and facilities to assure quality in all vocational and technical education programs (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963).

The Panel recommended that vocational education must be redirected from training in a few selected occupational categories to preparing all groups of the community for their place in the world of work, regardless of occupation. The Panel also insisted that vocational education must be responsive to the urgent needs of high school age youth with special difficulties including academic, cultural and socioeconomic, which prevented them from succeeding in a regular vocational program (Education for a Changing World of Work, 1963).

President Kennedy viewed the poor as a political powerless and inarticulate minority (Cremin, 1988). Although the Panel's report alerted him to the existing socioeconomic situation of the disadvantaged poor with special needs, the President began preparing an omnibus bill, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, with a Title V containing a broad conceptual framework of vocational education. It clearly differentiated the administration's understanding of special needs people from that of
handicapped people. In proposing legislation, Kennedy expressed the administration's desire to deal with the special needs students within the framework of the high school and also within the several programs projected for the expansion of vocational education in view of the extreme troubling unemployment condition. The President viewed the role of the federal government in vocational education as a vital one. According to Mobley (1963a), this was one of the first times in the history of federal aid for vocational education that a president of the United States recommended legislation authorizing federal funds for vocational education.

While the administration endorsed to a greater extent the views of the Panel agreeing that current federal allocations for vocational education were outmoded, it did not go along with the Panel on the size of the increases it recommended. The Panel put together in one package a $400 million annual program of federal aid to vocational education, but the administration in shaping its own bill, sought an annual appropriation of only $73 million; however, it retained the Smith-Hughes Act with its perpetual appropriation (Levitan, 1963).

The Formal Approach

On January 29, 1963, the President sent his message to Congress in which he discussed his proposed program of education. Along with his message was the draft of the omnibus bill from which he eliminated the George-Barden Act of 1946. The proposed bill was introduced that same day in the House by Representative Adam Clayton Powell of New York and others. In the Senate, it was introduced by Senator Morse of Oregon for himself and Senators McNamara of Michigan, Yarborough of Texas, Clark of Pennsylvania, Randolph of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick of North Dakota,
Pell of Rhode Island, Mansfield of Montana and Humphrey of Minnesota. It received numbers H. R. 3000 and S. 580, respectively. Hearings were held by the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives during February 1963 and ended on March 1, 1963 (Mobley, 1963a).

Having knowledge of the content of the administration's bill prior to its release, AVA's president, Dr. Milo J. Peterson, submitted a statement for the hearings sometime before the President's message reached Congress. The statement endorsed the general intent of the bill but called attention that in due time AVA representatives would like opportunity to present in detail facts regarding the need for expanding vocational education and to propose changes in Title V-A of the measure which dealt with vocational education (Mobley, April 1963b).

Beginning on January 27, 1963, two days before the President's message went to Congress, the AVA Program Development Committee comprising of representatives from business education, distributive education, agriculture, home economics, and trade and industrial education met in Washington for one week to draft an alternate proposal for Title V-A of the omnibus bill. The AVA strongly objected to the contemplated elimination of the George-Barden Act in the administration's bill and the open-ended nonceiling of appropriations left to the future discretion of Congress. The committee approached the solving of this problem on technical grounds, that the elimination of timeless earmarked funds was contrary to Resolution No. 2 that was unanimously approved by the AVA House of Delegates at the Milwaukee meeting on December 6, 1962. At that meeting, the following resolution was adopted:

Be It Resolved, that in any new additional legislation the American Vocational Association will support increased funds
for the vocational and technical services, including Agriculture, Business, Distributive, Guidance, Home Economics, and Trade and Industrial Education in the categories identified by the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. (Mobley, 1963a, pp. 5-6; Shilt, 1964, p. 53)

Realizing that the elimination of the George-Barden Act could remove protection from appropriations for the basic programs which the Milwaukee resolution agreed to support, the committee spent the week discussing and proposing changes such as keeping intact the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, which elimination they felt would greatly weaken the existing vocational acts and the present vocational education programs. Therefore, the committee, with the help of legal counsel experienced in federal education legislation, drafted an alternate proposal. The chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, Congressman Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky, was appraised of the proposal. Although he was a member of the president's majority party, he agreed to introduce the alternate proposal as sponsored by the AVA (Mobley, 1963a; Shilt, 1964).

The National Education Association (NEA) continued to support Title V of the President's omnibus bill even after many members of Congress and persons within the public at large saw the necessity for change. Even after the agreement reached by Congressman Perkins to introduce the alternate proposal for Title V, and even well into debates on the various floors of Congress, the NEA encouraged its members to lobby for the President's bill (Shilt, 1964).

**House Hearings**

Although there were hearings between January 29 and March 1, 1963 in the Committee on Education and Labor on the omnibus "bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunity in the nation", 
revision of Title V by AVA made it necessary for hearings by the general Subcommittee on Education to consider both Title V and the substitute bill. On March 18, 1963, the proposed new bill was introduced by Chairman Carl D. Perkins. The bill was numbered H. R. 4955 and hearings began on March 25, 1963.

The first witness to appear before the Subcommittee was the Hon. Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, who represented the administration's point of view. He emphasized the importance of H.R. 3000 with special reference to Title V-A. He gave attention to the advancement of technology and its impact upon the economic situation. He discussed the earmarking of appropriations to specific vocational programs and the policy of confinement to narrow subject matter or content, limiting training to a small segment of the youth population. He alluded to the effects of the situation in creating the group which the Panel defined as the special needs population.

The Commissioner also spoke of the necessity to change the structure which earmarked substantial funds for specific programs and emphasized that a noncategorical approach would allow the states to put realistic proportions of their funds into preparing people for occupations in which the greatest number of job opportunities existed. He recalled the areas the Panel cited as targets for vocational education and persons who needed special attention because of inability to succeed in regular vocational programs. He stressed that the multiple problems of big city vocational programs could also be alleviated, in part at least, under H.R. 3000. He stated that 5% of the federal appropriations would be set aside for special demonstration and experimental projects aimed particularly at problems of out-of-school, unemployed youth in
large cities and youth with academic and other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational programs. The Commissioner urged the general Subcommittee on Education to report favorably upon the vocational education provisions as set forth in Title V-A of H.R. 3000 and identical bills.

On March 26, 1963, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz testified before the general Subcommittee on Education in favor of the provisions of Title V-A of bill H.R. 3000. He stressed the importance of Title V from the perspective of the role it was to play in the preparation of manpower for the labor market.

On March 27, 1963, an AVA representation headed by its president, Dr. Milo J. Peterson, appeared as witnesses before the Subcommittee. Dr. Peterson's concern was centered in the provision of unrestricted opportunity for vocational and technical education of the highest quality. He stressed concern for preparation for the 80% of the students in elementary and secondary schools who will not complete the baccalaureate degree. In answer to committee members, he stated

Existing vocational education acts are just as sound today as they were when enacted into law. They should not be disturbed. They have charted the way for more equitable educational opportunity and created a framework and foundation for the future.

Under existing legislation the States have built a system of teamwork and cooperation that has stood the test of time. Vocational educators have developed an espirit de corps and morale unmatched elsewhere in education.

What is needed now is new legislation that will strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and expand vocational education opportunities in the nation. With the excellent relationships and efficient know-how that have been established, vocational education is ready, indeed overdue, for further development and expansion.

This is essential if the minimum economic needs of our people are to be met. We need adequate support in order that we may
move forward in all phases of vocational and technical education. The world of work is dynamic; it is changing and it grows more complex. The need is expressed in dramatic fashion in the want ads of our daily papers. (House Hearings, Vocational Education Act of 1963, p. 233)

Dr. Peterson explained the need for vocational education in large urban centers in view of the mobile nature of the society. He expressed the importance of the comprehensive high school in the structure of the delivery system. He then alluded to the same targets recommended by the Panel as the students who must benefit from the provisions of vocational legislation. He called the Subcommittee's attention to the need for specially tailored vocational programs to meet the needs of the disadvantaged/special needs students defined as those with academic, socioeconomic or other deprivations.

Dr. Peterson was aware of the changes called for by the AVA and of the structure and content of H. R. 4955, part of which was influenced by the AVA Program Development Committee, before the hearings begun. However, he suggested some changes be made in the bill.

Congressman Frelinghuysen then directed several questions to Mr. Mobley, secretary of AVA, who expressed AVA's guideline for appropriating funds during the first five years. This was different from the administration's initial approach. While the administration sought $73 million for 1964, its intent was to leave to the discretion of Congress how subsequent appropriations will be handled. Mr. Mobley suggested that the annual $400 million recommended in the Panel's report was high. Thus his suggested guidelines called for $100 million for 1964 and approximately an addition of $75 million each year for four years leaving to Congress further decisions affecting funding after the fifth year.
The next witness from the AVA team was Dr. Burr Coe, who supported H.R. 4955. Mr. Charles W. Patrick, who represented the San Diego schools on behalf of the AVA, testified in support of H.R. 4955. He stressed the need to maintain the existing vocational legislations and appealed for new legislation with appropriations that would facilitate the vocational link between the San Diego Junior College and its senior high schools, noting that the San Diego Junior College was the only facility where the senior high school students, most of whom were not proceeding beyond the high school level, could receive some type of adequate vocational preparation.

Dr. William B. Logan, Professor of Education at Ohio State University, testified as a member of the AVA delegation. His testimony was related to the deliberations of the Panel. He recalled their discovery of the high rate of structural unemployment, where in spite of the availability of four to six million job openings, there were four to six million people unemployed. Dr. Logan was careful to emphasize that the Panel did not recommend deletion of the Smith-Hughes nor the George-Barden Acts as an approach to correcting the economic or educational situation. He also made it clear that the Perkins Bill H.R. 4955 was much more in accordance with the deliberations and expectations of the Panel, than was the administration bill H.R. 3000.

The next AVA representative who supported H.R. 4955 was James L. Patton. He emphasized the importance of every provision in the bill. He also presented letters from several citizens expressing their desire to obtain vocational education.

On March 29, 1963, the Hon. William L. Batt, Jr., Area Redevelopment Administrator of the Department of Commerce appeared before the Subcommittee in support of Title V-A and Title V-B of H.R. 3000. He had no
knowledge of the Perkins bill H.R. 4955. His interest was in alleviating the unemployment situation through an indirect approach from formal vocational education. In answer to questions from members of the Subcommittee, Batt explained that the Negro situation presented the principal problem. He proposed that a vestibule process be taken as an indirect approach to orienting Negroes, the dropouts, the people, whom according to Congressman Bell, in his questions to Batt, represented the bottom of the heap and who could not attain certain levels of achievement. As a general approach to the orienting of these individuals, Batt suggested the teaching of dishwashing as one aspect of the proposed Youth Employment Act—the vestibule approach to formal vocational education. He further emphasized that the type of youngsters they were trying to reach under that act would most probably find it difficult to qualify for training in existing vocational schools. Some of these youngsters need upgrading to get them up to that point.

Dr. Albert E. Jochen, Assistant Commissioner and state Director of Vocational-Technical Education of the New Jersey State Department of Education, also appeared as a witness. He noted that "The wealth of a nation is its people, provided they are educated and trained up to the limits of their God-given abilities and talents and given the freedom to use their education and training productively in a free society" (House Hearings, Vocational Education Act of 1963, p. 366). He appealed to the members of the Subcommittee that on behalf of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational-Technical Education, the American Vocational Association, and as private citizens interested in the welfare of our nation, they support the passage of H.R. 4955.

On April 4, 1963, Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers composed of the state commissioners and state
superintendents from the 50 states and the chief school officers of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, testified before the Subcommittee in favor of H.R. 4955. Roy Ayers, Oklahoma State Supervisor of Trade and Industrial Education, also supported H.R. 4955.

On April 9, 1963, Dr. Gerald B. James, North Carolina State Director of Vocational Education testified in support of H.R. 4955. He stressed the need of maintaining the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. Between April 22 and 30, 1963, several additional witnesses appeared before the Subcommittee. They represented such influential groups as state boards of education, the National Urban League, the American Veterans Committee, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Both the Urban League and the NAACP made strong statements regarding their concerns and knowledge of the discrimination of Negro youth and their exclusion from the existing vocational programs.

Representing the Urban League was Otis B. Finley, Assistant Director in Charge of Education and Youth Incentive. He noted that many American citizens were unable to adequately contribute to our national progress because they were not equipped mentally to keep up with the needs of the times. For 18,750,000 Negroes already handicapped by reason of employment discrimination and inadequate training, and caught up in the quicksand of rapid technological change, the problem was immediate and desperate. More Negro youth dropped out of high school than white youth, and fewer Negro high school graduates entered college. During a recent school year, Negroes who constituted less than 11% of the total population supplied 21% of the school dropouts, but only 7% of the high school graduates. Although
nationwide, black young people constituted about 15% of the total youth population between the ages of 16 and 21, yet 50% of them were both out of school and unemployed. This situation underscored not only the importance of education to American life but the importance of adequate and equal educational opportunity. The underutilization of the ability of black Americans begins in the classroom and reaches out into all other areas of work experience. In this respect, the opportunities afforded blacks for vocational education generally have been both inadequate and unequal.

There was strong criticism by the Panel of the existing vocational education program. It noted that not enough students were enrolled, primarily in urban schools and in the trade and industrial education and distributive occupation programs, and that most of these youth comprised the special needs population. In view of this situation, Clarence Mitchell, Director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, presented to the Subcommittee some additional information which made black youth the greatest percentage of the special needs population. He mentioned that there was a wide difference between the types of training offered at so-called black vocational schools and the training offered at predominantly white schools. The vital areas of training such as electronics, tool and die design, and machine shop were made available to white young people. In the school systems that were supposed to be desegregated, however, the black children were still jammed into such classes as shoe repairing, drycleaning, and auto mechanics where inferior equipment was used so that the students who took these classes were still unsuited for employment. In the city of Baltimore, for example, there were two vocational schools that were supposed to be desegregated; one of them was still
predominantly black; the other predominantly white with a few blacks attending. There were differences between the type of training given in the schools (House Hearings, Vocational Education Act of 1963).

On April 30, 1963, the Subcommittee met pursuant to adjournment. It came to the attention of the committee that there were views of other persons who wished to be on record before the committee completed its work. The committee agreed to let the record remain open for a period of ten days for the purpose of witnesses filing statements. It agreed that with the close of the public hearings, it would go into executive session. Before this could be done, however, Wilbur J. Cohen, the Assistant Secretary for Legislation for the Department of Education appeared before the committee with a delegation from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. There was overwhelming evidence in the hearings by the House Subcommittee that H.R. 4955 was a preferred bill to the administration's H.R. 3000, Title V-A. Mr. Cohen with a delegation appeared before the Subcommittee to negotiate for the provisions of the administration's bill H.R. 3000, Title V-A in view of the strong support the Perkins bill H.R. 4955 received during the hearings.

The delegation sought directions from the Subcommittee much to the disapproval of Mr. Frelinghuysen, who stated that it was very much up to the administration to make these decisions. He advised that the committee may or may not agree with those decisions. He stated that the committee may not have enough wisdom to make certain decisions, but does this mean that there would be no substantial education legislation at all?

The delegation felt that in view of the committee's feeling that it should consider a separate vocational legislation, it should decide the substantive elements. Without this, it was difficult for the administration to decide
whether vocational education should be a separate legislation or be part of an omnibus bill.

In view of this approach taken by the delegation, a series of questions were addressed to Mr. Cohen, one of which was whether he was aware that the Department for a number of years interpreted the Smith-Hughes Act requirement as training for gainful employment and that this had not particularly helped the training of Negro youths? The committee was interested in whether vocational education as proposed in the omnibus bill would take steps to correct or alter the existing interpretation of the Smith-Hughes Act. The committee expressed its concern with the type of vocational education programs black students were given. It noted that these students, as reported by Mr. Mitchell in his testimony, were given vocational programs where they learned menial tasks, and that they did not have the opportunity to go to schools to receive training in such areas as sheet metal and welding which they could apply to meaningful employment.

Mr. Bell noted that this was a continuing problem, not only in the South, but also in big city urban areas. He inquired of the Secretary whether it was true that they did not train Negroes, because they can't get jobs. In other words, there is this dual relationship of job opportunities and training. In the vocational education area you only train people for jobs that are available, or that are likely to yield employment, and in many cases, if they are minority groups who are not employed in these areas, you do not train them. In Mr. Cohen's response, he noted, that this problem was exactly why he recommended two advisory councils. He further noted that this problem as brought to the attention of the committee could not be completely satisfactorily answered just by a change in legislation. It was a problem that involved changes in job
specifications, employers' attitudes and community attitudes. Faced with this situation, Mr. Bell admonished the Secretary that whether it was through separate legislation or through the omnibus bill, a large portion of the legislation should be dedicated to straightening out this matter. Therefore, the Subcommittee recessed on April 30, leaving the record open until June 1, to receive additional statements and letters (House Hearings, Vocational Education Act of 1963).

**Senate Hearings**

On April 29, 1963, one day before the hearings ended in the House of Representatives, hearings under the chairmanship of Senator Morse of the Senate Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare began. Unlike proceedings in the House, where the hearings concentrated on whether to adopt a vocational education bill as outlined in the administration's omnibus bill Title V-A or a single vocational education bill as outlined in H.R. 4953, hearings in the Senate included the whole omnibus bill S. 580.

The first witness, the Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), supported vocational education as a title in the omnibus bill. He mentioned the value of vocational education in relation to its usefulness to alleviating the conditions of the handicapped as defined in Part B of Title V and the special needs youth as defined by the Panel. He showed that of all vocational education enrollment in the nation, only one-fifth was in the large cities.

On April 30, 1963, the Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor appeared as a witness before the subcommittee. He informed the committee that he strongly supported Title V-A of the omnibus bill. He reminded the committee
that the manpower and redevelopment programs focused on those specific situations where members of the work force had to be retrained. He stressed that the provisions of Title V-A of S. 580 related directly to those needs. In the process of Wirtz's testimony, Senator Morse made it clear that he supported the Secretary's warning and added that he was concerned about the high dropout rate. He impressed upon the committee that the provisions of Title V-A of S. 580 could contribute to the educational rehabilitation and thus save many of these young people from the great economic suffering.

On May 1, 1963, the Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture testified before the committee. He strongly supported vocational education showing that Title V-A was necessary given that its appropriations would contribute to a new approach to farming since it would prepare the youth who chose to remain on the farm, but it would also prepare, to some degree, the mobile or migrating population moving into the large city areas (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume 1).

Among the many interest groups that appeared as witnesses both before the House and Senate was the Council of Chief State School Officers headed by Dr. Edgar Fuller, its Executive Secretary. He testified on May 27, 1963 and again made it known that while the Council supported in principle some of the provisions of Title V-A, it opposed the repeal of the George-Barden Act. It also opposed federal funds to private groups for education at the discretion of the Commissioner, who, it believed, would authorize these allocations in violation of the separation of church and state. The Council supported even larger allocations to vocational education to accommodate dropouts and other such disadvantaged youth. Generally, it favored the principles incorporated in H.R. 4955; it also supported S. 580 Title V Part B.
On May 28, 1963, Selma Borchardt, Chairperson, Education Committee, Greater Washington Central Labor Council testified before the committee in support of S. 580 with reference to Title V-A. They were concerned with the deprivation conditions which faced the youth defined by the Panel as special needs. These students were not motivated in school; they learned little or nothing in the classroom; became frustrated and dropped out. They received sympathy in words, but no true action to alleviate their problems. This Council supported the provisions of Title V-A of the omnibus bill S. 580, especially in relation to the special needs youth (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume III).

Celia Pincus, past President of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers testified on June 10, 1963, on behalf of Title V-A with special reference to conditions in the city of Philadelphia with regard to migration and the social, economic and educational conditions with an appeal for education in general, but reminded the committee that vocational education is part of education in the city of Philadelphia. This witness noted that within the 1950-60 decade, Philadelphia witnessed an exodus of 340,000 whites and an increase of 160,000 blacks. The public school population was then 53%. The newcomers to the city added to the problems and decreased the relative tax resources. This group of new city dwellers used up to 45% of the city's tax dollars and contributed only 6% of its tax income. The schools had to share the burden, and in many instances, the major share of the decline in human and financial resources. The schools had to meet the needs of about 100,000 pupils, including blacks and whites, who constituted the culturally deprived. They came with built-in deficits accumulated over many generations of neglect. The best we offered them were overcrowded classes, undereducated, unqualified teachers who
often had neither sympathy for nor understanding of their problems.

On June 11, 1963, Mr. William Truitt, Assistant Director of Legislative Services for the National Farmers Union appeared as a witness before the subcommittee of the Senate as he had done on April 10, 1963 in the House. He strongly supported H.R. 4955 before the House subcommittee. Before the Senate subcommittee, he rejected S. 580, Title V-A and explained that the Perkins bill was adequate in almost every facet so far as the Farmers Union was concerned. He made clear his knowledge that by the time he appeared before the Senate subcommittee, the Perkins Bill was amended and unanimously approved by the six Democratic and four Republican members of the general Subcommittee on Education.

On June 11, 1963, a larger delegation of the AVA than the one which appeared before the House subcommittee testified before the Senate subcommittee. It again strongly emphasized its disagreements with Title V-A S. 580 and reiterated the effort made to produce H.R. 4955 now called the Perkins bill (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume IV).

Among the members of this AVA delegation was William B. Logan, Director of Distributive Education Services at Ohio State University, who was also a member of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, and who also earlier appeared before the House subcommittee. He again testified on the Panel's findings emphasizing structural unemployment. He noted that there were many available jobs in the economy as there were unemployed persons without adequate training to fill these positions. Dr. Logan impressed upon the committee the situation of black youth and alluded to the situation in the District of Columbia. His emotional testimony led the Chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Morse to interrupt with the following statement:
I think the sentence, 'There are over 4 million unemployed people and at the same time there are jobs available,' as well as the statement that they do not have training on the part of the unemployed to fill the jobs that are available connects directly with a statement in Mr. Peterson's statement, where he said 'One need not stray far from this room to find evidence of the lack of vocational competence resulting from limited vocational training opportunity.'

Although this problem is not limited in any sense to the Negro population, the ugly fact is that in the District of Columbia, we have this huge unemployed group of Negroes who want to work but who do not have the skills to fill the jobs that are available. Day labor work, the so-called menial jobs, the unskilled jobs are relatively small in number in comparison with the total unemployed seeking them. All we need to do is to go down as I have done to see various gathering centers early in the morning. I have seen groups form early to get such jobs. You will find that there are so many, many more men than there are jobs that it is rather a pitiful scene. We know that statistically, the Negro, the unemployed Negro, has about one chance out of three compared with the unemployed white man to get a job. It is easy to say something is more important than something else. I am not going to make that fallacious mistake in this comment. But I would say to my colleague sitting with me on this subcommittee, Senator Prouty, who is also my colleague on the District of Columbia Committee, I have no hesitancy in saying that one of the greatest economic problems facing us is the so-called Negro crisis in America today is the problem of retraining or, in many instances, initial training of Negro unemployed to fill jobs that can be made available to them. That is why I made my introductory comments as to the importance of the segment of education that our witnesses represent in this testimony.

Vocational education may not solve the Negro crisis completely, but I will put it this way: We will never solve the Negro crisis in the United States until we solve the problem of economic discrimination from which the Negro suffers. There is no chance of giving the Negro freedom in this country, and he does not have freedom, except in quotation marks in my opinion, until we give him economic freedom. He does not have it today. If we are to provide an economic emancipation proclamation for the Negro, we will not be parsimonious in providing funds for vocational training for the Negro. (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume IV, pp. 2095-2099)
On June 12, 1963, the Hon. J. Caleb Boggs, Senator from Delaware appeared before the subcommittee. He reminded the committee of his lifelong interest in vocational education especially as governor of the state of Delaware. With knowledge of the social situation facing the nation, he wrote a separate vocational bill, S. 1222, which he introduced in March 1963 in view of the difficulties he envisioned vocational education would face in an omnibus bill. Because of the legislative developments which took place between January and June, Senator Boggs appealed to the committee to work for a vocational education legislation, whether it be an acceptable S. 580 Title V-A, H.R. 4955 or S. 1222 (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume IV).

Developments in the proceedings up to June 1963 inspired a change in the administration's approach. On June 25, 1963, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, testified before the Senate subcommittee that in order to accelerate the rate at which our fellow citizens--and particularly our minority groups in urban and other areas suffering from a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment--may gain marketable job skills and, consequently, full membership in the community of trained manpower needed by our dynamic economy, the following new draft proposals were presented:

1. Appropriations authorized for fiscal year 1964 were raised from $23 million to $108 million.

2. Funds earmarked for postsecondary education and construction of area vocational schools were raised from 25 to 40%.

3. The Commissioner of Education was authorized to make grants to States for the establishment of experimental residential vocational schools. For this purpose the sum of $15 million was authorized for fiscal year 1964.
4. Funds for grants by the Commissioner of Education for special projects to meet the needs of communities with substantial youth unemployment and school dropouts (as well as to meet the needs of youth with academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps to learning) would be increased from 5 to 15% of the vocational education appropriations.

5. A work-study program for high school age students enrolled in fulltime vocational education programs was proposed in order to encourage and assist youths who might otherwise drop out of school to continue their education and equip themselves for gainful employment.

After presenting the changes in the administration's program, the Commissioner of Education requested that a series of related exhibits be placed in the records. Senator Morse again impressed upon the committee the squalid condition of Negroes in the United States, stating that as an alderman of the District of Columbia government he had knowledge of the education situation that 84% of the student body remained Negro because of the flight of the white population to the suburbs and to private schools where education appropriations gave them an adequate education while the Negro remained locked in the city. He believed that this was the reason why it was so difficult for the District of Columbia to obtain appropriations for education. In a detailed summary of the Commissioner's report, Senator Morse likened the conditions of Negroes in the United States and especially, in the District of Columbia, to that of Angola and South Africa and swore that he would take every opportunity to present the situation of the Negro as revealed in the Commissioner's report and use them as his own in a series of speeches on the floor of the Senate. He mentioned that

No matter what the consequence of this fight may be to any of us who are in politics, some of us must be willing to challenge the low level of
citizen statesmanship, of millions of white people in the United States. The denial of these constitutional rights is the responsibility of the citizens of the United States. The politicians, in the long run, will respond to what our citizens demand.

Resolution of this issue cannot wait any longer, because Negroes know the situation is unjust. They are going to fight for their more unfortunate brethren. All of us, whites and Negroes, have a responsibility to see to it that we set up equal economic opportunity in this country, based on ability. We need also to establish a school system which will increase the opportunity for the native abilities of the Negro boys and girls to become manifest. (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume V, pp. 2482-2483, 2511)

Senator Morse then began the closing phase of the hearings, leaving the record open until July 15, 1963, for the inclusion of voluntary supplementary and rebuttal statements, and for requested material by the subcommittee. Of the material submitted, three exhibits were especially influential in the debates which followed on the floor of the Senate. They were

1. "Forgotten Youth" a report on vocational education by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee (Senate Hearings, Education Legislation--1963, Volume V).

2. "Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education."


The public hearings before the Senate subcommittee ended on June 27, 1963.

Process of Enactment

House of Representatives

With the release of the administration's bill on January 29, 1963, there arose several dissatisfactions with the suggestions for changes in existing vocational legislation. In view of this situation, the House of Representatives
allowed to be reported on March 18, 1963, a substitute bill, H.R. 4955 directly related to vocational education. On March 25, 1963, hearings began in the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor to consider the provisions related to vocational education (Title V-A) and that of the substitute bill H.R. 4955. After extensive hearings on the bill, which ended on April 30, 1963, the subcommittee went into 12 executive sessions and was later joined by the remaining members of the Committee on Education and Labor for three more sessions. On May 22, 1963, President Kennedy announced that he agreed to drop his request for an omnibus education bill, thus the committee approved a number of separate bills embodying certain requests (Congressional Quarterly, No. 24, 1963; Vocational Education Act of 1963).

During these deliberations, the Republican members of the committee sought to add a civil rights amendment to the bill to deny federal funds to any state or local area which maintained segregated vocational educational courses. This amendment was offered by Rep. Alphonso Bell, Republican from California and supported by two Democrats, Edith Green from Oregon and James Roosevelt from California. Among the Democratic members, who strongly opposed the rider was an black Congressman from California, Augustus F. Hawkins. His compelling speech stated that the rider would kill the bill. This influenced the democratic members of the committee to the extent that on June 5, 1963, the rider was rejected.

A second attempted amendment to the bill was offered by Rep. Charles E. Goodell, Republican of New York. This amendment called for funds for a pilot vocational education program for youth in the District of Columbia. It was defeated by the democratic members of the committee on June 6, 1963.
On June 6, 1963, after the defeat of these two amendments, the House Education and Labor Committee, by a vote of 19-0, approved bill H.R. 4955 with an authorization of a four-year program of revision and expansion of federal assistance to vocational education. The nineteen affirmative votes came from committee Democrats. The twelve Republican members abstained because, as they claimed, acting Chairman Carl D. Perkins, Democrat from Kentucky, refused to allow them time to check with House GOP leaders before endorsing the bill. They signed supplemental views which supported "the objectives of the bill", but noted three major objections. The first was that the bill failed to include the civil rights amendment which they supported because, as they claimed, it is right in principle and because of the evidence of racial discrimination in the administration of vocational education. They also objected to democratic refusal to agree to the pilot program in the District of Columbia, which they said was an excellent location for a pilot program of this kind. In addition, the Republicans recommended that the first year's authorization be reduced to $23 million, the amount of new funds requested by the President.

H. R. 4955 authorized for expansion and revision of state vocational education programs, new appropriations of $45 million for fiscal year 1964, $90 million for fiscal year 1965, $135 million for fiscal year 1966 and $180 million for subsequent years. State matching on a 50-50 basis continued to be required. It amended the 1946 Act to permit transfer of funds between the separate categories, to update requirements for vocational education in agriculture and in home economics and to relax requirements for the expanded vocational education programs in distributive occupations, and trade and industry.
On the day the bill was approved by the committee, President Kennedy, in a speech at San Diego State College, urged Congressional support for his education program stressing that the goal of U.S. education must be a system in which every child, whether born to a banker in a Long Island mansion, or to an Negro sharecropper in an Alabama cotton field, has every opportunity for an education that his or her abilities and character deserve. He particularly stressed the need for desegregation of classrooms, emphasizing that he meant the de facto segregation of the North as well as the proclaimed segregation of the South. On June 18, 1963, bill H.R. 4955 was reported out and sent to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.


On August 6, 1963, Bill 4955 was passed by the Committee of the Whole House by a 377-21 roll-call vote. It was the first section of the administration's omnibus bill to reach the House floor (Congressional Quarterly, No. 40, 1963). Thus in accordance with House Resolution 469, Mr. Elliott, a member of the Rules Committee, called up Resolution 469 and asked for its immediate consideration. The appropriate parliamentary procedure was followed by the clerk. He then addressed the House on behalf of a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. He brought before the House the then social ills of the nation noting that the members 88th Congress are faced with
problems comparable in every respect to the problems our predecessors faced in 1917. He showed the need to continue and expand the vocational programs which the pioneers in both the public and private sectors of the nation began in 1917. He presented a detailed description of the provisions of the bill established for the special needs of youths—particularly youths in economically depressed areas and youths having special academic or other problems.

In view of the desegregation rider which the Republican members sought to attach to the bill in executive session, Mr. Elliott at this stage appealed to the House members that there should be no attempt to attach a civil rights amendment, which in view of his experience, would jeopardize the passage of the bill. In concluding his statement for the adoption of the Resolution, he commended Congressman Perkins for his contribution to this bill, and to vocational education as a whole.

The attempt to attach the failed antidiscrimination amendment to the bill continued; whereupon Mr. Haley made a point of order that there was not a quorum present to continue moving with the resolution. Mr. Jennings then countered by asking for the call of the House. The call was ordered by the Speaker; 392 members answered their names; thus a quorum was present. There was still, however, discussion pro and con on an antidiscrimination amendment to the bill before the adoption of the Resolution. Mr. Brown, a second member of the Rules Committee then spoke in favor of the bill and movement of the House Resolution 469. He called attention to high unemployment, and the modest appropriations in relation to the amount spent for other programs of less significance including the $2,087 million recently voted "for a moon shot." Mr. Smith of Virginia, Chairman of the Rules
Committee, supported the bill without the amendment. The next two speakers having doubts about moving the resolution were concerned about the high appropriations for vocational education. Congressman Avery insisted that the antidiscrimination amendment should be part of the bill for adoption of the Resolution. However, Mr. Madden made a passionate plea for the bill as it came from the committee and as was discussed in the Committee of the Whole. At that point, Mr. Elliott called on the Speaker for the question; the Speaker called the question and the Resolution was adopted.

In accordance with the Resolution, the Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Powell, rose and addressed the Speaker for the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4955 "a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation." The motion was agreed to and the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill. The bill H.R. 4955, which came before the House for consideration appears in Vocational Education Act of 1963, pp. 38-62.

Mr. Powell's appealing address stressed the importance of this legislation for the period of time to which the nation came. He mentioned the changes in agriculture; the population shift from the farming areas to the large cities of the nation; the rapid advancement of technology; the situation of unemployment in reference to nonskilled youth both high school graduates and dropouts; the fact that 75% of the white youth were graduating from high school while only 40% of the nonwhite were in that same situation. Thus, those with potential for employment in a high unemployment situation
constituted 75% of the white youth, while 60% of the non-white youth were without education having dropped out of school and also without potential for employment. He alluded to a question presented to the Commissioner of Education during the hearings in which it was revealed that since employers did not hire young Negroes and since the Smith-Hughes and other vocational acts stated that training would be given to those who would profit from it, Negroes who could not profit from it, because they would not be given the jobs, were excluded from vocational education programs in the education system.

He then called attention to provisions in the bill that would seek to rectify the situation by helping even those who, through these deprivations, had suffered academically, economically and socially, the group which the Panel defined as the special needs youth. Mr. Powell then called attention to the appeal of the President in his Civil Rights Message of June 19, 1963. He then pointed out many of the provisions of the bill and the effect they would have in changing the situation. He ended this portion of his address with an appeal for favorable action on H.R. 4955.

Representative Carl Perkins centered his remarks on the provisions which called for appropriations for research and development of programs aimed at the special needs population as emphasized by the Panel. He strongly objected to any further attempt to add an antidiscrimination amendment to the bill reminding his colleagues what this amendment did to the elementary and secondary school bill at the commencement of the 1960s. For the three hours of debate on the floor and a short extension of time agreed to, the center of controversy was on the antidiscrimination amendment which many Democrats stated was an attempt to prevent the passage of the bill.
In the closing moments of deliberations in the House, Representative Cahill of New Jersey offered an amendment which would permit the supervision and control of vocational education, not to be only under public supervision and control but also to permit control by other nonprofit educational institutions. The main objection to this amendment came from Representative Thompson, also of New Jersey, who showed that the federal government could not set a precedent by legislating federal funds to nonprofit institutions beyond the wishes of the states. When the question was called on this motion, there were 44 votes in favor of and 123 against; thus the amendment failed.

In accordance with House Resolution 469, the Speaker called for the question on the substitute bill with its amendment and it was agreed to. He then called for the clerk to read the bill. Before the final vote could be taken, Mr. Snyder of Kentucky offered a motion to reconmit. While the clerk was reading his motion, he interrupted and asked unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with and that there be inserted in the record that his motion was the Bell amendment. There was no objection to his request, but on the call of the House, 181 voted for the motion and 217 voted against it.

The Speaker then called for the question on the passage of the bill. The Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Powell, asked for a public vote of yeas and nays. It was so ordered; there were 378 yeas, 21 nays with 34 abstentions. So bill H.R. 4955 was passed on August 6, 1963 and sent to the Senate (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 11, Aug. 6, 1963).
The President announced on May 22, 1963, that he was dropping his request for his omnibus education bill. He also announced during his Civil Rights Message on June 19, 1963, that he was requesting additional funds for vocational education, but the Senate continued its regular hearings on S. 580 as originally received. These hearings ended on June 27, 1963.

On July 18, 1963, the vocational education recommendations presented in these Presidential messages were introduced in the Senate by Senator Morse as an amendment to Title V-A of S. 580. With bill H.R. 4955 as passed by the House on August 6, 1963 and the amendments to Title V-A of S. 580 as passed by the Senate, the Education Subcommittee of the Senate went into executive session on September 10 and 11, 1963. In executive session, the Education Subcommittee recommended that H.R. 4955 be amended by striking the text of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives and substituting four new parts as follows:

Part A—the text, with minor modifications, of the July 18, 1963, amendment of Title V-A of S. 580, incorporating the expanded vocational education recommendations of the President;

Part B—the extension and amendment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

Part C—the extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874; and

Part D—the extension and expansion of the Library Services Act, originally Title VI-C of S. 580; and that the bill, as amended, be reported favorably to the full committee.

On September 25, 1963, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in executive session considered H.R. 4955 as reported from the Education
Subcommittee, amended it by deleting part D (which was ordered to be reported as an original bill), adopted a number of technical amendments, and ordered reported H.R. 4955 favorably to the Senate as thus amended (Vocational Education Act of 1963, Reported to Senate Section). The full text of the amendments to Title V-A from which the Committee on Education and Public Welfare made its decision appears in Vocational Education Act of 1963, Reported to Senate Section, pp. 3 through 53. The bill as passed by the Committee on Education and Public Welfare appears in Vocational Education Act of 1963 under Section, Reported to Senate.

On October 1, 1963, Mr. Morse reported the vocational education bill H.R. 4955 with substantial amendments. It added to the House-passed bill increased funds and new programs requested by the President in his June 19 civil rights message. As amended, H.R. 4955, in addition to initiating and expanding vocational programs, extended for three years, until June 30, 1967, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and extended until June 30, 1966, expired legislation providing aid to "impacted" school areas. The bill did not receive smooth sailing in the Committee on Education and Public Welfare. Opposition to the bill came from such Republican Senators as Barry Goldwater and John Towers. The main argument these senators presented was that the bill was an unnecessary extravagance. On the Democratic side, there was dissatisfaction from two Senators—Joseph S. Clark and Claiborne Pell, with the extent to which parts of the administration's omnibus education bill were omitted from H.R. 4955 (Congressional Quarterly, No. 40, October 4, 1963).

On October 3, 1963, Mr. Mansfield called for the motion to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 531, H.R. 4955. The Presiding Officer called the question and the motion was agreed to; however, Mr. Mansfield called attention
to the fact that although the Senate was proceeding with the bill, and it would be the subject of unfinished business on Monday, it would then be displaced temporarily by S. 927.

On October 7, 1963, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill H.R. 4955 to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the nation. Senator Morse brought to the attention of the Senate much of his personal knowledge of the social and economic situation faced by the disadvantaged youth of the nation, and knowledge gleaned about these conditions from witnesses who appeared before the Senate Subcommittee. He then spoke of the expanding interest of the federal government in vocational education since 1914, especially that presented by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, and the influence that historical background had on his decisions with respect to conditions faced by the nation. He called attention to the work, findings and recommendations of the Panel, and in view of these and the contribution of Mr. Perkins and the members of the House of Representatives to the bill before the Senate, he complimented Mr. Perkins on behalf of the Senate. Mr. Morse did not yield the floor until a comparison of the Senate and House versions of the bill was on the floor for debate. At the conclusion of his introductory address, he was highly commended by Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who selected the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education as requested by President Kennedy. Then, Senator Ribicoff made his statements on behalf of the bill; he urged its passage and the prompt appropriations of funds for implementing the legislation.

At this stage in the proceedings, a series of parliamentary maneuvers developed regarding the utilization of time between the two sides. The first
point of controversy, however, came from Senator Clark, a Democrat. He made a long and passionate speech in support of certain provisions of the President's omnibus bill, which he believed should have been included in the present bill before the Senate. While Mr. Clark and Mr. Pell contended on the committee that the President's bill was slighted, on the floor of the Senate, Mr. Pell made the following statement:

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in that I would have preferred the President's omnibus bill. But I am delighted with the bill that has been reporwholeheartedly that portion extending for 3 years aid to federally impacted areas. (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 14, October 7, 1963, pp. 18791-18805)

Senator Yarborough supported the bill causing to be written into the Record facts, figures and statements from several educators. He most strongly supported the home economics program. In committee, Senator Goldwater emphasized that he was opposed to grants for residential vocational schools and work study programs which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare added to the bill after it came from the House. He stressed his opinion of the high cost to the nation if these programs were added. Although Mr. Goldwater was knowledgeable of the President's civil rights message of June 19, 1963, and even though Mr. Morse brought to the attention of Mr. Goldwater and the Senate the President's statement of the conditions faced, especially by Negro youths with respect to the lack of training in vocational education and the deprived social and economic conditions under which they lived, Mr. Goldwater declared "I cannot recall any testimony in my experience on the subcommittee to indicate that any American has been denied vocational training. There may be cases which have not come to my attention" (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 14, October 7, 1963, p. 18820).
Mr. Goldwater did not object to vocational education per se, but felt that there was no need for the two programs which the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare added to the bill. He submitted an official amendment asking to delete portions of the committee's bill. In his amendment, he sought to lower the appropriations down to that originally called for in Title V-A of the omnibus bill or to that sent to the Senate in the House bill. The amendment sought to reduce vocational education funds from that in the Senate committee bill by $805 million over a five-year period. This amendment supported by a majority of the GOP members of the Senate was introduced on the first day of the Senate debate, and was defeated by a majority vote of 52-23 (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 14, October 7, 1963).

On October 8, 1963, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana gave a lengthy address in which he showed the need for vocational education and the contribution it could make to the economy and to the youth. He called for the reading of an amendment, which he submitted; it was authorized to be read. The amendment proposed an increase of $224 million over a three-year period above the committee's authorization. Senator Bayh's presentation was his first as a freshman senator and it was highly commended by many of the senior senators. However, the senior members in consultation with Mr. Bayh agreed that he should withdraw his amendment; thus it was withdrawn with the promise that this substantive matter would receive future consideration.

In the committee, Senator Morse agreed with Senator Javits of New York, that the extension of the impacted areas provisions was merely an extension of the existing racial discrimination condition which segregated the children of Negro military parents into inferior schools and at inconvenient distances from their homes. However, he disagreed with Senator Javits that
this single event of discrimination would produce a different outcome than that which most members of the Senate anticipated would be the outcome from a Powell amendment as introduced in the House by Representative Bell.

Senator Javits, impelled by his knowledge of the conditions which faced American children whose parents were assigned to duty as a command, offered an amendment which would prevent the separation of Negro and white children, living in these impacted areas, from attending separate segregated schools. He realized that many of the schools in the immediate impacted areas existed as a result of the federal government interest to accommodate these children, but that the federal government made no arrangement to integrate these schools although they were supported with federal funds. Mr. Javits insisted that his amendment was clear and distinct from the so-called Powell amendment. Senator Morse informed the Senate that he was aware of Senator Javits' position, but in view of the circumstances leading up to the moment, if this amendment was agreed to, the proposed legislation would be defeated. After a short parliamentary maneuver of tabling and voting, the Javits' amendment was defeated by a vote of 54 to 35 (Congressional Quarterly, No. 41, October 11, 1963).

The debate on impacted areas drew the attention of several senators and caused extensive dialogue on the appropriateness of its three-year extension as part of the pending legislation. Senator Clark offered an amendment to reduce the extension of time from three years to one year stating that he did so because the present program as administered was grossly inequitable. The dialogue which ensued involved senators who supported that position and those who saw it as detrimental to the passage of the legislation. After a period of reasoning, Senator Clark withdrew the amendment; agreed to the three-
year extension; and offered an amendment, that in the course of the three years extension, the Commissioner of Education must make a full report to the Secretary of HEW before January 1, 1965 on the operation of impacted areas programs and on proposed amendments to the authorizing laws. There was agreement to this arrangement.

Senator Clark called for the reading of another amendment he submitted. He asked that the President's omnibus bill S. 580 be substituted for H.R. 4955 the bill then in debate on the floor of the Senate. In the ensuing discussions, other senators along with Mr. Morse showed how an omnibus bill would be difficult to pass and how the piecemeal application of it would help, especially since the first portion of it to reach the Senate floor represented the central problem, the lack of training which resulted in massive unemployment, especially of Negro youth. Some senators expressed that vocational education would be an indirect route to civil rights for Negroes. Thus the vocational education bill H.R. 4955 rather than the President's omnibus bill would stand a better chance of passage. Mr. Clark therefore withdrew his amendment emphasizing that he would not want to embarrass the administration due to a rejection of bill S. 580. Senator Humphrey of Minnesota then presented a very philosophical address in supporting the bill. He recalled that the provision to extend the impacted areas program included, for the first time, the District of Columbia. As the debate drew to its close, several commendations were heard on the floor in favor of Mr. Morse. Senator Mansfield took this occasion once again to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the superb skill and sound generalship he showed in handling the bill now ready for a vote.
Mr. Morse thanked Mr. Mansfield; then all time was yielded back. The question was called. It was on the committee amendment as amended. It was agreed to. The bill was read the third time. The yeas and nays on the passage of the bill were called for; the result was announced; there were 80 yeas and 4 nays. There were 16 abstentions. So the Senate bill H.R. 4955 was passed on the afternoon of October 8, 1963. Mr. Morse then moved that the Senate insisted upon its amendments and requested a conference with the House of Representatives and that the Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed as conferees Messrs. Morse, Hill, McNamara, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Prouty, Goldwater and Javits (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 14, October 8, 1963). The Senate bill as passed on October 8, 1963, appears in Vocational Education Act of 1963 under Section, Passed Senate, pp. 25-70. Conference Proceedings

After sending the bill to the Senate, the House passed Resolution No. 554 agreeing that upon the adoption of the resolution, the House would disagree with the bill as passed by the Senate and agree to a conference as requested by the Senate. On October 29, 1963, after stating that a conference committee would be able to work out the differences between the House and Senate versions, Mr. Elliott made the motion, as agreed in the resolution, to take the bill from the Speaker's table on its way to conference. Before the motion was called for, a dialogue ensued in which Mr. Brown, also a member of the Rules Committee, made clear that the House should insist on its version of the bill in conference. He contended that appropriations in the Senate bill were too high and spoke at some length; that this high expenditure was due in part to the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the impacted aid program. Several
other members in the dialogue contended that impacted aid should be dealt with as a separate bill since this was at that time before the Rules Committee of the House. Mr. Elliott, sensing the situation, made a comprehensive assessment of vocational education and of his belief that disagreements could be worked out in conference. He moved the previous question—the question was ordered, and the resolution was agreed to. The speaker then selected the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. Powell, Perkins, Landrum, Dent, Brademas, Frelinghuysen, Goodell, Martin of Nebraska, Quie, Bell and Mrs. Green of Oregon.

On November 6, 1963, with Senator Wayne Morse as Chairman, the Conference Committee began deliberations with the conferees as chosen by the Presiding Officer of the Senate on October 8, 1963 and those chosen by the Speaker of the House on October 29, 1963. After three meetings in which suggestions for changes were made by both sides, the conference recessed to give consideration to suggestions. This lasted for more than three weeks. It was during this period that President Kennedy was assassinated. In the interim between November 6, 1963 and December 9, 1963, the bill H.R. 4955 was tied up in conference. The House Republican members of the conference committee were very much opposed to the provisions of the bill authorizing funds for work-study programs and for residential schools; therefore, none of the House Republican members of the committee signed the conference report (Mobley, 1964).

On December 10, 1963, the Conference Report reached the House of Representatives. On December 12, 1963, the Chairman, Mr. Powell, addressed the Speaker and called up the report, but made a motion that the Statement of the Managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report. This
statement gave a description of the changes between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference and showed details of the major decisions of the conference.

Mr. Frelinghuysen made a motion, on behalf of all five Republican members of the House conferees, to recommit the bill to conference. The Republicans objected to the extension of the NDEA and impacted areas legislation, which, according to them, involved costly appropriations. They more vehemently objected to the federal residential schools and federally financed work-study programs, calling them unwise and novel expenses. Mr. Frelinghuysen asked for support for his motion. He moved for his motion that the bill be recommitted with orders to the conferees to insist that the work-study program and residential school be removed from the bill with the exception of one national demonstration school for the District of Columbia. The question was called; the motion was rejected; 192 votes were against; 180 were for and 61 abstained (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 18, December 12, 1963).

The question to Mr. Powell's motion to agree to the conference report was called by the Speaker. There were 301 votes in favor of the report; 65 against; and 68 abstentions. So the conference report was agreed to in the House on December 12, 1963 (Congressional Quarterly, No. 51, December 20, 1963; Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 18, December 12, 1963).

On December 10, 1963, the Chairman of the Conference Committee, Mr. Morse, submitted his report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 4955 with the decision that the House agree to the changes. On December 13, 1963, the Chairman called on the Senate for a consideration of the report. There was
no objection and the Senate proceeded with the consideration of the report. The consideration was mostly of senators recognizing and praising each other for their part in producing the Senate version of the bill. There was no attempt in the Senate to reject or amend the conference report. In a final question from Mr. Ellender to Mr. Morse regarding residential schools, Mr. Morse noted the expected contribution that these schools, which the Republican members of the House rejected, would make particularly to students age 15 to 21 from the urban areas of high unemployment. This category of young people would come from crowded slums where the home environment made it impossible for them to obtain an education. Many of them almost literally lived on the streets since they had no other place to go. They constituted a great education challenge because of their economic and social problems. By enrolling them in the residential schools, we could help them to salvage themselves for gainful employment.

Without much discussion thereafter, the various senators yielded back all time and the Speaker ordered the yeas and the nays on the conference report. There were 82 votes in favor; 4 against and 14 abstained; so the report was agreed to (Congressional Record, Vol. 109, Pt. 19, December 13, 1963).

The Bill Becomes an Act

Five days after the bill was approved in the Senate and the House, President Johnson invited both Republicans and Democrats to a ceremony for the signing of the Act, P.L. 88-210. He thanked the members of the Senate, the House, the Administration and made special mention of the names of those who were prime movers of the bill (Congressional Quarterly, No. 51, December 20, 1963).
On January 7, 1964, the President informed the Clerk of the House that on December 18, 1963, he had approved and signed the bill H.R. 4955.

An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes. (Congressional Record, Vol. 110, Pt. 1, January 7, 1964, p. 6)

Summary

By the late 1950s, there was an outcry against the policies, programs and practice in education in general. These were vividly portrayed to the leaders of the nation as the Russians demonstrated their educational knowledge in science and technology in 1957. America's reaction was to prepare its better minds to regain what was apparently its loss in international leadership. The nation then decided upon a curriculum which gave priority to the children of the affluent who were better placed to carry out the objectives of the leaders.

By the end of the 1950s, poverty was widespread and the condition of the disadvantaged was presented to the nation. The Supreme Court gave directives to the nation in 1954 to make education equal to all members of the society. Some members felt that the traditionally disadvantaged were not entitled to equal education and made many efforts to thwart the mandate of the Supreme Court.

Social pressures by a larger group than those who concentrated on keeping the disadvantaged from equal education became louder and more distinct. By 1962, President Kennedy, through the leadership of his administration called for a team of leaders to assess the situation and condition of the poor and disadvantaged. These leaders, having assessed the condition,
called for it to be corrected noting that there were many thousands with special needs.

To correct the situation called for an official mandate. The nature of the problem led to a discussion that vocational education could provide a special focus program to help those with special needs and that this was a way out. During this period, a debate went on between the democratic and republican members of Congress as to the appropriate provisions to meet the special needs objective. By 1963, Congress gave the directives for a program that would change the focus of vocational education from a job-oriented approach to a people-approach. The mandate was the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210).
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Those situations which created adverse education, economic and social conditions for disadvantaged Negroes beginning early in the 1800s continued well into the 1960s. This realization was the problem with which this study was concerned.

Between the years 1821 and 1917, certain societal conditions arising from attitude, policy and practice continued to hinder several minority groups from free access to education and prosperity. With the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917, the administrators and policymakers interpreted this legislation as not encompassing all youth but only those who could profit from vocational education. Because of this interpretation, vocational education had difficulty in meeting the needs of all youth as recommended by the 1914 Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education.

By the early 1960s, conditions gave cause for a different approach to people in general and special efforts were made by the leaders of the nation to change the philosophy which caused certain persons to be excluded from vocational education. The policymakers assessed the situation of the poor and disadvantaged and mandated special provisions with special focus vocational education legislation in 1963 to alleviate the conditions of the disadvantaged.

Because of interpretation and social practice, vocational education had difficulty in meeting the needs of all youth as recommended by the 1914 Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education. The administrators and policymakers of the initial vocational education statute, the Smith-Hughes Act
of 1917, interpreted the law as not encompassing all youth but only those who could profit from vocational education. Therefore, there was need to communicate and assure that in 1963, special efforts be made by policymakers in vocational education to change the philosophy which caused certain persons to be excluded and that a different approach to vocational education be mandated with a special needs focus.

The purpose of this study was to examine economic and social factors associated with the disadvantaged in education and the involvement of federal vocational education policy in creating, as well as, alleviating their condition. Four questions guided the study.

1. Did federal policy and social practice in education, 1821 to the 1950s, contribute to the conditions and struggles of disadvantaged Negroes? By 1821, public education became a reality in many sections of the nation. However, certain minorities, including most Negroes, were excluded from education. When the change in the social structure of the nation occurred by 1863, there were many millions of illiterate Negroes, who were also without schools. During the Reconstruction Period, a certain accommodation between the races occurred and in 1875 Congress granted certain rights to Negroes including the rights to education. In 1883, the Supreme Court repealed the 1875 Civil Rights Act, a decision which greatly retarded educational opportunities. This decision was followed by several Supreme Court decisions which established federal policies affecting education.

The social position of most Negroes at the beginning of the twentieth century was at the lowest stratum of the social order. The problems of segregation in education which began shortly after 1883 contributed to the decreasing social position of these Negroes. They were victims of adverse
social and educational conditions which were evident in the cities at the turn of the century, when attention was drawn to the high dropout rate arising from educational policies which affected societal conditions. The outcry against classical education led to the planning phase and the enactment of the Smith-Hughes legislation.

The effects of World War I and the depression of the 1930s influenced the New Deal policies of the NYA and the CCC and these in turn affected education as a whole. Undefined educational philosophy continued to affect the disadvantaged after World War II. The effects of Prosser's doctrine offered as an official policy statement for the Department of Education in 1946 established the basis for life adjustment education and for 60% of the student population to be deprived of functional education. It was this 60% which Prosser's summary suggested could not be fully prepared to function adequately in the democratic society.

The realization of the aimlessness of life adjustment education came to the attention of critics and commentators, whose outcry became very loud at the time Russian education produced Sputniks I and II. Thus, the outcry of the critics and commentators together with the Russian technological feat brought the demise of the life adjustment approach to education and precipitated a series of events influencing changes in education. It was during this period that the Supreme Court's decision, Brown v. The Board of Education, was passed. After this decision, there ensued a sustained drive by certain members of the society interested in segregation and bent on depriving Negroes the rights to equal educational opportunity. This move continued until a spate of protests for social change occurred in the 1960s.
2. Why did vocational education become part of public education? The nation struggled to maintain the basic institutions of the society between the late 1800s and the early 1900s. By the late 1800s, there was a breakdown in business, commerce and industry which led to the depression of 1893. Most of the leaders agreed that the structure of the education system of the early 1900s could not adequately lend itself to the structure and practice of the economic system. Thus, they called for the federal government to enter into partnership with the states in making vocational education a part of the public school system to strengthen both education and the economy. The nation realized that it was behind the Europeans in educational preparation for world leadership, especially in the areas of business, industry and commerce. Realizing the social and economic effects on the youth and working classes and their implications for the country as a whole, the policymakers began to set new objectives.

Shortly after the depression, the NAM was organized. It took the leadership in influencing economic changes. It sensed that there was need for a different approach to education. Its efforts were not fully in accord with the educational objectives of the labor unions, however. The labor unions, the NAM and other leaders of the society agreed that there was need for a new approach to education. By 1906, a group of leaders from various industries and educational institutions came together to form the NSPIE. The objective of the NSPIE was to have federal government participation in the new education that was to become part of the public school. Through the influence of the NSPIE, the various interest groups who saw the need for the new education reached a compromise regarding how this new education would be structured. They were then able to work together in seeking federal aid for vocational
education. While they all made some contribution to bring vocational education to the public schools, the NSPIE was most influential in working with Congress and the Administration in securing the federal government's participation in the discussion to include vocational education into the program of the public school and finally the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917.

3. Did federal policy and practice play a role in maintaining the conditions of the disadvantaged in vocational education? The Smith-Hughes Act mandated that three subject areas--agriculture, home economics and trades and industry--be taught. While this was a very narrow curriculum range, it was interpreted as designed to meet the needs of those who could profit from it. This interpretation, as a policy decision of the Department of Education, caused many Negroes to be excluded from training in vocational education. Until the 1960s, high-quality vocational education was generally maintained as a right of the white, middle-class citizenry. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities faced discrimination and structural unemployment or underemployment resulting from inadequate opportunities to receive a broad spectrum of offerings in vocational education. Between the 1930s and the early 1960s, there was no support nor accomplishment for the development of special focus vocational education (Finch and McGough, 1982).

Question 4 asked: How was the focus of vocational special needs education achieved leading to the 1963 Vocational Education Act? The events of the late 1950s caused the nation's attention to be focused on the Cold War and education for the more affluent and capable young minds. As the 1950s ended, the philosophy of maintaining America's hegemony in the Cold War began to
wane and a spate of social unrests caused the attention of the leaders to be focused on the conditions of the poor and the disadvantaged.

However, the action of those who sought to circumvent the 1954 Supreme Court's decision continued, and special efforts were made by them to maintain segregation in the schools. This situation quickened the pace of the leaders for a solution to the poverty and deprivation conditions. The focus was then centered upon vocational education as the medium through which a solution could be reached. The Kennedy administration called for an assessment of the situation. This brought a team of prominent citizens into a panel to evaluate the condition. As a result of their evaluation, the problems facing the disadvantaged and the poor became clear, and the effort to achieve the focus placed on vocational education as the medium for change began to be an official reality by way of the legislative process. The Panel discovered that societal conditions produced a group of citizens who had special needs. They then agreed with the prevailing thought that vocational education with a special focus was necessary, if there was any hope of alleviating the condition. To achieve this focus, the Kennedy Administration, together with Congress, the AVA, leaders in vocational education and other individuals and interest groups throughout the country set themselves to the task of producing vocational education legislation with a people approach. To this effort, Senator Wayne Morse, Congressmen Perkins, Powell and Elliott contributed greatly. The AVA made a significant contribution in helping to prepare the legislation. It was through the total efforts of these leaders that the focus placed on vocational education as the vehicle for alleviating the conditions of the disadvantaged and the poor was achieved. The total effort resulted in the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210).
Conclusion

After analysis of the data, the following conclusions were made:

Certain external social pressures affected the education institution causing it to make decisions detrimental to the well-being of several people of various minority groups. However, the ethos which governed the behavior of the nation from the 1800s to 1963 caused the Supreme Court to support educational policies that were detrimental to Negroes. The effects of those policies continued to affect minority groups well after the 1954 Brown decision. It was a judgment by the Supreme Court in 1883 which removed the chances for educational improvement for Negroes and precipitated the segregation of the races in education. Throughout the period covered by chapter 1, decisions by the Supreme Court established precedent for disadvantage for Negroes. It must be concluded, however, that it was also the Supreme Court which was most influential in turning the tide against educational disadvantage of Negroes.

The structure of the education system of the early 1900s could not adequately lend itself to the structure and practice of the economic system. This was realized by the leaders and policymakers and they called for the federal government to enter into partnership with the states in making vocational education a part of the public school system to strengthen both education and the economy. Vocational education was necessary and essential in preparing a working class of people whose contributions were needed to help maintain the infrastructure of the nation and to sustain a level of educational achievement capable of competing within the international community.
The researcher concluded that the participation and efforts of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE) was the most necessary component in bringing vocational education into the public school. The contention which arose concerning vocational education centered around the interest of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the interest of the working classes represented by the American Federation of Labor (AFL), and the National Education Association (NEA) representing education. Within a few years of its formation, the NSPIE brought together these contenders who viewed the necessity of vocational education since the depression of the 1890s. The Society enlisted the support of organized industry and labor, NAM and the AFL, for public vocational education. Its influence was also essential in convincing the federal government to participate in partnership with the states in vocational education. There was no known record to show any other professional education organization but the NSPIE to be involved in acquiring federal aid for vocational education (Lloyd, 1979). From its inception, the founders stated that the purpose of the Society was "to unite the many forces making toward industrial education the country over." (Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Bulletin No. 1, 1907, pp. 7-8).

The manifest objective of those leaders who created the Vocational Education Act of 1917 was that all youth would enjoy its privileges, but many of the nation’s youth were not permitted free access to its privileges. Had the interpretation of the Smith-Hughes Act permitted Negroes free access to vocational education, and by practice made vocational education readily available to a wider range of citizens with a broader curriculum base, the
effort would have benefited the individual, as well as, the nation and could have averted much of the social unrests of the 1960s.

In viewing the social history, it was clear that by the late 1800s, the social position of Negroes was well established within the society. Although Congress passed statutes to grant education to Negroes, no education bill was passed stemming from the 1875 statute. However, because of the attitude of the victors of the Civil War, some Negroes were elected to Southern legislatures, and some served in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. A Negro served as the Governor of Louisiana for 40 days, but opposition to Negroes in state and local government was open and bitter. They were described as ignorant and depraved. Every available means was employed to drive Negroes from public life. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Negroes were at the bottom of the American society (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968).

The 1917 effort which brought vocational education into the public school did little to change the situation. From the inception of the Smith-Hughes Act, high-quality vocational education was generally maintained as a right of the white middle-class citizenry. Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities faced discrimination and structural unemployment or underemployment resulting from inadequate opportunities to receive a broad spectrum of offerings in vocational education (Finch and McGough, 1982). It was this situation which led Barlow (1976) to state that many of these disadvantaged persons were disenfranchised, had fallen through the cracks of the social structure and their civil rights became the object of national concern.
Segregation into separate schools did not contribute much to the generations of blacks, who by the 1960s were classified among those with special needs. The researcher concluded that because of the effects of these situations stated above, by 1963, there were sufficient leaders in the nation who were sympathetic to the situation of those who did not benefit from the privileges of the society. These leaders realized that vocational education as envisioned by the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education in 1914 contributed little to changing the situation and status of the poor and disadvantaged.

In seeking a solution to the problem, the role of the Panel of Consultants was crucial since it defined the central problem to be the condition of the group it defined as the special needs population. Some of the early difficulty to enact legislation to alleviate these conditions was caused by President Kennedy's decision to insist on an omnibus bill and to delete existing vocational education legislation.

The American Vocational Association (AVA) was instrumental in retaining the George-Barden Act and was responsible to a great extent for the 1963 legislation. It committed itself to the expansion of vocational education and to securing more effective programs essential to the needs.

Most democrats supported the special focus legislation and contributed much effort to include programs to accommodate the special needs population. Three Congressmen on the side of the House--Elliott, Perkins and Powell--were most effective in securing the 1963 legislation. Elliott began to influence this legislation even before 1958 and although he was unsuccessful in his attempt to expand vocational education, his effort was relentless even though he was a member of the Rules Committee in 1963. As Chairman of the House Education
Subcommittee, Perkins guided the 1963 vocational legislation through the American Vocational Association and made his H. R. 4955 the standard bearer for the legislation. Powell, as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the House, relinquished many of his convictions regarding discrimination and segregation in order to advance the legislation through Congress.

Of the many members of the Senate who supported the legislation, the most effective was Senator Wayne Morse. He presented a case for the disadvantaged. In the hearings, he championed the cause for the special needs program and worked wholeheartedly to secure passage of the legislation.

The federal government, including the legislative and executive branches, together with leading educators and many influential people outside of government saw the need for a new approach in education and especially for a mandate to address the special needs population through special focus vocational education.

The effort to produce the beginning of a workable solution to the crisis of the poor and disadvantaged resulted in three special focus programs or provisions as follows:

1. Vocational education for persons who had academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps that prevented them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

2. A work study program with financial assistance to aid the disadvantaged students attending school.

3. A residential school that gave needed board and lodging to students attending.

This effort resulted in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, (P.L. 88-210).
Recommendations

In view of the research questions and the findings which indicated that there were deliberate attempts to deprive the disadvantaged of an equitable education, the study recalled that certain leaders were concerned about the struggles of Negroes. The researcher, therefore, decided in making recommendations to briefly recall some events or special activities of primemovers whose efforts were influential in helping to alleviate the conditions of the disadvantaged.

1. A study needs to be conducted to consider the influence and contribution of Carl Elliott for supporting and advocating education legislation, especially vocational education, during his tenure as a member of Congress.

2. A study needs to be done to document the contributions of Senator Wayne Morse in advocating vocational education legislation for the youth of the District of Columbia.

3. The efforts of Congressman Carl Perkins and how they impacted vocational education in both his official and unofficial capacity should be studied, with special reference to his courage in shaping H.R. 4955 which influenced the 1963 Vocational Education Act.

4. A study of the influence and contribution of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE) to vocational education legislation should be conducted and documented.

5. Research needs to be conducted to determine whether the economically disadvantaged have benefited from vocational education programs made available by the federal mandate of 1963.
6. A study to determine into which vocational courses minority students are placed and if these courses lead to further advancement into technical education.
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