A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHIES OF THREE MAJOR INTEREST GROUPS OPPOSED TO FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

by

Father Everest John Michael Farnand, O.F.M., M.Ed.

Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Saint Louis University Through the Department of Education in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June, 1959

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Associate Professor John Joseph O'Brien,
Chairman and Adviser

Professor Oliver Frank Anderhalter

Assistant Professor Carl Albert Hangartner, S.J.

Assistant Professor Carol Kahler

Assistant Professor Trafford Patrick Maher, S.J.

Professor Walter Leroy Wilkins

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued.

CHAPTER I

SETTING OF THE PROBLEM

> A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes actuated by different sentiments and views.[1]

No one would deny the realization in fact in the contemporary world of these words of James Madison. Moreover, that American society is divided into many and various groups, is immediately evident to the most casual and superficial observer. It is also apparent that certain of these groups are highly organized, complex social unities. In our contemporary society, specialization has become a prominent characteristic. Specialization, in any walk of life where it may flourish, sooner or later leads to the formation of organized interest groups. The formation and development of such groups is quite natural to our times. It is also in keeping with the normal growth of such groups that they concern themselves with social problems brought to light by

---

[1] Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, No. X, "The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection," The Federalist on the New Constitution (new ed.). Hallowell: Masters, Smith and Co., 1857, p. 44.

and affecting the socially complex age in which we live.

The problem of this dissertation has its matrix in a remark which takes cognizance of the existence of these organized interest groups, and asserts a claim in connection with them.

> . . . each of these organized interest groups has developed a social philosophy and program which embodies, consciously or unconsciously, some theory of the public welfare, they have by virtue of that very fact also developed, implicitly at least, an educational philosophy and program.[2]

The problem is to test the verity of the hypothesis that each organized interest group has developed a social philosophy, by attempting to discover and to state in rather explicit fashion the social philosophies of three organized interest groups most opposed to any program of federal aid to education.

Of the many organized groups opposed to Federal aid, and there are over 100 civic, religious and business groups so dedicated, there are three of major influence and importance. These groups are specifically, The American Farm Bureau Federation, The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and The National Association of Manufacturers. Although as stated there are many

---

[2]William O. Stanley, Education and Social Integration, Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953, p. 9.

organizations equally or even more strenuously opposed to Federal aid to education than the three specific groups selected, it was felt that their selection was more pertinent for the purpose of this study. What is the evidence that these three interest groups are, of the many organized interest groups, the principal units opposed to Federal aid to education? The evidence is both intrinsic and extrinsic. An excerpt from a letter of the Director of Laws and Legislation Branch of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education offers the extrinsic evidence.

> As you may know, the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor recently completed hearings on various proposals which would provide Federal assistance for the construction of classroom facilities. The principal organizations testifying in opposition to these measures were the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, various State Chambers of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and various State taxpayer associations. Although I do not believe the organization testified at these hearings, the National Association of Manufacturers traditionally has been opposed to this type of legislation.[3]

Intrinsically the basis for selection of these three groups in preference to others is threefold.

In terms of <u>numbers</u> the selectees represent some

---

[3]Melvin W. Sneed, <u>Letter</u>: In response to Inquiry Concerning the Names of Groups on Record as Opposed to Federal Aid. Director, Laws and Legislation Branch, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D. C., April 1, 1957.

fourteen million adult American citizens. This number is a conservative estimate based on summary findings and indications in the related literature. This number does not consider the member's family, who would reasonably be presumed to hold the same view in regard to Federal aid. For instance, there are over 1,587,107 member families in the Farm Bureau.

In respect to the occupational level of the members, these organizations not only represent but also reflect the thinking of the American citizen employed in a variety of occupations. All social classes as well as all work and employment levels, such as unskilled and skilled labor and professional, are represented in the membership. In this cross-sectional representation, conceivably, a "Mr. Jones," who is a farmer, a member of the local Chamber of Commerce, is also an active member of a Veterans' Post.

Lastly, the vocality of these organizations is adequately attested to in the amount and variety of printed materials and publications, in speeches at various functions, in annual conventions and in many local programs beamed to the public through such media of communication as the radio and television.

The selection of these three interest groups opposed to Federal aid is in no wise meant to embarrass or in any manner to be construed as a derogation to other

groups whose policies harmonize with the policies of the selectees. As previously stated, and at this point worthy of reiteration, the basis for the choice of these particular interest groups was felt to be their greater pertinence to the purposes of this study. It may be well to note here that the author does not identify himself in the present study with those opposed to or with those in favor of Federal aid to education. The purpose of the study is to discover and present the social philosophy of three major interest groups as initially indicated in their opposition to Federal aid.

Basic Assumptions

In the quotation which set the problem for this investigation, there are two assumptions which need more detailed study. By the casual reader it may easily be assumed that the ideas stated are indeed so. The assumptions referred to are:

1. That such groups have developed social philosophies.
2. That these philosophies embody, consciously or unconsciously, some theory of public welfare.

Definition of Terms.--Before a considered and more detailed discussion of the verity of these assumptions is undertaken, it would be fruitful to have a definite acceptance of the specific meaning of the terminology employed.

Three terms are of note whose meaning shall be set forth here and used in that specific frame of reference throughout the remainder of the study.

1. Social philosophy: (1) A branch of philosophy dealing with the study of social institutions, customs, and other phenomena of societal life and with their ethical implications; the philosophical aspect of sociology. (2) a systematized and more or less integrated viewpoint or body of doctrines concerning societal life, the state, the citizen, and related problems, for example, democracy, socialism, communism, fascism, etc.[4]

Of the two definitions offered, the second is better suited for the purposes of this study as it is more direct in its application.

2. Public welfare: that which is of benefit or of good, in reality not in appearance only, to the greatest number of the community, state or nation. In other and less lengthy wording, "the common good."

3. Organized interest groups: a body of citizens, large or small, local or national, united by and through a specific objective, goal, ideal, purpose or activity. This group is not haphazardly or loosely or informally gathered but formally structured administratively and functionally to carry out its desired activities.

Having amply defined the terminology, it is time to discuss the two assumptions previously mentioned.

Statement of the Problem.--One of the main functions of the practical aspect of education is to preserve the existing social order. It is, therefore,

---

[4]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945), p. 296.

a chief responsibility of the school to educate the individual in the ways and traditions of society. Since society is dynamic and not static, the ways and traditions of society are formed and influenced by the very adult citizen the school has educated. Quite naturally the citizen is interested in his school and what it teaches. As an individual his opinions, ideals, interests and social values do not carry much weight. He is as a voice crying in the wilderness. An organized group which favors and fosters his interests also offers a channel through which he can be heard; even though it be by sheer force of numbers only, his views are heard. Since man by nature is a social animal or being, it follows that the groups he belongs to cannot help but have definite views which are an outcome of the combined thinking of the members of these groups. These views cut across the whole of his existence as a social being and form his social philosophy. In turn this social philosophy regulates or stimulates his thinking and overt behavior.

In respect to education he has a philosophy which is based on his social outlook. Often the former finds expression in definite policies and principles. It can at times be pin-pointed in precise statements. This clarity of educational views rests on the observation that his educational outlook is but one facet

of the many-sided eye of his social philosophy. Not being so broad in scope as his social views, specific expressions of his educational philosophy can be more readily and easily arrived at. This is all the more probable or likely when his educational philosophy is under pressure from whatever source.

In the present study such is the case. The three interest groups which have been chosen are vocal in stating their ideas of and about education for Americans. Their principles, policies and practices express their educational philosophy. But their social philosophy is not expressly set forth. The problem is to discover the social philosophy of these groups from the known policies and principles they hold in respect to public welfare.

It is not the interest of this study to agree with or to disfavor any stand the specific group may take in respect to the issues which they may defend or attack. Specifically, is this true in regard to the question of Federal Aid to Education. It is intended, however, that through the publications of these groups on all matters social, to ascertain the social philosophy, particularly as it is manifested through opposition to Federal aid to education.

Before the social philosophy of the groups involved may be stated and appreciated, a resume of

Federal relations to education must be advanced.

Procedure

The design of the study called for a survey of public pronouncements of the three major interest groups in regard to their concepts of public weal. This technique was employed to ascertain if there were any specific utterances which could be recognized as particular statements of their social philosophy. Direct application was made to the headquarters of each organization in an effort to obtain official promulgations respecting the explicit statements of their social philosophy.

The history of each organization was also explored in the light of their formative causes or reasons for their existence. Often the history of a movement or event will indicate the philosophy which set it in motion.

Personal interviews with various members of each interest group as well as discussions with several heterogenous units of informed and interested persons helped to build and augment the social image of the farmer and business man. The technique of the interview and the discussion was employed to obtain a qualitative opinion rather than a quantitative and statistical analysis of the impression sought.

Method of Research

The philosophical method of research was used in the present study.

The fact that the subjective phase cannot be eliminated from the philosophical approach has caused much opposition to this approach. Some authorities proclaim that it has no place in research, still others stress that philosophy is so vital that it constitutes a method of research. Since philosophy does not follow scientific procedure it is not considered true research.[5] The scientific approach, however, is employed for the purpose of increasing knowledge of problems of immediate nature, whereas the philosophic approach concerns itself with problems which are remote by nature.[6] Hence, philosophical research is undertaken for a different purpose. As Bode remarks, "It is one thing to determine the facts in the case and it is another thing to decide what is to be done about it. The reason for the difference is that there is a difference in standards."[7]

---

[5]Percival M. Symonds, "A Course in the Technique of Educational Research," Teachers College Record, XXIX (October, 1927), No. I, pp. 24-30.

[6]Henry Gordon Hullfish, "The Relation of Philosophy and Science in Education," Journal of Educational Research, XX (October, 1929), No. 3, pp. 159-165.

[7]B. H. Bode, "Where Does One Go For Fundamental Assumptions in Education?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XIV (September, 1928), No. 6, p. 369.

Basically, does the research look for facts or values?

The heart of the philosophic method is found in the development of suggestions, promoted by scientific facts, together with their implications through the process of reflection or critical thinking. In the same article previously quoted, the author makes bold to say, "It is high time to recognize the fact that the underlying questions in education cannot by any dexterity of manipulation be converted into questions of science."[8]

There seems to be little doubt at the present day in comparison with the attitudes of twenty years ago, that philosophy is being recognized as essential to research in general as is science.

As a research procedure or as a device for arriving at truth, philosophy dates back to the age of the Greek philosophers. "Originally philosophy was the principle if not the sole method of inquiry."[9]

Today, in conjunction with the scientific method, philosophy has an eminent role to play in the drama of education.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 369.

[9] John S. Brubacker and Velorus Martz, "Philosophy of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Walter S. Monroe (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1950), p. 818.

> The great service that philosophy can render to education as a whole is to establish its aims and objectives. This must be done antecedently to research, for otherwise there would be no problems for research to solve. . . . The tracing of large social concepts through the years is philosophical although it is usually classified as historical. Even experimentation becomes philosophical in character when discovered facts take on large social values of a permanent nature.[10]

Related Literature

Authors who have treated the specific problem of the present study were not revealed in the review of related literature. Several others, however, have contributed substantially in varying manner and degree.

William O. Stanley in Education and Social Integration, set the problem for investigation by stating that there are interest groups and by asserting a claim that they have developed a social philosophy.

The principles of ethical-social philosophy as portrayed by Joseph A. Leighton's extensive work, Social Philosophies in Conflict, offered much background material as well as pointed out the need which America has of recapturing the basic virtues of a pioneer community if a humane civilization is to survive. Immediately pertinent to the drift toward Socialism in America today is the historical and philosophical

---

[10]Henry Lester Smith, Educational Research (Bloomington: Educational Publications, 1944), p. 107.

presentation of Facism, Nazism and Soviet Communism. He points out that ethical values supply the guiding principles of social philosophy and that one may not be had without the other.

The Dollar Decade by James Warren Protho, furnished a significant contribution both historically and philosophically. In fact, on the basis of his study of the ethos of the 1920's, Protho previsioned the present study with a background for the comparative analytical approach to the contents of chapters seven, eight and nine.

Lastly, all three major interest groups contributed many and varied publications from which their social philosophies were induced. A basic compendium specific to each organization was selected from the available materials. These publications are: Industry Believes, This We Believe About Education, Main Street vs. Washington, D. C., of the National Association of Manufacturers; Policy Declarations and Education--An Investment in People of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Platform for America, Farm Bureau Policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The titles of the above mentioned works are self-explanatory setting forth as they do the cumulative thinking of these organizations in regard to national issues.

CHAPTER II

FEDERAL RELATIONS TO EDUCATION

Traditionally American education has differed from its European ancestry especially in the fact that it has been largely free from governmental control at the central level. Our Federal constitution does not mention the word "education" and hence many were inclined to believe that education was and is a state function. The inclination to such a persuasion is due to the tenth amendment to the constitution which declares that all powers not specifically assigned to the Federal government belong to the states or the peoples thereof. Though it is true that the supreme court has tended to consider as constitutional any activity of the Federal government having relation to the "general welfare clause," and that education can certainly thus be classified, nonetheless, the major control of public education ought to be centered in the individual states and not in the national government.[1] Hence we have many states

---

[1]Joint Report of Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education and Educational Policies Commission of N.E.A., "Federal-State Relations in Education," 1945.

patterns but no national system of education in the United States.

Each state has established three major agencies that are usually active in the educational plan, namely, the legislature, the state board of education, the chief state school officer. Though local control and finance are still standard practice, it is true that with consolidation of districts and the development of state boards of education there has been a tendency by state departments to centralize within themselves more and more authority and supervision over local schools so that they might reach conditions of excellence that they would find unattainable of and by themselves.

All public schools are state schools and all officers of public schools and school boards are state officials. The local communities, even as cities, operate only by charter from the state. Hence, the local autonomy in our early history existed only because the state considered it expedient to delegate this function to the local parents because these parents still insisted on having the primary right in education and difficulties of communication and transportation made local control expedient.

Only in recent times, even in Europe, has education been considered a national governmental function,

having been previously regarded as the function of either family or church. In 1794 an imperious Prussian monarch first enunciated this doctrine for the governmental control of German education.[2] The history of the German governments has shown the base purposes to which education might be put by unscrupulous dictators. Unfortunately, some of our none too astute American educators were so impressed by the efficiency of the educators they saw on their visits to Germany that they decided to transplant from a dictatorially controlled state a philosophy of control, finance, organization, totally inimical to the democratic prind ple of diversity, individual responsibility and freedom that America represented.[3] Political scientists, unlike educators, would prefer to see the school system become unified with other types of local governmental units.[4]

There are indications in early United States documents such as those of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton and others, that the participation of the Federal government in education was by no means a settled issue.[5]

---

[2]W. Kane, S.J., A History of Education (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1938), p. 481.

[3]Ibid., p. 568.

[4]Address before the National Society of New England Women, New York, N. Y., February 26, 1948, by Augustine G. Rudd, Chairman, Guardians of American Education, Inc.

[5]Charles Flinn Arrowood (ed.), Thomas Jefferson

We find that as early as 1787 the Northwest Ordinance expressed well the Federal attitude toward education when it declared,

> Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged.

It would be too tedious to indicate all the specific actions of the Federal government in relation to education; therefore, in outline form a general view of Federal activity and influence will be offered with an occasional particular example of such activity.

I. Enabling Acts of Congress contain regulations concerning schools.

   A. Adoption of state constitutions.

   B. Upon entrance of territories as states, Ohio, 1802, and Illinois, 1818, Congress specifically stipulated "a college or university"; for Arizona, 1906, some twelve specifications were made.

II. Regulations concerning education were made following grants of land and funds to states and institutions.

   A. The first land grant was made to Ohio in 1802.

      1. Section sixteen in every township was reserved for schools.

      2. School lands were held to be tax free.

   B. In the new western states large areas of public lands were granted for school use.

---

and Education in a Republic ("McGraw-Hill Education Classics," New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1930).

C. Various designated institutions have received grants of land and funds.

1. 1819 Connecticut Asylum for Teaching Deaf and Dumb was founded and received a land grant.

2. 1857 The Columbia Institute for the Deaf, Washington, D. C., was founded. It receives an annual appropriation.

3. 1879 Howard University for Negroes received its first grant.

4. From 1879 to 1927 The American Printing House for the Blind received grants.

III. Specific Acts.

A. MORRILL ACT OF 1862.

Change of Policy.

1. Grants of subsidies or funds as well as lands to be sold for endowments made from now on.

2. Stipulations were specific rather than general.

3. Purpose: To stimulate education in agriculture and mechanic arts.

4. Grant: 30,000 acres of land for each senator and representative to each state.

Results.

1. Fifty-one states and territories now receive aid.

2. Immediate effects: Eighteen states combined new institutions with state university; three gave funds to private institutions already established; remainder established separate agriculture and mechanic arts colleges.

3. General effects: An enormous stimulation to higher education in agriculture and engineering; new colleges came to be known as "land grant colleges" (vulgarly, "cow colleges").

B. HATCH ACT OF 1887.

1. Initiated scientific investigation and experimentation in agricultural education. It embodied detailed limitations.

2. Inaugurated annual subventions in place of previous lump sum grants.

3. Adams Act of 1906 and Purnell Act of 1925 merely extended aid to stations operating under the Hatch Act.

C. STATE MARINE SCHOOL ACT, 1911.

1. Purpose: To offer training for those contemplating a sea-faring career.

2. Allows other than financial aid.

3. Introduces principle of "matching" Federal aid by state and local funds.

D. SMITH-HUGHES ACT, 1917.

1. Purpose: To benefit those interested in agriculture, trade or industry, home economics.

2. Preparation for teachers for service in the same fields.

3. Specific norms for distribution of funds.

4. Created new administrative organizations. Administrative system included research and studies in cooperation with other Federal departments and bureaus.

5. Required a Federal Board for Vocational Education; permitted creation of state boards.

6. Elaborate and detailed provisions as to qualifications of teachers, equipment, etc.

E. NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, 1920.

1. The President is authorized to establish units of a Reserve Officers Training Corps in civil and other institutions.

2. Advances Federal powers in education by creating a direct relationship between the Federal government and educational institutions. (Many specific regulations made.)

F. THE G. I. BILL, 1941.

1. Over 6,200,000 veterans of World War II received education at Federal expense from 1944 to 1949. This has been extended since to veterans of the Korean Action, 1950 plus.

IV. Activities Carried on by the Federal Government in Various Departments.

A. Education in the states. Federal U. S. Office of Education computes the only complete statistics of education in the various states.

B. Education in specific Federal areas: Canal Zone, District of Columbia.

C. Indians and other indigenous people.

D. Territories and other outlying possessions.

E. Training of government personnel.

F. Research and information service.

G. International intellectual relations.

V. Boards.

A. Federal Board for Vocational Education.

B. Department of Agriculture.

C. Office of Education.

D. Defense Act of 1920, the beginning of direct control through cooperation of the authorities in military education.

VI. The Federal Courts Make Decisions Affecting Education.

> "Probably the first United States Supreme Court decision to affect education was the one that gave Congress the right to grant lands and appropriate money for promoting education in the states. In part, this decision was based upon what is known as the 'general welfare clause' of the Preamble to the Constitution.[6] The decision was also based on Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution which in part reads, ' . . . to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."[6]

The decisions of the Supreme Court may change from time to time anent the same issue. Thus for instance in 1900 the Court rendered a decision which directed the Board of Education, Richmond County, Virginia, to provide equal educational opportunities for all pupils. In effect the county had to establish a high school for Negroes since they were not permitted in white schools and had none of their own. Recent Court decisions some fifty-seven years later now decide that separate schools are not legitimate and that integration must now be established in all states of

---

[6] C. Grieder, and W. Rosentengel, Public School Administration (New York: Roland Press, 1954), p. 58.

the union.

In 1923 the Nebraska Case dealt with the teaching of foreign languages in public and nonpublic schools as to whether or not the State could prohibit the teaching thereof. The Supreme Court ruled that under the Fourteenth Amendment the State could not prohibit the right of parents to hire a teacher of foreign language and the foreign language teacher could not be deprived of the right to follow his vocation.

In 1922, the Oregon Case involved the law passed by the people of Oregon that required all children between the ages of eight to sixteen years to attend the public schools. The Supreme Court held that

> . . . the child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.[7]

The Oregon Law was thus contrary to the Constitution because it interfered with the liberty of the parents in the education of their children.

The McCollum Case, 1948, set forth the idea that teaching religion in the public school as the program was set up in Champaign, Illinois, violated the First

---

[7]Pierce v. Hill Military Academy, 268 U. S. 510, 45S. Ct. 571,3 A.L.R. 468 (1925).

and Fourteenth Amendments. Although there was a strong dissenting opinion in the Court's decision, nonetheless the Court ruled that religion as taught in the Champaign schools was a violation of the amendments stated.

It is clear from the contents of this summary that the Federal government is exercising much control over public education.

For the past fifteen years there has been increased interest in the question of Federal Aid. In fact this problem was paramount in the White House Conference on Education.[8] The long campaign for Federal funds, now current, started in the early forties. This desire for Federal monies according to some did not arise from a demonstrated need on the part of the people of any state. According to others, it did.

> The 81st Congress appropriated three million dollars to conduct a nationwide survey to determine the school building needs in each state and to measure the financial ability of the States to meet their respective needs.[9]

In December of 1953 the first report of this government survey on school facilities was published. Of the thirty-nine states which took part, not one state of

---

[8]Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn, U. S. Congressional Record, 84th Congress, Second Sess., 1956, Vol. 102, Part 5, February 1, 1956.

[9]Steve Stahl, Speech on the White House Conference on Education and on the Question of Federal Aid to Education, before the Oklahoma City Rotary Club, Tuesday, January 1, 1956.

this number was shown as capable of financing its individual school building requirements. The Report of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, created by Congress with the approval of the President, contradicts the aforementioned survey. According to the Intergovernmental Relations Commission "Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expense for public schools or for capital expenditures for new school facilities."[10]

Whatever the validity of the evidence on which these conflicting claims as to the need of the States for Federal aid to education, the significant point for this dissertation is that a tremendous public interest in the problem has been created.[11]

During the first session of the 85th Congress fifteen bills and joint resolutions proposing some form of Federal aid to school construction were introduced. A problem had arisen which divided the interested populace "pro" and "con" in respect to Federal aid. Briefly, the arguments for and against Federal aid to school construction are those which follow.

---

[10]Study Committee Report on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education, June, 1955, p. 98.

[11]Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor on Proposed Legislation for Federal Assistance to the States for School-Construction Purposes. 85th Cong., 1st Sess., Part 1, p. 258-259.

PRO--Since adequate school facilities are lacking and are necessary for the national welfare, the Federal Government should provide part of the needed funds from Federal sources of revenue.

CON--The provision of public school facilities is a State and local responsibility.

Implicit in the arguments of the contestants of either side is the social philosophy which prompts them.

CHAPTER III

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

One hundred years ago the United States was practically an agricultural country. Great Britain was the leader in industry and France was not far behind her. It was a period in history when the manufacturing industry of America was just emerging from its infancy. Only ten of the states were considered superior as manufacturing areas. These ten were Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.[1] It is interesting to note that the productive cities of the nation were those on rivers and oceans. At this time an economic situation arose which crippled the nation as a whole and proved to be one of the most disturbing crises the United States had experienced in nearly a century. In 1893 the great panic swept the nation. A distinguished American historian and man of letters wrote of the panic that men died like flies under the strain, and Boston grew suddenly old, haggard and thin.

---

[1]Vada Horsch, NAM Past and Present; Presentation made to NAM New Regional Personnel, September 4, 1951.

Again, at a time of crisis, of need, America displayed her talent for forming an organization to cope with the need. Out of this depression arose the impetus which led to the formation of the National Association of Manufacturers.

> On September 26, 1894, a southern trade paper, the "DIXIE"--a very influential paper at the time--wrote a letter of appreciation to the Fay and Egan Company of Cincinnati for its prompt and affirmative response to the "DIXIE'S" circular invitation requesting manufacturers to participate in a Mexico City exhibit of manufacturing products. The letter went on to say that the trade paper had received hundreds of replies from the manufacturers indicating their desire to participate in such an exhibit. This indicated, the "DIXIE" said, the great desire of manufacturers to sell their products abroad, particularly in Central and South America. The letter went on to say that the time was ripe for the promotion of such trade and commerce. It pointed out that it believed the time was opportune for the formation of a National Association of Manufacturers--and they used that name. It suggested some midwestern city, such as Cincinnati, as the logical place for organizing the NAM.[2]

Four months later, January 22, 1895, the suggestion of the "DIXIE" was acted upon. On this date a meeting was held in Cincinnati at which 583 manufacturers and association executives attended. A constitution was unanimously adopted which embodied two purposes: the promotion of the foreign trade of the United States and the consideration of questions of national interest to

---

[2] Ibid.

manufacturers. The organization was to be non-partisan and non-political. It was founded as an Association of associations and in the early years of its existence individual manufacturers were only secondary or cooperating members. It was felt at the organizing convention that since there was so great a number of industrial associations, local boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and trade associations that primary membership would be limited to such representation. As time went on the need of better financial support and adequate representation of manufacturing interests determined that membership support would have to be based primarily on the dues of individual manufacturers. Satisfactory action was taken on this question at one of the early annual conventions.

More than 20,000 member manufacturers representing a cross section of the industrial might of America belong to The National Association of Manufacturers. The Association is frequently referred to by the use of the first letter of each word in its official title, NAM. The members of NAM account for more than eighty per cent of the nation's output of manufactured goods. The companies and manufacturers who belong to NAM are not only and exclusively the giants of industry. No other industrial organization in the United States contains so many small companies. Member companies

range from a concern with two employees to those of 450,000 employees. Regardless of size each member has one vote in the Association elections,

The purpose of the National Association of Manufacturers has been expressed in the history of its origin at the organizing convention. What, however, is its position on the American scene today? In answer to this query no more definite answer could be found than that NAM is the voice or the spokesman of industry.

> NAM necessarily seeks to represent the prevailing view-point of its broad membership, but in doing so bears in mind that the interest of industry is best served when the public interest and welfare are best promoted.[3]

The organizational structure or the method of governing the activities of the Association, though it may seem quite complex to the casual uninitiated reader, is basically the line-staff type of administrative technique. There is one governing body known as the Board of Directors. The number of directors on the Board varies from year to year. Each state and territory is allowed one elected director if the number of members in the state or territory is fifteen; two elected directors for 100 members and three elected directors

---

[3]The National Association of Manufacturers, Champion of the American Competitive Enterprise System Since 1895 (New York: National Assn. of Mfgrs., n.d.).

for 200 or more. But three elected directors is the total representation each state or territory is entitled to regardless of the number of members. As a consequence the total membership of the Board of Directors can range as high as 172, as it has been in recent years, or it may be lower.

Thirteen policy committees work out the policy positions of the NAM. More than 3,000 members of the Association devote their time and talent to the service that this committee-work demands. The committee recommendations, on approval or modification by the Board of Directors, become official policy of the organization. Once policy has been established it is disseminated from the New York headquarters, the Washington office, and the thirteen regional and divisional offices throughout the country. Industry's views are made known to official Washington, to local and state officials, to the public, to business and management groups and organizations; in short, to every individual or body that should understand or could be helpful in solidifying objectives and in achieving the determined goals.

In 1949 the Educational Department of the NAM was organized. This act was a climax to many years of interest and activity in education. Historically, NAM's first direct educational work was in the area of vocational education. As early as 1897 the Association aroused public interest in trade and technical

education and commercial education.

The Department of Education is localized as an integral part in the office of the Managing Director. At its headquarters in New York the department is staffed by four professional educators experienced both in pedagogy and the fields of industry and business.

There are five Divisional Offices and thirteen Regional offices which deal with the Association's activities in the field. The Educational Directors of the Divisional offices are educators of many years of administrative and teaching experience in all levels of instruction. Again they have had practical experience in business and industry.

Two groups assist the Education Department in an advisory capacity. The first group, the Advisory Committee, is composed of twenty-nine industrialists who are also members of the Board of Directors. One representative each from state, local and manufacturing trade groups of the National Industrial Council completes the Advisory Committee. The work of this committee is very detailed. In general, however, it considers national needs and interests and the extent to which they are presently served by educational media in America. Any problem or interest which affects industry-education relationships, the implementation

of programs and the extension of the Educational Department's activities, the presentation of education problems which confront industry to the Educational Advisory Council, form some of the specific agenda of the NAM Educational Advisory Committee.

The second group has a membership of twenty-five professional educators who represent practically every level and phase, public and private, secular and denominational, of the nation's education system. It is called the Educational Advisory Council and it considers national educational needs and interests and how they affect education-industry relationships. The Council presents recommendations to the Education Department and/or to the Advisory Committee for such action as may be indicated or required. A primary and valuable service of the Advisory Council is a professional analysis of all NAM's educational activities. This analysis of all the activities is carried forward by means of a continuing survey and appraisal of such activities.

Many and varied policies have been adopted by The National Association of Manufacturers in relation to education. The scope which these policies embrace is quite extensive. It covers many of the vital and currently pressing problems which beset the nation's

educational system. Definite positions have been taken in regard to such factors as the physical plant of the school, the curriculum, the professional status of the teacher, administration and support of the schools. This last has been firmly and consistently established as one of the major areas of vital interest to industry and to the American way of life. Of the many statements the Association has made in this connection the following is indicative of the objectives and ideals of the organization. The statement is an amplification of a resolution passed by the Congress of American Industry, December 3, 1948. The NAM submitted this statement to the Legislative Reference Service, The Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., on October 10, 1950:

> The Association believes in the principle that the determination, administration and control of education is properly a state and local concern and prerogative. This includes elementary, secondary, higher and adult education.
>
> The Association further believes that many education and training programs for adult workers, and especially those conducted within business and industrial establishments, can best be determined, administered, supervised and operated by individual employers or employer's associations through their own facilities or in cooperation with state and/or local education authorities.
>
> The Association views with increasing concern the continuing governmental activities aimed at further extending the role of the Federal Government into the field of education. Local educational activities should be handled

> at the local level, where the agencies of government are in close touch with and amenable to the wishes of the people. Educational opportunities must be increased and improved and new and better facilities provided in many sections of the country. In this endeavor to upgrade our American educational system, American business men and industrialists face the responsibility of acting vigorously, each in his own community and in accordance with the policies adopted by the 53rd Congress of American Industry. Intensive work is necessary to reverse the trend of the last 17 years toward centralized government and to bring local responsibilities, with the necessary tax revenues to support them, back home where they belong.[4]

Since the function of government is primarily political and not economic, the Government's responsibilities do not lie in the support, much less the control of education. The Government should not compete with its own citizens or take a position of paternalism to the devastation of civil rights and civil liberties. That industry believes in the worth of the above position is openly manifest in the policy it adopted February 10, 1956.

> 1. It is the direct and exclusive responsibility of each state and its citizens to retain control and to provide funds and facilities for public education. The citizens of each community should be actively urged by all possible means to see that their state and local governments support education adequately in the provision and allocation of local and state funds.

---

[4] Handbook of NAM Activities and Services for Education-Industry Cooperation (New York: Education Department, NAM, 1953), p. 13.

2. It is believed that the financial position of each of the states with respect to outstanding debt, borrowing capacity, cash reserves, and potential tax resources, is adequate to fulfill this responsibility. Therefore, we do not favor Federal support, either as to grants or loans.
3. The failure of some states to meet their full responsibility for the support of education can be rectified by the states themselves through the removal of restrictive provisions of state constitutions or statutes and through improved foresight and leadership.
4. Existing Federal grants for specific purposes should be terminated and the services involved should be assumed by state and local governments as expeditiously as may be practical.[5]

---

[5] Industry Believes, Policies on Current Problems Adopted by the Board (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1957), p. 53.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has an interesting history. In its matrix one finds an outstanding example of how many of our American institutions found their inception. Frequently it has been said that need or necessity is the mother of invention. It was due to a specific need that the Chamber of Commerce came into being.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States was organized at the suggestion of President William Howard Taft, who recommended the formation of a central organization to help Congress keep abreast of and in closer touch with the affairs of commerce and business.

The need, however, of such an organization had been pointedly set forth on the floor of the United States Senate prior to the President's recommendation. Senator Knute Nelson of Minnesota gained the floor one day to announce that that morning he had received a telegram from a Chamber of Commerce in his state urging him to vote against a certain bill, whereas that afternoon he had received a telegram from another

commercial organization requesting that he vote for the proposed bill. "What does business really think?" was the perplexed Senator's question. None could answer. For no one knew. Nowhere in the country was there an organization which could give to the Congress and the American people the view and recommendations of the varied commercial interests as a whole. The poignant query of the Senator spelled out a vital requirement for the national well being. This requirement is fulfilled today by the National Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

In April, 1912, President Taft called a meeting in Washington of all commercial organizations and trade associations representatives and the National Chamber was brought into being.[1]

In essence, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is the national voice of all business, large and small, in every section of the country.

A more specific breakdown of the purpose and activities of the Chamber is in order.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a national federation of business organizations, firms and individual business and professional men. It is

---

[1] The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, What It Is, What It Does, How It Works (Washington, D. C.: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1957).

frequently called by the briefer term of National Chamber and sometimes the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. The latter term, although it is applied correctly, is not readily encouraged. Its use can give the impression that the National Chamber is a part of the United States government which of course it definitely is not.

The National Chamber is composed of, or has two kinds of membership, Organization members and Business members. The local Chamber of Commerce in each locality--city or village--regardless of its name, be it called the Association of Commerce, The Business Men's Association, The Board of Trade or any other term of similar connotation, more than likely belongs to the National Chamber of Commerce as an Organization member. County and regional chambers may also be included in the membership of the National Chamber as Organization members. This likewise applies to many trade associations, industrial and professional associations. There are more than 3,300 Organization members in the National Chamber of Commerce. This number constitutes a membership of more than two million business men.

Firms, companies, corporations, partnerships and individuals affiliated with the National Chamber are known as Business members. The private business firms which belong to the National Chamber are diverse,

ranging from small retail stores, small workshops in tiny communities to the large corporations and companies in vast metropolitan areas whose names are recognized in practically every home in the land.

The extensive representation of the American business man from the small local communities to the large industrial centers of America affords one a telescopic view of the many walks of life, of the opinions, thoughts and ideals which all merge into the policies, principles and ideals of the National Chamber itself. It is precisely because of this central merging of ideas that the institution can play its role of informant and serve the purpose of its existence.

The purpose of this organization is to make known to Congress and to the American people, the views of business on national issues and to obtain action on business recommendations for the solution of national problems. More specifically and fundamentally the purpose is to provide "the organizational means by which the business men of America can work together to make their views, opinions, thoughts, and judgment count in national affairs."[2]

The National Chamber thus strives to maintain a suitable atmosphere in which business can operate at a

---

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

profit. It endeavors to preserve and consistently improve our free market economy for the greater good of all America.

One of the vowed ideals of the Chamber is the right of the individual not only to earn a profit but also the right to acquire and to hold property. In some portions of the world the individual has had this right taken from him unjustly by dictatorial government. A similar loss of the individual's worth and rights shall never happen here in America, if the National Chamber can carry out its firm determination to prevent such a catastrophe.

The National Chamber of Commerce is unique. It does not duplicate nor imitate the work of any other group, for it is the only organization of its kind in the United States. As such, it is a forceful influence in shaping the destinies of millions of Americans by its policies.

The policy of the National Chamber of Commerce must be "national in character, timely in importance and general in its application to business and industry." Policy represents the major opinion of the membership.

A policy may be adopted in one of three ways: (1) by a vote of the delegates at the annual meeting; (2) by referendum of organization members; (3) in emergency, by the Board of Directors. The general

practice is that a proposed policy comes from a Chamber committee. This committee is composed of experts in their individual fields who serve on the committee on a voluntary basis. The proposal is submitted to the Board together with the reasons behind that proposal. The Board then determines the proposal's eligibility for further action. It may submit it to the Organization members for referendum, or again refer the proposal to the committee on policy for further study, another review and for preparation for submission to the annual meeting of delegates. When the Board of Directors in an emergency adopts a policy, the policy is subject to review by the membership. Any chamber member in good standing, organization, firm, or individual may recommend a policy declaration to the committee on policy. This recommendation may then be considered at the annual meeting. All proposals to be considered at the annual meeting must be given to the committee at least forty days prior to the annual meeting. Three years after its adoption a policy automatically expires, unless it has been expressly reaffirmed.

It is evident that such a system for the formation presentation and adoption of policy requires organization at a top level of performance. Since the National Chamber represents the voice of millions of

people from all parts of America it of necessity must be a practical and functional unit.

A glance at the organizational structure of the National Chamber will indicate that it is a well planned unit for activity.

The National Chamber carries on its work through twenty-four departments. These departments are set up under four special areas.

1. Specialized departments which deal with national problems and policies.
2. Organization Service Department.
3. Co-Ordinating and Operating Departments.
4. Research and Communications Departments.

It is within the Specialized Departments that the committee on Education which formulates the policy with which we are concerned, is found.

The importance of education to business and of business to education is well established. But unfortunately there are chasms of misunderstanding between the two. The breach prevents them from giving the full, honest and mutual support so essential to problems of prosperity, national security and education. The Education Department of the National Chamber in recognition of the gulf which exists between these two institutions has placed concentrated effort on two objectives.

1. Understanding of the mutual dependence of our economic and educational systems on each other. The Department's publications, slides and other visual presentations show how closely related are the educational levels of our people to their productivity and their faith in the free market economy. These studies also reveal the increasing importance of educated man power to the success of representative government and an expanding technological economy.[3]

2. Greater cooperation between business men and educators. Local and state chambers of commerce and trade associations are encouraged to establish committees on education with year-round programs of (a) visits by teachers and students to business establishments to obtain clearer views of the methods of--and opportunities in--business; (b) visits by business men to schools for clearer views of education problems; and (c) surveys of school conditions and school finance in cooperation with school boards.[4]

Basic to these two objectives is the concept that the Chamber holds in regard to the role education plays in America.

It firmly believes that education is the foundation of our economy and culture and that our national destiny stands or falls on the quality and thoroughness of the education we offer American youth. Education, it maintains, achieves a central objective

---

[3]Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Education An Investment in People (Washington, D. C.: Education Department, Chamber of Commerce of U. S., 1956).

[4]Op. Cit., p. 18.

when the individual learns intellectual honesty, develops a spirit of inquiry joined with a sound sense of values based on a historical perspective. The properly educated person has the ability to differentiate between weak and strong arguments in social judgments. There is a great emphasis on the importance, the responsibility and the dignity of the individual citizen. It is the right of every American to make use of the educational opportunities of the primary and secondary schools. Beyond the high school level educational opportunity rightly should exist for those who have the desire and the ability to achieve in higher education.

The locus of responsibility for American education is a matter concerning which the National Chamber has very strong convictions. To quote directly from the Educational Policies approved at the Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, April 29--May 1, 1957:

> RESPONSIBILITY FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION
> Individual and community responsibility, so basic to a free society and the success of representative government, are equally essential to the preservation of academic freedom and to the maintenance of education of the highest quality. All measures that government may take to meet either temporary or long-range needs in public or higher education should be directed toward the stimulation of such individual and community responsibility--hence to the ends of maintaining

freedom, economy and efficiency. The historic separation of church and state is a basic tenet of the American constitutional system. Likewise, the freedom of education from domination by government must remain a basic tenet.

Based on these concepts, measures of government to support education should be subjected to full-scale public debate before adoption, to determine that they are prudent, reasonable, and appropriate.

In regard to the financing of education the following policy reflects the views of well over two million business men in America.

FINANCING EDUCATION

The American public school system is traditionally and distinctively a community affair. The States and local school districts should accept full responsibility for the financing and direction of their public schools. Federal financing inevitably leads to Federal control. To avoid the one we must and do vigorously oppose the other. Existing federal grants in aid to special projects in public education should be wholly under state and local administration. In the interest of the independence of our schools, of efficiency in administration, and of economy, school support from federal sources should be subordinate to, and should encourage, state and local responsibility.

The United States Office of Education should be a semi-autonomous, nonpartisan research and service agency working with state educational departments and other interested bodies to further good educational practices.

In this connection the Chamber reaffirms its faith in the wisdom of the separation of church and state. It is our conviction that religious institutions contribute vitally to the life of this nation and can best continue to do so by remaining free from administrative and financial ties with governmental agencies.

Thus, from the history, the purpose, the work and the policies of the National Chamber of Commerce

the voice of the American business man is heard. It reflects the social philosophy of a cross section of the nation's men of commerce whose interest in the future of America and its educational system acts in their view as a bulwark in the defense of the principles and ideals upon which America was conceived and dedicated.

CHAPTER V

THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Many and varied factors contributed to the rise of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Placed in categorical form these factors included the social, political, the economic, the educational elements existent in America at the turn of the twentieth century. A study of the times reveals that the Bureau came into being for other reasons than the express purpose of organizing the farmers from the bottom up.[1] The Farm Bureau cannot be credited with the original idea of federating existing farm groups into one functional and major unity. At least two major attempts had been made not long before the American Farm Bureau was finally organized. In 1910 the Farmers' National Headquarters was formed. In 1917 a rival body called the National Board of Farm Organizations came into being. Both of these organizations sought to unite and speak for the farmer of America. Both groups were out of step with the conservatism of the post World War I era. The Farm Bureau, however, sponsored a program that was consonant

---

[1]Theodore Saloutos and John D. Hicks, Agricultural Discontent in the Middle-West (Madison, Wisc.: 1900-1939 University of Wisconsin Press; 1951), p. 256.

with postwar reaction and the desire for a "return to normalcy." The Bureau was built upon well-organized county units and state federations. It was much better off financially than either of the earlier organizations had been and employed methods that business interests had found effective.

Educational leaders, commercial and financial interests, government officials as well as many farmers themselves felt the need for a strong farm organization. The feeling was that the type of conservative, stable. well-financed body that would be in keeping with American tradition could best be built around the county agents.[2]

Thus it is that the history of the development of the Farm Bureau is so interwoven with the development of the extension service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to indicate the development of the first without mention of the second. The idea of this relationship and some of the important dates in the development of both institutions is in order.

In 1902 the cotton boll weevil had become a menace to the southern cotton planters. A certain Dr.

---

[2]Orville M. Kile, The Farm Bureau Movement (New York: MacMillan Company, 1921), pp. 54-93, 233-243.

Seaman Knapp, a gentleman outstanding in southern agriculture, brought forward a method to combat this particular hazard to the cotton plant. He instructed the cotton planters in the method through demonstrations conducted by trained personnel. The county agent system later evolved from this happy circumstance. The year 1906 is significant for in that year Smith County, Texas, appointed the first county agent, a Mr. W. G. Stallings. By degrees, slowly but surely, the county agent system took root throughout the south.

The North had its first county agent by 1910, in Bedford County, Pennsylvania. This position was more interestingly inaugurated than that of the first county agent in the South. Mr. A. B. Ross was a young lawyer of Cleveland, Ohio. In 1907 he suffered a nervous breakdown and was advised to get out into the country for a complete rest. He chose Pennsylvania countryside as his land of therapy. While driving about the farmlands he visited with farmers and in conversations passed on bits of information he picked up here and there. He took a deep interest in the growing of legumes, large yields of corn, and the improvement of various fruits. As word got around farmers and fruit growers came to him for advice. About this time the United States Department of Agriculture became aware of

his hobby work. As a consequence on March 1, 1910, Mr. Ross was appointed county agent.

A year previous to this, the Binghamton, New York Chamber of Commerce had entered the scene with an additional concept. The Chamber had initiated a study of the ways and means to improve agriculture in the surrounding area of trade. A Farm Bureau of the Chamber of Commerce of Binghamton was organized. Through funds subsequently provided by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, the Lackawanna Railroad and the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. John H. Barron was employed as the county agent March 20, 1911.

It is evident by this time that the county agent system was becoming a fixed landmark in the agricultural scene of the nation. Legislation aided the work of the county agent, as is evidenced by the action of the New York legislature in 1912. A law was enacted which empowered the county boards of supervisors to appropriate funds for farm improvement programs and work. Acting upon this authority the county board of supervisors set aside a sum of $1,000.00 soon after the law was passed. As yet, however, the farmers in given locals were not organized into any set pattern. Mr. Barron, the county agent mentioned earlier in this history, may be credited with the initial step which led to formation of

the first county unit. Whether his action was placed with a view to the consequent program that developed or not, is open to conjecture at this point. It is certain that he appointed community chairmen among the farmers to assist him in his work. Subsequently, the farmers themselves under the inspiration of the community chairmen organized the Farm Improvement Association of Broome County, New York. One year later, in 1914, they entitled the organization the Broome County Farm Bureau, and the first county unit was born.

The idea of the county Farm Bureau took fire and swept across the country. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 made funds available for the support of extension work. The state extension personnel from the colleges of agriculture seized this opportunity and made capital of it. They organized county Farm Bureaus as agencies through which the county agents could better aid the farmer with his local problems and interest.

The county agent system was destined to spread even more rapidly because of the outbreak of World War I. The popular patriotic slogan of the period was "Food Will Win the War." Funds from the Emergency Food Production Act also lent an able hand in the rapid expansion of the county agent system. Numerically, on July 1, 1917, there were 542 county agents; one year later the

total reached 1,133--an increase of over 100 per cent. The bureaus themselves likewise increased in number, though not at so rapid a rate. In 1917 there were 516 county Farm Bureaus in the nation; by 1918 they had increased to the number of 791.[3] As the county bureaus grew more numerous they found need to better correlate and facilitate their work. Accordingly, county bureaus soon began to organize into state federations.

It was but a step or two from the state federations to the path which led to a national federation. The directors of the New York state federation, through its chairman, Frank Smith, invited other state federations to a meeting in Ithaca, February 12, 1919. The purpose of this meeting was to consider the possibility and the ways and means of establishing a national farm federation. Twelve states sent representatives to this initial meeting. The federal government was also represented in the person of Mr. C. B. Smith, who at that time was the head of the States Relations Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Editors of farm papers and publications as well as other persons interested in agriculture enlarged the total attendance with their presence. The immediately important outcome of this meeting was

---

[3]The American Farm Bureau Federation, Of, By and For Farmers (Chicago, Illinois: The Farm Bureau, n.d.).

the selection of a five man committee whose commission was to work out a plan for a national federation. A future meeting was planned for November of the same year, to be held in Chicago. At this meeting the committee was to present its findings. The second gathering was held according to schedule on November 12, and 13, in Chicago, Illinois, at the LaSalle Hotel.

Historically, the 1919 meeting held in Chicago is looked upon as the first annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation since it held its 39th annual meeting in 1958. At the Chicago meeting in 1919 thirty-seven states were represented. Thirty-four representatives were official delegates from state federations. All sections of the nation were represented, indicating that the interest in the national federation was not limited to any particular region of America.

The work of this convention resulted in a tentative constitution and by-laws which were to be sent to the individual states for ratification. By the time the permanent organizational meeting was held in Chicago, March 1, 1920, twenty-eight states had ratified the constitution and by-laws. The first president of the new farm organization, to be henceforth known as the American Farm Bureau Federation, was Mr. J. R. Howard of Iowa.

Many years have passed since that initial meeting in Chicago when the Farm Bureau made its bid for a place in the development of the American way of life and culture. These were years of "growing pains," of turmoil, of misunderstandings which at times threatened the continuation of the organization. Eventually the fixed purpose and objectives of the federation became manifest so that in this decade of the twentieth century they can be expressed clearly and briefly.

> The American Farm Bureau Federation is the largest general farm organization in the United States. . . . Farm Bureau is a voluntary, family organization, financed by membership dues. It is an independent, non-governmental organization of farmers and for farmers. It was organized to provide a means whereby farmers can work together and speak with a united voice on problems which affect them either as farmers or as citizens.[4]

The Bureau represents the federation of all forty-eight states and Puerto Rico. It has a total paid-up membership of over 1,587,107 member families.

The administrative structure of the organization is headed by a Board of Directors. The Directors are elected by the voting delegates at the annual meetings and represent the four geographical regions of the nation. The Board of Directors meets four times a year to handle administrative problems, to determine

---

[4] Policies of the American Farm Bureau Foundation for 1955 (New York: American Farm Bureau Federation, 1954), Foreword.

administrative policies, and to supervise the activities of the executive officers.

The executive officers are the president, the vice-president and the secretary-treasurer. They are elected by the delegates at the annual meeting. The executive officers and staff maintain general headquarters in Chicago, Illinois. The Legislative Department of the Bureau is in Washington, D. C.

The policies of the Farm Bureau are uniquely originated, developed and adopted. Any policy, and this is especially true of recent years, is the result of the considered judgment and mature consideration of the American Farmer. Hence it is claimed that the Bureau policies are built by the membership. Individual families or small neighborhood meetings of several families gather to discuss and study a certain problem or interest. After talking things over among themselves and in their community they make recommendations to the county unit. If these recommendations are accepted by the county as resolutions, the specific items become after further deliberation a resolution which, if adopted, are the policies for dealing with county problems. Recommendations from the county may be adopted by the state unit as a resolution and in turn these become policies for the state interests. Recommendations from the state

unit become resolutions if adopted by the voting delegates at the annual state convention and these resolutions when adopted by the national level become the policies of the Farm Bureau. The recommendations submitted for national approval are first considered by a national resolutions committee made up of representatives from every State Farm Bureau. At the annual meeting the resolutions are considered, amended if need be, and adopted or rejected by the elected voting delegates. The policy formation program is one that features individual member participation aided by study and discussion and progressively developed at local, county and state meetings.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is confident that its policies and recommendations adopted in the fashion described above, after serious consideration at every level of organization, accurately reflect the thinking of the member farmers and ranchers of the nation. It bases this confidence on the fact that widespread participation of the membership has developed the policies and also the fact that increasing number of farm families are giving financial support to the Farm Bureau programs and policies.

In the light of information given thus far in the present study it is interesting now to hear the

voice of the American Farmer and Rancher in regard to the question of Federal Aid to Education.

> Farm Bureau believes that the control, administration, and financing of our public school system should remain identified with the smallest unit of government capable of satisfactory performance.
>
> We submit there is no evidence to demonstrate that the state and communities cannot build the schools they need.[5] They are in much better financial position to do the job than the debt-ridden Federal government. All the taxable wealth of the nation is located within the forty-eight states and it is as subject to state taxation as it is to federal taxation.
>
> During the past ten years new school construction has exceeded by a substantial margin the growth of the school population.[6]
>
> The Federal aid to education would, we are convinced, lead gradually to a large measure of control by the Federal government of the operations of our public school system. We consider this a substantial danger to our free educational system.[7]

---

[5] Testimony on School Construction Legislation, American Farm Bureau Federation, February 27, 1957. Before the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

[6] Washington Report, January 25, 1957.

[7] American Farm Bureau Federation, Farm Bureau's Platform for America (Chicago: American Farm Bureau Federation, 1956), p. 12.

CHAPTER VI

THE IMAGE OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

An earlier reference to the purpose of the National Chamber of Commerce identified it as "the organizational means by which the business men of America can work together to make their views, opinions, thoughts and judgments count in national affairs." Similarly does NAM propose that it is "the voice or spokesman of industry." The American Farm Bureau Federation is confident that its policies and recommendations "accurately reflect the thinking of the member farmers and ranchers of the nation." Granting that the purposes mentioned are valid, there nonetheless remains the question, "What is the American business man's and the American farmer's concept of his role in society?" On what grounds does he feel himself justified in thinking that the rest of America should concern itself in any serious fashion with his recommendations and policies affecting national issues? Without intending either insult or frivolity, the question may be asked, and not without merit, what concept do the American farmer and business man have of themselves in relation to

the American community? This sociological contemporary self evaluation of these fellow citizens may be crucial to the understanding of why their thoughts, views, opinions and judgments ought to be of significance in the direction of national affairs.

It is important to this investigation to pose still another question, namely, "How does American society in general view the business man and the farmer?" For it is in relation to this view that the larger society will, in all probability, accept or reject any proposals which the business man, as represented by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, and the farmer, as represented by the Farm Bureau, offer on any of the social issues of our times.

The poet, Robert Burns, on one occasion expressed a universal plea in the words,

> O wud some power the giftie gie us,
> To see ourselves as others see us.

The thought is apropos to the present discussion of the businessman and farmer.

The Public Image of the Businessman

"Apparently the public image of business is rapidly being shaped in the image being reflected in recent fiction."[1]

---

[1] Business Week, October 12, 1957, p. 187.

> Major executives are becoming seriously worried over a picture of business they fear is fastening on the public mind. The villains, as they see it, are a handful of best selling novels and radio and television programs,[2] that paint business as either a snake pit of ruthless ambition or a giant press squashing everyone into faceless conformity.[3]

Russell Kirk finds the business man "inhumane."

"They are," he says,

> largely ignorant of the humanities, which in a word, comprise that body of great literature that records the wisdom of the ages, and in recording it instructs us in the nature of man . . . the pity is that most of our business men are unaware of the fact that they are missing anything; they fail to appreciate how much of their intellectual power is wasted in getting and spending.[4]

Such unfavorable judgments are not new or few. In the past few years prominent men in various vocations and position have found cause to criticize the business man in print. Henry Luce, in considering the character and the reputation of the business man generally in history, remarks,

> Perhaps the first thing to be said is that, at most times and places, the business man has not been an attractive figure . . . businessmen must accept the fact that usually they have

---

[2]As patterns see: The Dark Tower, Executive Suite, The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.

[3]Business Week, October 12, 1957, p. 189.

[4]Russell Kirk, "The Inhumane Businessman," Fortune, LVI, 2 (August, 1957), pp. 108-109.

not been the most admired models of humanity.[5] That the business man has long been engaged in the process of social self-justification seems likewise to be the conclusion reached by Sigmond Diamond in The Reputation of the American Businessman. In treating the ethical conduct of the businessman, Louis Finkelstein contends,

> If American businessmen are right in the way most of them now live, then all the wise men of the ages, all the prophets and saints were fools. If the saints were not fools, the businessmen must be.[6]

The businessmen are such because they tend to ignore the ethical concepts and laws which have immediate application to their work. Finkelstein states also that in the role of businessman the individual is "the leading citizen of a largely hedonistic nation propelled by meaningless drives toward materialistic and frequently meaningless goals."[7] The same author explains why he singles out the businessman for indictment when he argues,

> . . . because of the responsibility he bears, because his role in American society is so

---

[5]Henry Luce, "The Character of the Businessman," Fortune, LVI, No. 2 (August, 1957), pp. 108-109.

[6]Louis Finkelstein, "The Businessman's Moral Failure," Fortune, LVIII, No. 3 (September, 1958), p. 116.

[7]Ibid.

> great. Ours is an industrial society, and the customs and morals and attitudes of businessmen pervade our whole life.[8]

After showing at some length how men and nations have fallen into ruin and oblivion by neglecting ethical and religious standards in the chase for the almighty dollar, Finkelstein points out that

> Time and again in American history the businessman has transcended his industrial role and become the buttress not only of government but of public welfare. Today's crisis demands of him leadership in still another dimension . . . one where he has thus far conspicuously failed.[9]

Unattractive, unadmired, ruthless, anonymous, conforming, inhumane, unethical--such are the harsh characteristics attributed to the public image of the businessman.

An admittedly unstructured survey of opinion--for it is not the purpose of this dissertation to offer precise statistical validation for the claims made concerning the characteristics of the contemporary businessman--seems to bear out the basic contention that the public concept of businessmen is indeed "being shaped in the image being reflected in recent fiction" and other media of the entertainment world.

Some sample replies to the question, "What do

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

you consider to be the most significant characteristics of the contemporary American businessman?" are interesting as well as significant. The following are verbatim replies to the above question.

1. He is ambitious, he is intelligent in arriving at the goal he desires. Rather loose on moral side--because morals might interfere with his goal.

2. Conformist.

3. Materialistic apple-polisher.

4. Shrewd, practical, in harmony with public views or afraid to be different.

5. I believe they have shrewdness above everything. Secondarily--aggressiveness.

6. The aims of a businessman determine his characteristics, thus--he is concerned with material gain and abstracts (sic) and often fails to recognize the results of his transactions.

7. All businessmen are out to make money. That is why they are in business. Some have motives other than earning a decent living such as a desire for power, importance, and being someone influential. The average American businessman is honest and carries his christian principles into his business life. The terms "unscrupulous" and "ruthless" usually apply only to executives of large corporations.

The significance of this view was stated earlier when it was suggested that the acceptance or rejection of the business community's proposals on the solution of national social issues would depend less on their soundness or lack thereof, than upon the larger public's favorable or unfavorable image of that community.

The Businessman's Social Self-Concept.--The public image of the businessman expressed in fact or fiction is one which is deliniated in the mind's eye of the third person. But what is the self-concept of the men about whom the critic or author or playwright builds his artifact? How does he view himself? On what self-conception does he feel justified in thinking that the rest of America should concern itself in any serious fashion with his views on social issues? Henry Luce, in the article previously cited, attributes to what he calls the "New Man," i.e. the industrial manager, "high standards of ethics and efficiency."[10] He claims further,

> Without the businessman we could never have arrived at this great moment when the Age of Abundance lies before us . . . it is the businessman who is destroying campanalismo . . . and he must rejoice in the vast mobility he is giving to the peoples of the earth who were hitherto slaves of parochial ignorances and prejudices. The businessman is opening the eyes of all the children of men . . . to each other and to the great globe itself.[11]

Russell Kirk, admittedly not a businessman, while decrying the businessman as inhumane, offers an affirmative evaluation with which, it may safely be asserted, most businessmen would agree. "The American

---

[10]Luce, loc. cit., p. 109.

[11]Ibid.

businessman by and large is a benevolent humanitarian. In fact, probably no class of businessman in all history has been so openhanded and so full of social conscience."[12]

In a number of personal interviews with various businessmen an opinion as to their own social self-concept was requested. The number of men interviewed was not great quantitatively, but significant in so far as it represented successful and influential personnel. The opinions expressed are herewith summarily presented.

The businessman, especially if he is successfully established in the field of commerce, feels that he has a deeper and closer contact with many of the problems and issues of the day than those outside the commercial field. His success in business, among other things, depends upon his keeping his fingers on the pulse of events which affect his business immediately and the nation as a whole. His dealings with the general public offer him a rich avenue of information about the likes and dislikes of his clientele.

He feels that he has a fundamental right, as does every citizen, of expressing his views on current national issues. Although he has been associated in the

---

[12]Kirk, op. cit., p. 160.

past in a general way with the rise of freedom and the progress of civilization, he is awakening to the fact that his influence and record in modern politics is a mediocre one. He has come to see that he must know more about politics and become more active politically as a businessman. He can understand the ways in which good organization can liberate and intensify men's energies and imagination. He also views with alarm the ways in which a too rigid or too pervasive organization can cripple, even destroy, men's initiative and abilities. The whole of this practical business insight leads him to see that governments can rob by expropriation and paternalism.

A "too pervasive organization" could develop with centralization of control in the Federal Government. In such a situation the individual is circumvented in his educational endeavors, or refused the opportunity, even the right, to the rewards accruing to the individual from the free enterprise system. The businessman cherishes the latter for various reasons as the follow-remark indicates.

> Our American system of free enterprise is far more than just a way of doing business. At its best it comprehends good sportsmanship; gives free play to the laws of supply, demand, and competition; develops discipline, character, and initiative; raises the standard of living, and improves the moral of the people. . . . The institutions of political democracy and

> economic freedom have grown side by side. They have grown together and lived together; their epoch has been marked by the emancipation of the common man and by humanity's most impressive advances in the arts and sciences. . . . Everyone must have his chance; and under our American system of free enterprise and equal opportunity everyone gets just that chance.[13]

To the specific inquiry as to the benefits of government help, especially Federal aid to education, several businessmen were quite vocative in their views. They expostulated that the facts are apparent to any experienced businessman that temporary government programs have a way of becoming permanent. They laughed at the idea of Federal aid as a temporary measure. No business can compete with government, they said, and when government becomes "big business" individual enterprise will soon cease. All government needs is a beach-head, a foot in the door and it will take over control.

Other businessmen were not wary of Federal aid. They felt that the American people are the government and that laws and educational policies can be made or changed as the will of the people desired. Even these so minded, however, believed in control at the local

---

[13]H. Pew, "The Oil Industry: A Living Monument to the American System of Free Enterprise," Proceedings: Nineteenth Annual Meeting, American Petroleum Institute (Chicago; 1938), Section I, pp. 18-20.

level. They reasoned that educational controls by Federal government would soon affect the economy at large, and that, therefore, businessmen should express themselves in regard to national issues and governmental policies.

A spirit of paternalism was evident in the remarks several made in regard to taxes and finance. If the government can send millions of dollars to foreign countries it was their contention that the people of the United States ought to be able to get some of the tax money for needs at home. This is especially so since it is our hard earned money which makes up the tax. Only a few saw that extending the hand to Washington, D. C. was a way of destroying initiative and an eventual loss of liberties and freedom essential to the democracy which we hold dear.

It was interesting to note that the philosophic foundations of the American system was an area of discussion which most were ignorant of, and mayhap as a foreboding of things to come, cared little about. It seems that the businessman is not concerned over ideals and ideologies unless spelled out in terms of practical dollars and material success. Until some circumstance of person, place or time dares to make an inroad on the status quo of his existence, he is content to lie dormant.

The Public Image of the American Farmer

Whatever may be the situation of the businessman, so far as the public image of him is concerned, the farmer labors under no handicap in this regard. Throughout a long span of history, both he and his work have been favored by the public mind with an idyllic view. Socrates declared that

> Husbandry is the mother and nurse of the other arts. For when husbandry flourishes, all other arts are in good fettle, but when even the land is compelled to lie waste, the other arts . . . well-nigh perish.[1]

Cicero stated "that of all the occupations by which gain is secured, none is better than agriculture, none more profitable, none more delightful, none more becoming to a freeman."[2] Cato says that when his ancestors

> were trying to praise a good man they called him a good farmenr and a good tiller of the soil, and the one who received this compliment was considered to have received the highest praise . . . and the men engaged in this pursuit are least given to disaffection.[3]

---

[1]Xenophon, Oeconomicus (trans. by E. C. Marchant, Loeb Classical Library. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923), p. 405.

[2]Cicero, De Officiis, I, XIII (trans. by Walter Miller. New York: MacMillan Co., 1913), p. 55.

[3]Cato the Censor, On Farming (trans. by Ernest Brehaut. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), pp. 1-2.

It is interesting to note that in a footnote explanatory of the expression "least given to disaffection" Brehaut observes that the "expression is used not in a moral but in a political sense; the farmers were supporters of the established order."

In more recent times, this idyllic view of the farmer was sustained by the writings of many of the Romantic poets. From "The Deserted Village," by Goldsmith:

> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroyed, can never be supplied,
> A time there was, ere England's griefs began,
> When every rood of ground maintained its man.[4]

and then Robert Burns in "The Cotters Saturday Night":

> An honest man's the noblest work of God
> and certes, in fair Virtues heavenly road
> The cottage leaves the palace far behind;[5]

In our country, Thomas Jefferson and his Virginia compatriot John Taylor helped to maintain what Griswold has called quite properly the "mystic and romantic elements"[6] in the agrarian theme.

> "I have often thought," wrote Jefferson, "that if heaven had given me choice of my position and calling, it should have been on a rich spot of earth, well-watered, and near a good market for the productions of the garden. No occupation is so delightful to me as the culture of the earth . . .[7]

---

[4] Complete Poetical Works: William Collins, Thomas Gray, Oliver Goldsmith (ed. Epes Sargent; Boston: Crosby, Nichols, Lee and Co., 1860), p. 40.

[5] The Illustrated Family Burns (New York: P. F. Collier, n.d.), p. 14.

[6] Alfred Whitney Griswold, Farming and Democracy (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., Inc., 1948), p. 20.

[7] The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. XII, "Letter to Charles W. Peale," August 20, 1811 (Washington, D. C.: 1905), p. 79.

Jefferson held to this view not only as a personal matter. Farming was the occupation which in his view, developed in those who pursued it independence and self-reliance, essential qualities to the citizen of the political system he championed. Small wonder, then, that he declared that "small land holders are the most precious part of a state."[8]

Where Jefferson is politically oriented in his view, Taylor is almost theologically oriented in his attitude toward the farmer and his farm. That "divine intelligence," he states, "which selected an agricultural state as a paradise for its first favorites, has . . . prescribed the agricultural virtues as the means for the admission of their posterity into heaven."[9]

In our own day this sort of romanticized view has persisted. In the President's Message to Congress on February 16, 1937, dealing with farm tenancy it is disclosed that

> Sturdy rural institutions beget self-reliance and independence of judgment. Sickly rural institutions beget dependency and incapacity to bear the responsibilities of citizenship.

The result of a survey designed to discover contemporary views on the qualities of the American

---

[8] Ibid., XIX, p. 18.

[9] Cited in Mudge, E.T., The Social Philosophy of John Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 152.

farmer reveal the persistence of the theme. The majority of the responses in this survey pointed out the characteristics of "hard-working," "honest," "simple" as being quite commonly associated with the farmer. Several specific replies are quoted here as indicative of the type of view in which the farmer is held by some of his contemporary fellow citizens.

1. The characteristics of a farmer are again efficiency but also a great technical knowledge of his field rather than the old-time "feel for the soil."

2. Honest, hard-working, clean-living, religious.

3. Strong, ambitious, able, and in this day and age honest, highly intelligent, hard-working, generous.

4. Ambitious; selfish to an extent, interested in monetary rewards rather than production for the psychological or spiritual reward.

5. Contented with simple things . . . likes nature.

6. Thrifty hard-working. A man who must know a little about everything.

7. Individualistic . . . industrious.

8. More educated and integrated person, a more social and civic personality than formerly. He still retains a good portion of his down-to-earthness.

9. Strong, conservative, independent of intellectual tyranny.

The Farmer's Self-Concept

Without doubt the farmer's image of himself has in large measure been shaped by his consciousness of the

high regard in which he has been held throughout history.

The farmer visualizes himself as the backbone of America. He is the element in our culture which lends the stabilizing effect to that milieu. He and his family are a microcosmos of the American scene. For the farmer in his work-a-day world is a businessman, an inventor, a mechanic, a doctor, an investor, a speculator, a husband, father and teacher. In him resides the last vestige of the raw courage, hope and dreams characteristic of the frontier and pioneer spirit. By necessity of his every day living the farmer is an independent man, at least in his outlook. He is a person who has learned to "do for himself"--not in any sense, however, of being isolated from his neighbors and community, since he is united with them by a kindred spirit.

The farmer in comparison with the businessman is in a position to feel more keenly about his views in regard to national interests. The farmer, so to speak, becomes wedded to the soil, "the good earth," as he tames it, cultivates it and makes it produce. Love and interest for his country is not a far step from the love and interest he has for his own land and farm. In recent years he has had definite experience with the restrictions placed on farming by the government. On this background the farmer and rancher hold up the dangers they conceive in Federal aid. Therefore, fellow Americans

should be interested in anyone so experienced when he expresses his views on national issues.

Specific interviews with farmers brought out some of the above concepts in greater detail. An official of a local Farm Bureau indicated that the farmer has a concept of himself as an independent thinker, as one who thinks in terms of his local community and government. As such, he fears centralization of control and is afraid of anything which even hints at socialistic ideals. As he put it, "any hint at socialism is like waving a red flag before a bull."

Another successful farmer, a man held in high esteem in his local community, set forth the idea that the farmer has had sad experiences with governmental programs and therefore feels that the farmer can warn others of the pitfalls in government sponsored or financed educational programs.

A graduate of a mid-western college of agriculture explained that there is a "philosophy of individualism in farm groups and communities which has arisen in the course of agrarian growth." The farm people know that the nation thrives and advances on the wheels of agriculture. In support of this contention, three farmers cited the fact of the production and supply of food for the armed forces during two world wars. Their thoughts

on Federal aid could be summarized in the words

> If we could feed a nation at war, we certainly can support our educational needs locally, at least much better and more consistently than under government controls.

With his self-conception very largely paralleled by a similar image in the mind of the general public, it is little wonder that the farmer and rancher feels confident that when he speaks, especially when he speaks collectively through his organized interest group, that the public would indeed do well to listen. An official self-concept is found in the words of Allan B. Kline when he writes for the members of the Farm Bureau,

> Farm Bureau's philosophy makes it clear that we are not a protest movement. We do not devote our main energies to opposing things. We take a positive attitude towards measures affecting farmers' welfare and toward public issues generally.
>
> Farm Bureau represents farmers and confidently expects to be effective as anyone else in the development of policies affecting them as farmers and as citizens.
>
> Our policies always have been based on a broad foundation. They have encompassed all sorts of problems and questions. We take full responsibility as an organization of citizens as well as farmers.

---

[10]Allan B. Kline, "A New Direction in National Farm Policy," The Nation's Agriculture, XXIX, No. 11 (December, 1954), pp. 4-5.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

What is meant by the term social philosophy? In Chapter I of this study the definition of social philosophy and its accepted usage for purposes of this study was said to be:

> a systematized and more or less integrated viewpoint or body of doctrines concerning societal life, the state, the citizen, and related problems, for example, democracy, socialism, communism, fascism, etc.

It is evident upon reading that this definition is broad in scope. Specific concepts are not explicitly drawn out. What, for instance, are some of the particular categories which are commonly contained in the generally accepted meaning of a social philosophy? To determine in something of an objective fashion the answer to the query just posed, some two hundred people were interviewed personally or by questionnaire. The individuals chosen for this project were both men and women, and included professors of philosophy, doctors, nurses, lawyers, laymen and women with only highschool education, and business executives. These people were asked, "What concepts or ideas come to mind when you hear the words

social philosophy?" From the responses offered the following categories were most frequently selected as being part and parcel of the contents of a social philosophy:

> government, economic, freedom, education and culture, the individual, family, community, religion, general ethical concepts in respect to all human relations.

Even upon a cursory inspection of the elements here listed it is discovered that they are identifiable in the broad definition quoted above. But it must be admitted that the questionnaire venture offered too wide a range of concepts to deal with comfortably. To facilitate the analysis of the public statements of the interest groups under consideration, the nine categories which evolved from the interviews and questionnaire were reduced to three. The warrant for this reduction rests extrinsically on an extensive study of business ideas of the 1920's. In his book, The Dollar Decade,[1] James Warren Protho offers conclusive evidence that during the hey-day of rugged individualism the "ideas of the national business organization spelled out in terms of a systematic conceptual structure"[2] can

---

[1]James Warren Protho, The Dollar Decade, Business Ideas in the 1920's. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press).

[2]Ibid., p. 209.

be reduced to three component factors: the nature of man, the nature of society, and the nature of government. There is further warrant of an intrinsic nature in the fact that these are still the categories of social philosophy to which allusion is most frequently and significantly made in the public statements of the three groups under investigation.

From an analytic study of the materials pertinent to that era, Protho states that concerning the nature of man, a doctrine of elitism and a material standard of values were the essential tenets of that facet of the social philosophy of business. In regard to society, the business community believed in the pre-eminence of economic interests and in the necessity of rather rigid social stability. "The theory of government points at that time to the fear of popular control and the importance of individualism."[3]

During an interim of thirty years, the United States has suffered through two major wars, is currently engaged in a cold war, has passed through the throes of a terrible depression. Indeed the whole world has been passing--is still passing--through a process of social upheaval. The Sudan, for instance, an independent nation for only two years, has launched an ambitious

---

[3] Ibid., p. 210.

program of economic and social development. But it is balanced today between progress and disaster because of the pressures of Egyptian, Soviet and United States policies, the rivalry over the Nile, and the depressed cotton market. Red China is experimenting with its forced communes in an attempt to change a culture and a society which for hundreds of generations were inimical to change. Great Britain has broken with the age-old tradition of government and societal life and since 1945 has adopted the philosophy of Socialism much to its unrest and upheaval. The road to nationalism and socialism is paved with agonies. This is best demonstrated in 1948 when France sent French soldiers under government orders to fight government-employed coal miners in order to protect government-owned coal mines.

In view of all this, has there been any significant change in the basic social philosophies of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce? A study of their published materials should reveal whether or not such is in fact the case. Resort to and critical evaluation of their published materials is a necessity. In a private interview with an official of a particular Chamber of Commerce it was confirmed that there was not to date, September, 1958, an official promulgation in whole or in part of the social philosophy

of the Chamber. Moreover, correspondence received from principal departments of all three organizations included in the study, states that there are no documentary pronouncements of the specific social philosophies of these groups.

In the organization's Constitution of 1895 there is an expression of NAM's basic philosophy. This is to be found "only slightly changed" in the present Constitution, adopted in 1950. Sections One and Two of Article Eleven of this Constitution are in point.

> This philosophy embraces fundamental belief in the virtues of individualism as opposed to collectivism; its belief that freedom is indivisible; that when free competitive enterprise, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of elections--when any of these are attacked, all other freedoms are endangered. This philosophy recognizes that incentives are an element--and indeed a basic one--of our private competitive enterprise system, and that one of the major incentives under our system is the right to own and use property. Furthermore, the basic philosophy of NAM emphatically stresses the belief that the Association has the right, the duty, and the responsibility, to disseminate these views to the general public and to the federal government as well as to its members.[4]

How then is the social philosophy which it wishes to disseminate spelled out in detail?

It has been pointed out that NAM, insofar as

---

[4] NAM Champion of the American Competitive Enterprise System Since 1895 (New York: The National Association of Manufacturers, nd), p. 6.

it represented the voice of industry and business, held to some policies and practices in the 1920's regarding the nature of man, the nature of society, and the nature of government which were based for the most part on economic and political considerations. In the ensuing years, apparently a self-evaluation has taken place with the effect that a more mature and well rounded position is now apparent in the publications of business and for business interests. Some modification of the positions held in the 1920's are apparent.

The basic belief of NAM concerning government is to be found in the statement that the "function of government is primarily political rather than economic."[5]

> In the traditional sense, the things done by government are, or should be, mainly for the purpose of providing and maintaining the conditions under which the people generally can go about their own affairs more securely and to better advantage.[6]

Stemming out of this basic position is a manifest desire for government, particularly the Federal Government, to disengage itself from business competition with private enterprise.

---

[5]NAM, Industry Believes (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1957), p. 12.

[6]NAM, Main Street vs. Washington, D. C. (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1957), p. 9.

> The government's responsibilities do not encompass competition with its own citizens in the fields of production and distribution. In so far as governmental activity invades the field of private enterprise it threatens the other elements--civil rights and civil liberties--inherent in our system of Government.[7]

While NAM recognizes the three traditional levels in American government, i.e., federal, state, and local, it champions centering the bulk of governmental authority at the state and local levels.

> In a country which seeks to retain free, popular government, service responsibilities should be performed by the smallest unit competent to handle public services satisfactorily and economically.[8]

> The future of the federal system of government as a union of states, and of the American system of free, private, competitive capitalism demands a decrease of this concentration (of power in the central government) and a diffusion of power, resources, and responsibilities among the several levels of government or a return to the private economy.[9]

In the presentation of NAM's views on specific problems, the same desire to limit the powers of the federal government is manifest.

> The Federal Government has no place in an old-age assistance program. It should withdraw from this field as promptly as possible.[10]

---

[7] Industry Believes, p. 12.

[8] Ibid., p. 14.

[9] Ibid., p. 14.

[10] Ibid., p. 25.

> . . . workmen's compensation should continue to be a matter for state legislation without intervention by the Federal government.[11]
>
> . . . public employment services . . . should remain within the jurisdiction of the respective states and should not be subject to federalization.[12]
>
> It is the direct and exclusive responsibility of each state and its citizens to retain control and to provide funds and facilities for public education.[13]
>
> The Association views with increasing concern the continuing governmental activities aimed at further extending the role of the Federal government into a field of education. Local educational activities should be handled at the local level, where the agencies of the government are in close touch with and amenable to the wishes of the people. . . . Intensive work is necessary to reverse the trend of the last 17 years toward centralized government . . .[14]
>
> . . . responsibility for the execution of a highway plan should rest principally on the state and local governments.[15]

While NAM does not regard government as economic in function, it should, through its proper political activities, be aware of, foster, and protect the interests of business. As representing this trend of thinking, the following positions may be cited.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 27.

[12] Ibid., p. 39.

[13] Ibid., p. 53.

[14] Ibid., p. 84.

[15] Ibid., p. 54.

We believe that the policy of the United States lending agencies, as well as the policy of the United States in international financial agencies in which it participates, should operate to encourage and not to compete with private investment.[16]

. . . sound policy decisions of both private industry and government are dependent upon the availability of accurate and adequate information oftentimes statistical in nature, and available only through the Federal Government. Any curtailing of funds necessary for conduct of censuses as provided in Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution of the United States or U. S. Code, Title 13, including Public Law 671 of the 80th Congress, supplemented by the 81st Congress, and recodified by the 84th Congress, would represent a reversal of Congressional intent and an ill-advised and dangerous trend.[17]

The conflict of interest laws should be reviewed for the purpose of simplification and clarification. They should be revised in such a way as to enable government to receive the advantages of the skill and knowledge of businessmen in public service without undue hardship to those who are willing to serve.[18]

The National Association of Manufacturers believes that the Federal Communications Commission should give adequate consideration to the growing needs and requirements of the manufacturing industries in the field of radio communication both for intra-plant and external operating use.[19]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 31.

[17] Ibid., p. 62.

[18] Ibid., p. 67.

[19] Ibid., p. 68.

In his previously mentioned study of the business ideas of the 1920's, Protho offers evidence that during that era, business (which for him is precisely identified with the Chamber of Commerce and NAM)[20] viewed the common man with a rather aristocratic eye. He finds adequate justification for maintaining that in the view of business at that time, man en masse was not capable of profound or even rational thought; leisure and thought would pervert the common man; his political judgment was considered to be sadly deficient.[21] On the other hand, business perceived the business man as constituting something of a societal elite, for any number of reasons.

1. Business brings into play that aspect of human nature which represents man's finest attributes.
2. An executive role imbues one with added breadth of human sympathy.
3. Association with business gives one a realistic outlook.[22]

Does business still hold such views? On the basis of the available evidence, the answer which seems warranted is indicative of the influence of the age. As a result

---

[20]Protho, op. cit., pp. xvii-xviii.

[21]Ibid., pp. 4 ff.

[22]Ibid., p. 31.

of the progressive "democratization" of society, business--or more accurately in this connection, NAM--holds a view which is in the process of evolving away from such an aristocratic concept of the so-called common man. But the apparent import of its pronouncements on certain matters, still shows a partiality for the concept of the business man as a natural member of a societal elite.

The business view of what the lot of the common man should be, and how, when his lot is unfortunate, he has projected himself into such a situation, is considerably more human than formerly. But there is still a belief in a sort of natural aristocracy which rises to the top as a result of a selective policy inherent in business mechanisms. Moreover, to allow the operations of government to favor this business-created aristocracy, is a tendency which business regards as proper. What is the evidence which warrants this conclusion?

As instancing the growth of a more human and benevolent estimate of the common man, and a sympathetic concern for his lot when this is unfortunate, the following statements of policy may be cited.

> Full consideration of the human personality and the need for individual recognition, opportunity and development call for the provision of working conditions which protect the health, well-being,

dignity and self-respect of the individual employee.[23]

NAM recognizes that the maintenance of a high level of employee health is a vital and integral part of sound personnel practices and good human relations, and believes:

1. That the protection of employees against any adverse or harmful job-connected conditions remains a basic responsibility of employers.[24]

American industry recognizes that steady employment and steady pay are of vital importance to employees everywhere and contribute to a sound economy.[25]

The American system of private competitive enterprise should provide every possible opportunity for handicapped persons who are willing and qualified to work at productive jobs.

Employers know from experience that the handicapped individual, when matched to the requirements of the job, is no longer handicapped.

Employers should continue to make every effort to provide still wider employment opportunities for the handicapped by adhering to those personnel policies which promote the hiring, retention and advancement of these individuals on a sound and fair basis. Thus the human and economic needs of the handicapped are best served while they, on their part, can become self-supporting and thereby make their contribution as self-reliant members of society.[26]

The second part of the proffered conclusion seems warranted by the following policy declarations. NAM

---

[23] Industry Believes, p. 21.

[24] Ibid., p. 23.

[25] Ibid., p. 35.

[26] Ibid., p. 39.

favors:

> a) a policy of increasing the risk of borrowers and beneficiaries as a condition of securing government financial help.
> b) a policy of transferring to private ownership such agencies as can be so transferred.
> c) a policy of making all credit operations, which are not readily transferrable to private ownership and operation, self-supporting by appropriate increases of fees, interest, premiums or other charges.[27]

> Except for the alchoholic beverage, tobacco, communication and transportation taxes, and except as provided below, the present system of federal excises should be replaced by a uniform excise tax on all end products of manufacture, except food for human and animal consumption; drugs; seeds, fertilizers and associated agricultural items; raised print material for the blind; and religious articles.
> The tax should not apply to any manufactured article sold for use as a component in further manufacture of another article whether taxable or not.[28]

Those who can best bear--or profit most from--such suggested approaches to the solution of human economic problems, are rather evidently those who have, under the selective mechanisms operating in the business world, risen to the top of the natural aristocracy.

Protho's study led him to conclude that the business community was, in the time under investigation, dominated by a material standard of value. On the basis of the evidence this would still seem to be true

---

[27] Ibid., p. 17.

[28] Ibid., p. 49.

of NAM. But it would be obviously unfair to maintain that this is a unique characteristic of the social philosophy of business. For, the well-nigh unanimous opinion of competent critics of contemporary society in the United States maintains that the material standards of value is an over-arching characteristic of our total society. Business may well foster the perpetuation of this standard of value because its prevalence redounds to the good of business by increasing the consumption of its end-products both quantitatively and qualitatively. This, however, still does not fix upon business the original responsibility for the appearance of this criterion of value. Moreover, it does not make it a concept peculiar to business in distinction to other identifiable segments of the American social community. The support of this contention finds credence in the following selection of statements sponsored by NAM.

> A free society within a dynamic economy where the welfare of each citizen depends primarily upon his own ability, industry and thrift has been shown by experience to be the best way to create large real national income and to promote social, material and technological progress.[29]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 11.

Efficient performance of services by the several appropriate grades of government enables all of the people to have more economic and social advantages here and now.[30]

The second concern of Industry with the objectives of Education lies in raising the material standard of living in America through the higher expectation of all the people, which inevitably results from raising the level of education. This upward trend helps to create expanding markets upon which Industry thrives. Even elementary education in America has made people want, and work to get, bathtubs and fountain pens, better clothes and encyclopedias, table silver and classical records, and countless other products of industry for which these same people, if completely illiterate, would feel far less urge. The impact of education on material desires and expectations is felt at every level of society and of education, and the greatest importance of this force probably lies in the future. Industry has a tremendous stake in the influence and extension of Education in America.[31]

Given the correctness of the foregoing interpretation of the general attitude, the best direction for a counteroffensive against the "isms" would be to show that the people have, and will continue to have, more here and now, and more from here on, under the economic system of free, private, competitive enterprise than they can ever have under any state-owned, state-dominated economic system. From this major premise it follows that the less there is of governmental domination, direction, dole, and exaction, the more the people will have as their own.[32]

---

[30] Main Street vs. Washington, D. C., p. 9.

[31] NAM, This We Believe About Education (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1955), p. 18.

[32] Main Street, p. 6.

> Industry recognizes the vital importance of the sound development and improvement of land and water resources of the United States in association with the wise utilization of our other natural resources--soil, forests, range, and their attendant economic and aesthetic values.[33]

From what has already been said concerning NAM's position on one of the proper exercises of its political power, i.e., the fostering and protecting of business interests, and of NAM's contribution to the perpetuation of a material standard of value, one may reasonably deduce that the concept of economic pre-eminence is still a highly operative concept in the social philosophy of business. Protho identifies this concept as the judgement of business when he attributes to it the thought that economic interests are and ought to be the pre-eminent interests of society.

The contemplation of the contribution the views of business make to the perpetuation of a chiefly material standard of value, and the position that government has the obligation to further business interests, seem to bear out the above mentioned claim. One other instance might be cited.

> The typical, modern American business man is vitally concerned with moral and spiritual values. Primarily, of course, because he is a good citizen, but also because he knows that

---

[33] Industry Believes, p. 19.

> a vigorous American capitalistic society cannot flourish in a moral and spiritual vacuum.[34]

While NAM is willing to admit the desirability of social change, it favors a very cautious approach thereto. NAM affirms,

> That all established relationships between individuals, and between the individual and society as a whole, are subject to change, and that any effort on the part of Education or of particular educators to keep the American social organization static instead of dynamic, or to prevent or to ignore change, would be contrary to the proper spirit and purpose of American Education.
>
> But that acceptance and evaluation of change should proceed from a fundamental and firm belief in the American form of government, in the free, private, competitive enterprise system, and in the maximum freedom for the individual that the essential functions of government in a complex modern civiliation will permit.[35]

> This is the fundamental philosophy upon which our way of life was founded and adherence to its precepts constitutes our best guarantee for the future.[36]

By way of summary, the principal facets of the social philosophy of NAM may be stated thus:

Government's function is political, not economic, and

---

[34]Kenneth R. Miller, "Democracy Is a Challenge," Vital Speeches, Vol. XXIII (July 15, 1957), p. 586.

[35]This We Believe About Education, p. 28.

[36]Industry Believes, p. 11.

its chief political purpose is to provide and maintain the conditions under which the people can generally go about their own affairs more securely and to better advantage.

The more decentralized government is, the better.

Government should, as one of its proper political functions, foster and protect the interests of business.

Individual ambition is the most universal, reliable, and powerful of human motives.

The welfare of each citizen depends primarily upon his own ability, but circumstances do admittedly arise in which citizens are through no fault of their own unable to provide for themselves. Provision for them must then be made in such way as not to diminish the individual's sense of responsibility for his own welfare.

Every human being is possessed of dignity and worth.

The business man is still to some degree properly regarded as an elite member of human society.

There is a willingness to admit and to accept a standard of value that is principally, but not exclusively, material; and to judge that economic

interests are and ought to be the pre-eminent interests of society.

Social changes are inevitable, but are to be introduced very cautiously.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

An explicit statement of the nature of government is not found in the Policy Declarations of the United States Chamber of Commerce. A prefatory statement, however, explains that "this book is a guide to where business stands on national issues and what business recommends should be done."[1] Consistently, however, throughout the contents of this particular publication one is given to understand that our traditional form of government as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is the only type of government for the wholesome flourishing of the free competitive enterprise system.

> Taken together, these declarations of policy reflect the American philosophy of enterprise favoring limited government and the motivation of production by incentives within the framework of a free competitive market economy.[2]

A glance at some of "these declarations of policy"

---

[1] Arch. N. Booth, "Chamber Policy," Policy Declarations (Washington, D. C.: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States), Foreword, 1957.

[2] Ibid.

bears out the central theme referred to.

> The American democratic system will be preserved only if citizens search for ways to participate actively in all appropriate matters pertaining to education.[3]

> A competitive economy is basic to our political and social freedom, and a primary feature of private enterprise.[4]

> Government competition with private business lessens the opportunity and responsibility of such enterprise and thus diverts government from its basic function.[5]

> The activity of the federal government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, are the primary interest and obligation of the several states. Such encroachments should be eliminated in the interest of protecting our system of government.[6]

> Finally, there should be searching scrutiny of the incursions of the federal government into fields that should be developed by private industry.[7]

The fear of populism, spoken of by Protho as characteristic of business in former times, has now become a fear of government. Business has seen that any monopoly is inimical to sound business interests--especially to the economy of a free enterprise system.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 48.

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

[5] Ibid., p. 8.

[6] Ibid., p. 14.

[7] Ibid., p. 26.

While pointing out the nature of the type of republic which it upholds, business does so in terms of economy, of freedom to capitalism, of interest to small business, as well as large corporations. It is apparent from the literature that the Chamber of Commerce is wary of, even opposed to, any movement, be it political, social or economical, which tends to infringe on the competitive enterprise system.

> The Chamber opposes any policy or proposal which, directly or indirectly, might either lead toward the nationalization of the mineral industry, in whole or part, or unnecessarily hinder its development by legislation, administration or intergovernmental agreements involving the regulation or limitation of production, distribution or price. The domestic minerals industry should not only be permitted but encouraged to develop and expand its activities under our system of free, competitive enterprise.[8]

This does not refer only to the mineral industry. So also is the case with coal,[9] petroleum and natural gas,[10] synthetics,[11] and natural resources.[12]

Against organized labor the Chamber of Commerce asks that federal and state laws ban certain "improper

---

[8] Ibid., p. 144.

[9] Ibid., p. 145.

[10] Ibid., p. 148.

[11] Ibid., p. 149.

[12] Ibid., p. 153.

practices" of labor unions. Such for instance as compulsory unionism, monopolistic practice of industry-wide bargaining, secondary boycotts and "feather-bedding."[13]

The purpose of a society incorporates certain aspects of its underlying philosophy.

> The National Chamber maintains a sleepless vigil over the right of the individual to earn a profit, to acquire and hold property.[14]

This is interpreted by the National Chamber as another way of saying that the Chamber's purpose is

> to maintain a favorable atmosphere in which business can operate at a profit--to preserve and persistently improve our free market economy for the greater good of all Americans.[15]

Warren Protho's analysis of the 1920's said of business, that it upheld material standards of value. Senator Barry M. Goldwater told a general session of the American Farm Bureau Federation Convention, December, 1958, a contemporary view of business when he said:

> Both business and labor have materialistic philosophies wrapped up in "what can we get for ourselves."[16]

---

[13] Ibid., p. 89.

[14] The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, What It Does, How It Works (Washington, D. C: Chamber of Commerce of the U. S., 1957), p. 6.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Senator Barry M. Goldwater, Arizona Republican, Speech Before a General Session of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Fortieth Annual Convention, Boston, December, 1958.

Business itself seems to uphold the point in question when it declared in a 1956 policy that,

> Freedom must be defined in this generation or it will be lost. Maintenance of this country's economic and military strength is fundamental. But to be strong economically and militarily this country must first be strong spiritually. Faith in ourselves, maximum effort, increased productivity, real sacrifice, and political and social adaptation to scientific and technological progress, will be required now and for a long time ahead.[17]

How else is this statement to be interpreted than that "being strong spiritually" means having "faith" in our economy and the "good life" and "better standards of living" which our free enterprise system has and will produce? Clarification of this issue may be achieved by further insights offered through specific utterances which reflect the tone of the Chamber's thinking.

> The Chamber is confident, however, that distribution will respond by continuing to seek new techniques to contribute to an ever more effective flow of goods and services--to fulfill wants and needs, to bring maximum comfort and convenience, in short, to bring better living to more Americans.[18]

> It is our obligation to make clear to all that the basic or fundamental security of all people lies in the labor and savings of the individual.[19]

---

[17] Op. cit., p. 119.

[18] Ibid., p. 32.

[19] Ibid., p. 36.

"Increased economic and cultural well-being"[20] is sought by the Chamber and to this end states that:

> The effectiveness of our foreign policy depends in large part on the strength of our domestic economy. It is therefore important that American foreign policy should be formulated and carried out in such a way as not to jeopardize our national economic health.[21]

Speaking of non-agricultural rural lands under the broad heading of "Recreation" the National Chamber thinks that

> . . . such lands should be managed primarily for their highest economic use. Other uses should be encouraged only when compatible with the major use.[22]

Human values then are subordinate to or are "of value" in proportion to their relativity to material standards of merit. Or is there no other "basic or fundamental security of all people" than "labor and savings of the individual?"

Out of a materialistic philosophy arises an artificial division of societal life. "The have's and the have not's," although of itself a natural distinction--for the poor we always have with us--nevertheless, needs must be maintained in the light of material standards. Thus an elitism is perpetuated by pre-eminence of economic interests which in turn clamors for social stability.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 46.

[21] Ibid., p. 111.

[22] Ibid., p. 150.

> The continuance and vigor of our system of democracy and free enterprise depend upon permitting individuals, as well as corporations, to retain sufficient income after taxes to reward and stimulate initiative and risk-taking. Present taxes do not permit retention of sufficient funds to provide adequately for equity investments needed for economic development and expanding employment.[23]

> The effects of present high rates, low exemptions and inequitable provisions are damaging socially and economically. There is a serious impairment of incentive and discouragement of the natural desire to make family provision. Successful family enterprises are broken up and family ownership and control destroyed. There is dissipation of productive capital with all of the public detriment that follows. The consequences bear heavily upon small enterprises which must continue to have an important place in the business structure.[24]

> Economic security, provided by the initiative and thrift of the individual, should be encouraged.[25]

> Business has a responsibility in the public interest and in its own interest to help higher education continually to replenish the nation's supply of educated men and women.[26]

In retrospect, the social philosophy of business as portrayed in its approach to national issues, appears as a conservative, materialistic philosophy. It is based on the pre-eminence of economic interests, favoring a milder elitism than thirty years ago, under a form of

---

[23] Ibid., p. 56.

[24] Ibid., p. 57.

[25] Ibid., p. 109.

[26] Ibid., p. 46.

government protective of the individual and his freedoms.

In accordance with the purpose of the National Chamber expressed at the opening of this chapter, it is fitting to close with the following quotation:

> Business should exercise more aggressively its freedom of speech and assembly guaranteed in the Bill of Rights in order to help develop public attitudes that will provide a climate in which business can continue to effectively discharge its responsibilities to society, fully utilizing all modern techniques of communication appropriate for this purpose.(1957).[27]

---

[27] Ibid., p. 19.

CHAPTER IX

THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

> The full realization of man's dreams as envisioned by our founding fathers can only be achieved if each individual assumes active responsibility for maintaining and strengthening of the principles upon which our republic was founded and vigorously opposes all programs and policies which erode the very foundation of our American system.[1]

This statement prefaced a list of fundamental beliefs in the constitutional form of government and in political, economic, and religious liberty which were endorsed at the 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation. In every official promulgation of its policy, the Farm Bureau has consistently stressed the type of philosophy of government in which it firmly believes. Yet an even stronger emphasis was placed on the nature of government in the policy declaration of 1959.

"The time is upon us when we must assume the responsibilities of citizens and earn anew the right to our heritage."[2]

---

[1] American Farm Bureau Federation, Farm Bureau Policies for 1959 (Boston: 40th Annual Meeting, 1958), p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

What in concept is the nature of government which is "our heritage" according to the statement of this the largest voluntary organization of farm and ranch families in America? In answer, a few examples of the many specific references to traditional American principles of government will suffice.

> The Constitution of the United States of America was conceived and purposely designed to make secure the God-given liberties of each individual against the domination of government. This provision was made by a division of authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our federal republic; the diffusion of government powers; and the retention by the people of those powers not specifically delegated to the government.[3]

> That the centralization of power and authority in the federal government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend, and the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens are among the greatest dangers threatening our republic and our system of competitive enterprise.
>
> That the Constitution is the basic law of the land and that it should be interpreted in accordance with the intent of its authors. . . . in strong and responsible state and local units of government and in protection of state laws against federal pre-emption.[4]

It is quite evident from these selected quotations that the nature of government here set forth is that of a self-governing constitutional republic in the form of a federal union of sovereign states. The

---

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] Ibid., p. 6.

reasons for adherence to this form of government are that it best insures and preserves the dignity of the human individual, his basic freedoms and his right to a livlihood in a free, competitive enterprise system.[5]

In keeping with this theory of government Farm Bureau is constantly watchful lest the relationship between government and people become unbalanced in favor of centralized federal control. On this point the organization states that

> We are seriously concerned over the present tendency of the Supreme Court to legislate, the acquiescence of the Executive Branch in such decisions, and the tendency of Congress to yield certain of its legislative powers to the Supreme Court. These attitudes destroy the system of checks and balances which is a fundamental concept of the Constitution.[6]

Not only fear of centralization of power and administration in federal government but also fear of any monopoly is basic in the members of Farm Bureau.

> Monopoly power, no matter who exercises it, threatens individual freedom . . . concentration of economic power in labor unions has reached the point where it must be considered a monopoly.[7]

---

[5] Nation's Agriculture, 34 (January, 1959), 1.

[6] Loc. cit., p. 8.

[7] "Curb Monopoly Power," Nation's Agriculture, 34, No. 1 (January, 1959), p. 8.

In support of the above statement, delegates at the 40th annual convention pointed out that many labor unions are employing tactics inimical to the best interests of the members and society at large.

> To compel any individual to be a member of and financially support an organization which engages in political activities is politically immoral and violates the spirit of the Bill of Rights.[8]

In stronger support of this contention legislation was recommended to the effect that labor unions be made subject to anti-monopoly laws.

Is this the "fear of populism" which capital and management experienced in the 1920's? As a great segment of our society was opposed to monopolies in business thirty years ago, the opposition led to the enactment of anti-trust laws. This legislation curbed the corporate power at the turn of the century. At that time farmers seemingly were on the side of labor against capital. At this time they are seemingly on the side of capital in opposition to the labor unions. Is this a fluctuation in philosophy? Or is it a persistent adherence to basic tenets respecting the American heritage of freedom?

Allan Kline, past president of Farm Bureau, speaking to the assembly of delegates in December, 1958

---

[8] Farm Bureau Policies, 1959, p. 35.

pointed out that just as farmers have long recognized the necessity of controlling monopoly in business, so also must farmers confront the need to check and control the powers of labor in the public interest.[9] This specific contention of Farm Bureau is shared by members of Congress. Senator Barry M. Goldwater, Arizona Republican, remarked in his speech to the same convention that

> . . . the power of labor is going to become the major issue before the American people.

Expressing pride in Farm Bureau he continued,

> I wish that there were more business and professional people in this country who would bind themselves together with a determination not just to help themselves, but to help America, and what America means.[10]

In similar vein, Senator Spessard L. Holland, Florida Democrat, warned the delegates that

> . . . the trend away from individual freedom toward enlarged federal government and a labor "super government" may lead to the destruction of the American way of life.[11]

The underlying philosophy of Farm Bureau as indicated above is that of individual responsibility and maximum political and economic liberty. It is a

---

[9] "Freedom is the Issue," Nation's Agriculture, 34, No. 1 (January, 1959), p. 17.

[10] Ibid., p. 16.

[11] Ibid.

conservative democratic philosophy of government.

> Nations may live or die, but nations which live by the great principles of Christianity can be expected to endure. The true measure of a nation is found not in its census, the size of its cities, the yield of its crops, nor the strength of its armies, but in the kind of people it has as citizens.[12]

What of the nature of the citizen of America as seen in the eye of the Farm Bureau? An elitism seemed to be fostered by business interests in the days of the "Dollar Decade" according to Protho. In the course of three decades which have ushered in the "Age of Abundance," has elitism grown apace with the trend toward Socialism? Who are the elite, if any? Is the Farm Bureau representative of elitism?

In a personal interview with one of the members of the State Board of Directors of Farm Bureau, the pattern of questioning set forth above was pursued. In summation of comments offered by him it was made clear that the farm and the farmer are in a period of evolution. Newer methods and cheaper ways of farming have forced the husbandman as a class to an orientation not previously experienced. In fact the question could well be put, "What is he?" Farming is a family enterprise, a home and living, but it is also a business.

---

[12]Farm Bureau Policies, 1959, p. 7.

The relative ease, luxury and abundance of living today because of the advance in better machinery and techniques is far and above the era of the twenties. Material possessions, variety of recreation and many other items once considered the peculiar domain of the elite are now common place in most every home in rural as well as urban America. Occupationally, the farmer is in a distinct class. His entire milieu of necessity places him in the position of fostering his mode of existence. In this sense there is an elitism natural to his environment. That this form of elitism is naturally and not artificially sustained can be argued from Farm Bureau's proposals in economic planning.

> A major objective of Farm Bureau policy is to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate government regulation of individual farming effort. . . . The problem of maintaining prosperity in agriculture is broad and complex and that it involves many lines of action not only in agriculture but also in other fields.[13]

Production payments or programs that fix prices and controls of production are artificial and do not consider the natural phenomena of supply and demand, competitive conditions and market trends.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 9.

Although seeking to insure satisfactory, even an opulent, farm income, the farmer does not desire to do so to the jeopardy of public welfare.

> Every means should be used to eliminate the excessive accumulation of surplus agricultural production, to substantially reduce the use of public funds . . . to allow prices to respond to supply and demand, to reduce costs of these programs to taxpayers.[14]

As a result of other personal interviews with farmers and members of Farm Bureau, one can express the general thinking of these men in the remark

> that it is time the American public realize that the majority of real farmers do not want nor need the charity of the American tax-payers.

Similar sentiment was expressed in the words

> it's time the Government got out of farming for many reasons. It is regrettable that so many people actually believe that farmers desire or even need the programs now forced on them by the Government.

The general prosperity is necessary for the farm prosperity. The farmer desires national policies which insure high employment, rising productivity, and a good distribution of income after taxes.

Material standards in regard to human values seems to be related to the American free, individual competitive enterprise system, which is basic to the nation's economy. When one examines the related

---

[14] Ibid., p. 11.

literature invariably one finds many encomiums about the economic system of free enterprise. One such tribute for example holds that it is a system "which has provided unprecedented goods and service." Isn't it but natural that the material abundance, ease and comfort of living furnished by this system should lead to standards of value that are material? Is there need to document the statement that "efficiency and the dollar have become the criterion of American progress?" And in that progress are we not losing an asset which has been a major asset in the formation and development of our country . . . the dignity of the individual and individualism? Although Farm Bureau philosophy does not support materialism as such, the contemporary farm citizen is influenced by material standards of living to the detriment of the individual.

A society is as good as the members who compose it. The stability of a given society depends on the principles which govern it. To Farm Bureau

> Our national life is founded on spiritual faith and belief in God. While Christianity has been the dominant force in the religious life of our country, we recognize the contributions of other religions.[15]

On this background Farm Bureau seeks to stem the trend of Socialism. A prime dogma of Christianity is the worth and dignity of the human individual. This concept

---

[15] Ibid., p. 38.

is found in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights upon which our society has been founded. In all of its policies and in the solution of problems which arise under pressure of social and economic change, Farm Bureau reiterates that these solutions involve "recognition of spiritual and moral values." How is the recognition to be accomplished? Primarily and fundamentally by the individual. Since the importance of the individual is basic to our society, the individual must also accept the responsibility of protecting society. Therefore, Farm Bureau urges each member:

> to make every effort to keep belief in God the dominant force in America . . .
>
> . . . to be alert to the dangers of political or social action foreign to the basic concepts of our American system which might be proposed in the name of his church.
>
> to encourage growth of churches and extend their spiritual influence by active support, regular attendance, and such special activities as spiritual instruction in the home.[16]

The complex nature of our society, the present trend toward Socialism, the ever encroaching standards of value of Materialism, the critical international situation, the centralization of power in federal government necessarily involves greater vigilance than in

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

the simpler times of the past. In the interest of securing social stability, the farmer looks not only to dangers to religion but also to education, family and youth.

> We should be alert to the possible danger of promotion of ideas and reading materials unsympathetic to our American system of government.[17]

> The old age and survivors' insurance should not be designed to replace individual thrift but rather to protect against hardship in advanced years and to protect dependents against tragedy of premature death of the family breadwinner.[18]

> One objective (of Farm Bureau's program for youth) is to develop leadership for places of responsibility in Farm Bureau--as well as the community, state and nation. . . We recommend that the program be evaluated periodically.[19]

> An imperative need of our public schools is the establishment of curricula which help students to acquire a true concept of the basic principles and philosophy of the American system of self-government and the competitive enterprise system.
>
> We need to develop greater individual appreciation of the problems of education, including the responsibility for students guidance and selectivity of courses, and greater emphasis on high scholastic attainment.
>
> Farm Bureau opposes expanded federal aid to education because it involves the increased control and eventual domination

---

[17] Ibid., p. 39.

[18] Ibid., p. 39.

[19] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

of our public school system by the federal government.[20]

In summation, it is noted that again a conservative philosophy is paramount in Farm Bureau's concept of society. The continuance of our present social status is stabilized by religion, family as well as individual importance, well rounded and carefully guarded educational programs. On the other side of the coin is the embossed image of the pre-eminence of economic interests under the free, individual, competitive enterprise system.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 42.

CHAPTER X

THE VALUE THEORY OF THE THREE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHIES

The student of social philosophy could ask several questions in regard to the values which are found expressed and operative in any society, community or interest group. A few specific questions are germane to the three major interest groups of this study.

Out of their printed pronouncements, what values do these organizations want the public to think rule these groups? Previous chapters in the present work have stated the answer to this question.[1] Here it is sufficient to recall that all three organizations are explicit champions of the individual, free enterprise system under a form of government which constitutionally and traditionally guarantees the freedom and rights of the individual. In a word, all that the cultural heritage of America holds dear, and has dearly paid for with the sacrifice, tears and blood of its patriots, are the values these groups sincerely uphold for the public eye.

Each group assures the public that it speaks for the whole of its membership when each unit states

---

[1]See Chapters VII, VIII and IX of this study.

respectively that it is "the voice of Industry," "the voice of Business," and "the voice of the farmer and rancher." But here another query can be injected, and not without merit. Are the values which are expressed by each group those to which all members of the group adhere? Could there be a strong minority which maintains views partially or entirely inimical to the majority decision? Or are there members of these groups who "go along with" the public pronouncements of policy but do not really know--or perhaps care--what they mean or even what is the group's position on matters of national import? Certainly, it is safe to say, that no member of these specific groups would knowingly go contrary to those utterances which portray or uphold Americanism. Such items, for instance, as are contained in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States are quite American. Perhaps the inference made here would be more clear by posing the question: What values effectively rule in these groups regardless of what the public is intended to accept as the guiding values of these groups?

The factual analysis of the public pronouncements of the three major interest groups of this study shows that human values are secondary to material values. In the literature of each group can be found several

indications of this great emphasis on the value of material possessions. NAM has several apt quotations concerning this point. Witness the following:

> The second concern of Industry with the objectives of Education lies in raising the material standard of living in America . . . Even elementary education in America has made people want, and work to get, bathtubs and fountain pens, better clothes and encyclopedias, table silver and classical records, and countless other products of industry. . . . The impact of education on material desires and expectations is felt at every level of society and of education . . .[2]

The Chamber of Commerce reflects that:

> The Chamber is confident, however, that distribution will respond by continuing to seek new techniques to contribute to an even more effective flow of goods and services -- to fulfill wants and needs, to bring maximum comfort and convenience, in short, to bring better living to more Americans.[3]

The American Farm Bureau Federation in comparison with the two other interest groups is more specific in its enunciation of human values. This concern with humaneness may perhaps be explained by the fact that Farm Bureau is a family organization. What, therefore, affects the farm has immediate effect on the farm family. Such a direct relationship is not the case with NAM and The Chamber. Nevertheless, the spirit of the age is

---

[2]NAM, This We Believe, op. cit., p. 18.

[3]Policy Declarations, op. cit., p. 32.

caught from time to time in the pronouncements of Farm Bureau.

> A satisfactory adjustment of production to market demand for farm products is still the major problem of agriculture.[4]

Does this mean that all other problems in agriculture are minor? One may also wonder at the implications involved in the blanket statement that:

> We should offer farm products in world markets without regard for destination whenever it will advance the welfare and security of the people of the U. S.[5]

This emphasis on material standards and material possessions indicates, according to one line of thought, a yen for security. The individual, free enterprise system is lauded as the means to material wealth and comfort. Material possessions then become a proof of this security. In the chase for security, however, any means may be used. The general trend in the country at large is that government is the means to security. Those who are able to secure and possess wealth, do not want government help or aid. Quite naturally such aid is feared as it brings controls and destroys individual effort. On the other hand, those who for one reason or another lack wealth, are ready to extend the hand to government for the material aid which will spell security.

---

[4] Farm Bureau Policies for 1959, op. cit., p. 12.

[5] Ibid., p. 25.

Whatever the motives which prompt men to seek this longed-for "security," the fallacy lies in the order of values. Whenever material values supersede human values society disintegrates. History offers the pattern of what seems to be taking place in America.

There are five stages to this pattern, as history points out. The first is the period of Bondage and Slavery. Man suffers this yoke until he reaches the second stage of Courage. He has arrived at this stage when human values are seen in their proper hierarchy of order. Casting off the yoke, man enters the area of Freedom. Herein, he lives in true dignity. Fear of losing his freedom drives him to any means to secure it. At this stage human values take a lower position in the hierarchy of worth. In his effort to obtain and maintain security, under a false perspective of values, man eventually is led back into Bondage.

The ear-marks of the quest for security are generally manifested by a pre-eminence of economic values, a material standard of living, an elitism in society fostered by such standards. It is precisely these characteristics that have been identified in the underlying inferences drawn from the explicit social philosophies of these groups.

Seemingly, at least in theory, the philosophies

of the interest groups in question, for the most part uphold the human values which are essential to freedom as expressed in our American cultural heritage. But are the values which effectively rule or operate in these groups those which develop and maintain a civilized and truely human culture? Culture is not the same as education. Yet, education continues and develops culture. The philosophies of the three groups promote a definite cleavage between educational support and control by local and state systems and educational support and control by a federal governmental system. The basis for this stand is traditional and constitutional. Yet, the curricula of the schools are, in some institutions of learning, such as would, if probed thoroughly, eventually pave the way for Materialism and Socialism which are inimical to true human culture. One may well ask whether the criticism directed toward the American educational system by these groups has in every instance been sufficiently perceptive of this possibility. Meanwhile, these groups influence the commercial and vocational subjects taught. In themselves such subjects have a degree of merit. We expect the graduates of our schools to know how to make a living. A parasitical society would soon destroy itself. Likewise, a civilized and truely human culture cannot endure when students

receive little or no training in how to live. According to Christian social principles, the dignity and worth of the individual are intrinsic values. They are inherent in the very human nature of the person. From these concepts stem the natural rights and freedom of the individual. A material standard of values would judge merit by material opulence. A person of affluence and influence is then given a position of worth extrinsic to his human dignity. Quite conceivably education should then emphasize how to make a living, rather than how to live. In short, such a system of values makes man a laborer first, then a human being. Effectively, curriculum changes which these groups foster are those which de-emphasize the humanities, the ultimate sources of the patriotic and moral values upon which this nation was founded, and encourage practical business and vocational programs. A survey of course content in the nation's high schools, colleges and universities sufficiently demonstrates the order of values currently endorsed.

Theoretically, the order of values which promote a civilized and human culture, is the order all three interest groups publicly proclaim as a dominant concept of their social philosophies.

With considerate reflection upon the questions:

What values do the interest groups want the public to believe that the groups uphold?

What values effectively rule these groups?

Are the values which rule the best for a civilized and truly human culture?

it appears that the social philosophies of these major interest groups lacks integration. Their philosophies are not systematized, not so much from a sparsity of sufficient and proper concepts, as from failure to recognize the inherent dichotomy between material and human values. Perhaps these groups--in the interest of the very values they are anxious to uphold--should take a second look at their philosophies in order to discover the implications contained therein. Philosophy is not just theoretical; it must also be practical.

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Essentially, the social philosophies of the three major organized interest groups investigated in this dissertation may be classed as conservative. Protho so identified the social theory of business in the 1920's, calling it "a theory of rigorous conservatism."[1] This appears as a still credible evaluation simply upon extended inspection of the philosophies involved as they are currently presented. It is even more warranted when the general content of the three philosophies is measured against some of the norms for conservatism suggested by Russell Kirk. The American conservatism, he declares, is marked in part by these characteristics:

> A conviction that justice, properly defined means "to each the things that go with his own nature," not a levelling equality; and joined with this is a correspondent respect for private property of every sort. Civilized society requires distinction of order, wealth, and responsibility . . .

---

[1]James Warren Protho, The Dollar Decade (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954), p. 210.

> A suspicion of concentrated power, and a consequent attachment to our federal principle and to division and balancing of authority at every level of government.
>
> A reliance upon private endeavor and sagacity in nearly every walk of life . . .
>
> A prejudice against organic change, a feeling that it is unwise to break radically with political prescription, an inclination to tolerate what abuses may exist in present institutions out of a practical acquaintance with the violent and unpredictable nature of doctrinaire reform.[2]

There is a dictum in metaphysics which states that action follows being. If an organized interest group's social philosophy may be in any sense regarded as its "being," then--if that philosophy be conservative--one may reasonably expect a general conservative program of action to be recommended by such a group in regard to any area of human endeavor upon which they try to exercise influence. Can one validate such expectation by appeal to the official statements of each of these three groups on educational matters?

The NAM and Education

The Locus of Educational Responsibility.

> The ultimate final responsibility for the education and upbringing of every child still remains, and should remain, in the family of which that child is a part. The schools must

---

[2]Russell Kirk, A Program for Conservatives (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954), pp. 42-43.

be regarded as agents of, and auxiliary to, parents in the schools' assumption of a part of that responsibility.[3]

Education and the Social Order.

NAM believes:

That all established relationships between the individual and society as a whole, are subject to change, and that any effort on the part of Education or of particular educators to keep the American social organization static instead of dynamic, or to prevent or ignore change, would be contrary to the proper spirit and purpose of American Education.

But . . . acceptance or evaluation of change should proceed from a fundamental and firm belief in the American form of government, in the free, private, competitive enterprise system, and in the maximum freedom for the individual that the essential function of government in a complex modern civilization will permit.[4]

Government Control of Education.

The Association views with increasing concern the continuing governmental activities aimed at further extending the role of the Federal government into the field of education.[5]

. . . Constitutionally public education is a function of the several states, and . . . statewide legislation establishing minimum standards of attendance, minimum educational standards, requirements for facilities, and the pattern of local administration within certain limits of authority and responsibility, is necessary and proper.

But . . . community responsibility, community

---

[3]NAM, This We Believe About Education (New York; National Associations of Manufacturers, 1955).

[4]Ibid., p. 28.

[5]NAM, Industry Believes (New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1957), p. 84.

administration, and community determination of matters concerning local school systems should not be weakened by centralization of either facilities or control beyond actual requirements for the most efficient and economical educational service in a given area.[6]

The Purposes of Education

General.

There probably is no one single purpose of education acceptable to all, but some rather widely accepted purposes without reference to their order of importance may be generalized as follows:

(a) To prepare the individual to make a living and to make progress in his vocation, or to help in that process.

(b) To prepare the individual for mature and complete living--personal and family, social and civic--in today's world, and to help develop the moral, ethical, and spiritual values which benefit both the individual and society.

(c) To increase man's understanding of the arts, sciences, and humanities, and his appreciation of his cultural heritage.[7]

In Relation to Industry.

Industry must look to Education for its supply of trained personnel.[8]

This needed supply is detailed to include research and development; scientists and engineers; men

---

[6] This We Believe About Education, op. cit., p. 31

[7] Ibid., p. 28.

[8] Ibid., p. 18.

for top-management positions, "who have the vision and intelligence to assume improved industrial concepts and production,"[9] "non-scientific personnel for specialized departmental duties, such as traffic management, job evaluation, and accounting."[10]

> Finally there are the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers . . .[11]
>
> All of these people can better adjust to job situations with a minimum of friction and costly job-turnover if they have acquired from the schools at least a basic understanding of actual conditions in the world of work.[12]
>
> The second concern of Industry with the objectives of education lies in raising the material standards of living in America through the higher expectations of all the people which inevitably results from raising the level of education. This upward trend helps to create expanding markets upon which Industry thrives.
> The impact of education on material desires and expectations is felt at every level of society and education, and the greatest importance of this force probably lies in the future. Industry has a tremendous stake in the influence and extension of Education in America.[13]
>
> Industry must look to Education to assure the economic and political literacy of the people which alone will preserve the American free enterprise system and social order.[14]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 18.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., p. 18.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 19.

Experimentation and Education.

> . . . in Education as in all other divisions of its cultural activities, America should be and remain a melting pot of professional experimentation, and of ideas, purposes, and traditions, that merge to make the nation great.
>
> But . . . too radical or idiosyncratic deviations in educational theory or practice, from the broad standards determined and accepted by preponderant public opinion and professional experience, should not be supported in so universal a nation-wide service as education.[15]

The Curriculum and Its Purpose.

> American history, with special emphasis on American economic history, should be taught in all schools, from grammar school through college. Since industrial enterprise in all its forms--research, invention, manufacturing, and distribution of goods and services--is fundamental to the phenomenal growth of our high living standards and our national strength, the relationship between American freedom and industrial progress should be presented in its full true light.[16]

Many other specific citations could be offered to validate the contention that the influence NAM tries to exert on and in behalf of education is essentially conservative.

In appraising both the general social philosophy and the beliefs about education of the NAM, one is left with the conclusion that, whether or not such is the fact, it seems to favor what it favors in virtue of the

---

[15] Ibid., p. 32.

[16] Industry Believes, op. cit., p. 85.

way it expresses its positions. It favors limited central government, the accent on individual freedom, the extension of education, etc. . . . less because these things are inherently valuable in themselves than because they provide a situation in which the dollar can be more readily pursued and acquired. And this in view of what other possible conditions would allow. The reading of most of their published documents would, it seems fair to state, perpetuate in a considerable segment of our society the unfavorable public image of the businessman alluded to in Chapter VI, and in so doing defeat one of the stated purposes of the Association:

> To formulate its policies and conducts its operations so as to merit the respect and support of the American People.[17]

It would seem possible for the NAM to cast the expression of its ideas, which in themselves would be acceptable to large groups of conservative-minded people, in less vague verbal formulas. For as such, they leave one with the feeling that in the last analysis the monetary value was the fount from which all else derived its value.

The Chamber of Commerce and Education

The Chamber of Commerce discusses American

---

[17] Ibid., p. 5.

Education in a brochure entitled Education--An Investment in People. Perhaps its orientation is to some degree indicated by a key word in this very title--Investment. It is not possible, from the very nature of the documents involved, to delineate in precisely the same fashion the views on education of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, but within the framework of the limitations thus externally imposed, it is possible to present and evaluate the thoughts of the Chamber of Commerce on education.

The above mentioned work is divided into three sections dealing respectively with the value of education, our changing population, and current and predicted school conditions. A summary with pertinent conclusions is then offered.

In assessing the factual relationship between income and education, the Chamber observes:

> There is a direct relationship between education level and earning power and, therefore, buying power in our total American economy.[18]

Concerning the relationship between education and retail sales, it is noted that when,

> Metropolitan areas were classified into four groups according to the median levels of their adult population (twenty-five and over), the

---

[18]Education Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Education--An Investment in People (Washington, D. C.: 1954), p. 2.

> group of cities having the highest education levels also was found to have the highest average per capita retail sales.[19]

More significant than this statement of fact, however, is the sentence,

> This association of business sales with education levels justifies business leaders in pressing for adequate schools in their community.[20]

One is led to wonder if this, and not the inherent values existing in an adequate school system, is the only, or at least the major, justification the Chamber finds for support of the schools by business leaders.

The Chamber would further encourage the extension of education because in a survey on which they report "Belief in a 'free market economy' was directly related to the years of school completed."[21] Further investigation revealed that people with higher education were "well to the right of public 'centre' in their economic attitudes."[22]

Education is apparently regarded as a valuable ally in protecting conservative economic theories.

In the second section--Our Changing Population--

---

[19] Ibid., p. 6.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 12.

[22] Ibid.

the Chamber asks in connection with certain demonstrated statistics questions which are indicative of a basically economic appraisal of the significance of these facts. Noting that the number of school years completed by our people is rising, the Chamber asks if these rising education levels,

> . . . indicate America's potential for expanding markets, for better goods, for more recreational services, for greater political activity, for greater economic understanding, and for a generally rising standard of living?[23]

Apparently there is no expressed appreciation for the sheer human value that accrues from a generally rising level of education.

In the summary chapter the following over-all conclusions are voiced.

> Section One, then, indicates that education is related to social and economic progress. It suggests that education develops the potential skills and understandings of a people so that they may become more efficient producers, more appreciative consumers, and more able to use and value political and economic freedom. These are the essentials of an expanding competitive economy under representative government.[24]

> Section Two, then suggests, that as our population has multiplied it has grown even faster in its productivity, its capacity to consume and its adaptability to expanding opportunity.[25]

---

[23] Ibid., p. 20.

[24] Ibid., p. 42.

[25] Ibid., p. 43.

Such statements seem to offer fair warrant for the observation that the Chamber of Commerce has been much impressed, and perhaps in a way he never intended, by a statement attributed to William James, "You must bring out of each word its practical cash-value."

> Section Three, documents the increasing concern of Americans about their schools and encourages local and state action to maintain educational opportunity for oncoming generations.[26]

This indicates a conclusion which could have been fairly anticipated; that as far as governmental control of education is concerned, it is chiefly the state and local levels that should be operative.

In appraising both the general social philosophy and the beliefs about education of the United States Chamber of Commerce, one seems warranted in concluding that the social philosophy of the Chamber of Commerce is conservative, materialistic, based on the pre-eminence of economic interests, favoring a milder elitism than it did thirty years ago, under a form of government protective of the individual and his freedoms. The Chamber labors under the same difficulties as does the NAM. Its pronouncements seem to make the economic level the most significant level of human life. In an effort

---

[26] Ibid., p. 43.

to propagate the tenets of conservative philosophy, it will alienate many people who would be otherwise receptive until it uses verbal expressions that minimize this economic appeal. Unfortunately the public utterances of its top officials sometimes may completely destroy the confidence of the very people they desire to impress. Significantly is this the case in the public address of one Chairman of the Board of the Chamber of Commerce. Speaking of the spiritual responsibility of the businessman, he said:

> 'Honesty and morality are good business' and the wise business man practices these virtues whether he has his heart in it or not . . . . Business men are just (only) people.[27]

American Farm Bureau Federation and Education

Many people would probably be stultified to learn how little most young people know about the patriotic and moral values upon which America was founded--and without which it may not survive. Every American, particularly every young American has a fundamental right to know all the facts connected with the spiritual origins and official customs of our nation. To overlook, eliminate or ignore any of them from his education is to shortchange

---

[27]Clement D. Johnson, "The Spiritual Responsibility of American Business and Industry," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 5 (December 15, 1955), p. 152.

him. It is a question of right and not of privilege.

Farm Bureau seriously conforms to the ideals upon which the government and the nation found inception. A few select passages of the Bureau's stand on education reveal this conformity.

Philosophy of Education.

> An imperative need of our public schools is the establishment of a curriculum that helps students acquire a true concept of the basic principles and philosophy of the American system of self-government and the competitive enterprise system. Such a curriculum should emphasize learning how to live and think independently. It should provide the fundamental academic knowledge necessary in daily life.
>
> Every effort should be made to keep subversive influences out of schools and to guard against educational institutions falling under the control of any subversive group.
>
> We urge State and Country Farm Bureaus to study the curricula of the schools and take effective action to improve the educational system.[28]

Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics.

> Programs that encourage the development of intelligent, self-reliant citizens using the power of science and education for more efficient and balanced production and for the development of responsible citizenship should be encouraged. Programs that help us move in this direction deserve our support. The Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics work in the field of in-school education is consistent with the above objectives.[29]

---

[28] American Farm Bureau Federation, 1957 Policies (Miami: 38th Annual Meeting, December 13, 1956), p. 43.

[29] John C. Lynn, Legislative Director, Statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation Before the Senate Subcommittee on Health, Education and Social Security with Regard to Increasing the Federal Appropriations for Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics (May 19, 1954), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

> We are well aware that the vocational agricultural training in our high schools has done an excellent job in preparing young farmers for their chosen vocation. Recognizing the full importance of vocational education, both to these people as individuals and to the industry of agriculture, the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation feels that vocational training should be available to all high school students who earnestly desire its advantages. We commend the sharing of the financial burden through funds contributed jointly by the Federal Government, the state governments and local school districts. The Federal grants-in-aid should be made with the minimum of federal control and supervision, as indeed, it is being conducted.
>
> Training in home economics in our high schools is playing a leading role in preparing young people for future advance courses and as better home makers.[30]

Rural Education Problems.

> Rural people are concerned with five major issues in the field of public education: equalizing educational opportunities for rural children; spreading the costs of the support of schools among all citizens; raising the standards of rural teachers through better compensation which will encourage the retention of better trained teachers by rural committees; reorganization of school units and administration for efficiency and adequate educational service; and a curriculum related to life and living.
>
> We favor reasonable federal grants-in-aid, to supplement state funds, to be allocated in proportion to state needs, dispensed by state boards with adequate agricultural representation and entirely independent of federal jurisdiction.
>
> We favor the maximum amount of local guidance and initiative consistent with operating efficiency and a sound program of education.[31]

---

[30]John C. Lynn, Legislative Director, "Statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation Before Senate Appropriation Committee With Regard to Vocational Education Appropriation," (May 20, 1955), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

[31]Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly, President, "Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Before

Financing of Education.

> We maintain that the control, administration, and financing of our public school system must remain identified with the smallest unit of government capable of satisfactory performance.
>
> Federal appropriations for resident instruction in the land grant colleges should be maintained at the present level.[32]

> Farm Bureau opposes expanded federal aid to education because it involves the increased control and eventual domination of our public school system by the federal government. Proper financing of, and increased interest on the part of individuals in, the public school system at the local and state levels are necessary if we are to avoid an expanded program of federal aid to education. The public must recognize its responsibility in this connection.[33]

Citizenship.

> Our citizenship is a priceless possession and a continuing responsibility. Each privilege in our representative Republic carries with it a commensurate obligation if we are to endure as a free people. Responsibility for preservation of our form of government rests with the individual and begins in the home and the community.
>
> Farm Bureaus should continue to carry on active, vigorous citizenship programs. We urge that each individual and group undertake with renewed vigor the basic responsibility of citizenship. This includes the active participation by the individual in the political party of his choice; a continuing study of local, state, national, and international issues; and sound citizenship programs in our schools.[34]

Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Concerning Federal Aid to Education" (April 30, 1947). (Mimeographed.)

[32]American Farm Bureau Federation, 1957 Policies (Miami: 38th Annual Meeting, December 13, 1956), p. 43.

[33]American Farm Bureau Federation, 1959 Policies (Boston: 40th Annual Meeting, December 11, 1958), p. 42.

[34]1957 Policies, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

Cooperative Extension Service.

> The decentralization of administration and control of this important educational function gives a continuing responsibility to state and local administrative authorities and to the people of the areas served to see that the extension program is directed toward the basic needs of the farm family.
>
> We recognize that the agricultural extension service is called on to serve rural non-farm and urban people. We believe that extension activities in these areas should promote agricultural products and seek better understanding of price relationships, production costs, and other agricultural problems. In rendering these services, however, caution should be exercised to prevent infringement on the primary function of the extension service, which is to serve farm people.[35]

Checking all selections of Farm Bureau's policies of Education against the characteristics classified by Kirk as those of a conservative bent, it is readily apparent that the general philosophy of the Bureau is conservative. In this expression of its conservative view, there is lacking the "harsh clank of coins" which seemingly accompanies the view of business and industry.

One intuitively has the impression that human values receive the emphasis in the societal conceptions of the member-farmer. Although interested in making a living and concerned with the economic and monetary media this entails, the art of how to live, of being humane, still has a perceptible influence. Perhaps the very circumstances of rural living account for this

---

[35] 1959 Policies, op. cit., p. 44.

humaneness. The term "farm" to the rural inhabitant means more than buildings, grain and livestock. It also means home, family, and community inter-relations. And to what extent will a man go to perpetuate, to enhance, and to protect his home and family? Certainly he will strive for the conservation of all ideals, customs, and beliefs which have established his mode of life, and thence to the adoption of such measures which at the time seem to him to better his political, economic, cultural and ethical values.

Farm Bureau's philosophy embodies the type of living so depicted. The implementation of such a philosophy as attempted by the Bureau policy portrays a social overview which is evaluated as conservative. The ideals which the Bureau's overall social philosophy imply are caught up with an economic pre-eminence as farming becomes less agrarian in its evolution into a business with political interests.

Politics, broadly conceived as the science of self-government, is of paramount concern to every citizen of a democracy.

Today,

> To an increasing and alarming extent, the important decisions relating to production, distribution, prices, wages, and the use of resources, the use of materials, the distribution of incomes, the way in which incomes are to be spent, the flow of investment and other aspects of our economic

life, are being made in Washington.[36]

A comment of the former president of the Farm Bureau reflects the social response of this interest group when he said:

> It seems certain that no problems in the survival of freedom anywhere take precedence over the solution, by us, as a self-governing republic, of our own problems within the framework of our principles of freedom under law.[37]

Suggestions for Further Research

Stemming from this dissertation are the following suggestions for further research.

1. An appraisal of these three social philosophies from the viewpoint of Christian Social principles.
2. An investigation of the practical ways in which these three groups attempt to exert an influence on education as an actual on-going process in the classroom.
3. An investigation to discover the degree to which the social philosophies of these three groups are representative of the real attitudes of their membership.
4. Comparative studies of these social philosophies with the social philosophies of labor groups.
5. An investigation of a linguistic nature to discover how phrasing of a social philosophy may tend to either alienate or gain support for the tenets of that social philosophy.

---

[36]Farm Bureau's Platform for America, American Farm Bureau Federation. 1952, p. 4.

[37]Allan B. Kline, Address to the Delegates of the 40th Annual Convention of American Farm Bureau Federation, Boston, December, 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Arrowood, Charles Flinn (ed.). Thomas Jefferson and Education in a Republic. Education Classics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1930. Pp. xii - 184.

Diamond, Sigmond. The Reputation of the American Businessman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. Pp. 209.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1945. Pp. xxxix - 495.

Grieder, C., and Rosenstengel, W. Public School Administration. New York: Roland Press, 1954. Pp. xii - 622.

Griswold, Alfred Whitney. Farming and Democracy. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., Inc., 1948. Pp. ix - 227.

Hardin, Charles M. Freedom in Agricultural Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. Pp. xviii - 275.

Kane, Rev. W., S.J. A History of Education. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1938. Pp. xvi - 637.

Kile, Orville M. The Farm Bureau Movement. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1921. Pp. xiv - 282.

Kirk, Russell. A Program for Conservatives. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954. Pp. 325.

Leighton, Joseph A. Social Philosophies in Conflict. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1937. Pp. xxii - 546.

Macdonald, John. Mind School and Civilization. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952. Pp. xi - 132.

McConnell, Grant. The Decline of Agrarian Democracy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953. Pp. 226.

Protho, James W. Dollar Decade: Business Ideas in the 1920's. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955. Pp. xxi - 249.

Rugg, Harold, and Withers, William. Social Foundations of Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955. Pp. x - 771.

Saloutos, Theodore, and Hicks, John D. Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West 1900-1939. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1951. Pp. viii - 581.

Schafer, Joseph. The Social History of American Agriculture. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. ix - 302.

Shannon, Fred A. The Farmer's Last Frontier. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1945. Pp. xv - 434.

Smith, Henry Lester. Educational Research. Bloomington: Educational Publications, 1944. Pp. vi - 249.

Stanley, William C., Smith, B. Othanel., Benne, Kenneth D., and Anderson, Archibald W. Social Foundations of Education. New York: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1956. Pp. xviii - 638.

Thompson, Merritt M. The History of Education. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1946. Pp. 159.

Articles

Albjerg, Victor L. "Allan Blair Kline: The Farm Bureau, 1955," Current History, 28, No. 166 (June, 1955), 362-368.

Bode, B. H. "Where Does One Go For Fundamental Assumptions in Education?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XIV, No. 6 (September, 1928), 361-370.

Brubacher, John S., Martz, Velorus. "Philosophy of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by Walter S. Monroe (1950), pp. 817-820.

Carelton, William G. "Gray Silver and the Rise of the Farm Bureau," Current History, 28, No. 166 (June, 1955), 343-350.

Clugston, Herbert A., and Davis, Robert A. "Is a Scientific Method Possible for Philosophical Research in Education?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI, No. 4 (April, 1930), pp. 293-299.

_____. "Suggested Criteria for the Philosophical Method of Research in Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI, No. 8 (November, 1930), pp. 575-580.

Finkelstein, Louis. "The Businessman's Moral Failure," Fortune, LVIII, No. 3 (September, 1958), pp. 116-117, 194.

Hullfish, Henry Gordon. "The Relation of Philosophy and Science in Education," Journal of Educational Research, XX, No. 3 (October, 1929), pp. 159-165.

Johnson, Clement D. "The Spiritual Responsibility of American Business and Industry," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 5 (December 15, 1955), pp. 151-153.

Kirk, Russell. "The Inhumane Businessman," Fortune, LV, No. 5, pp. 160-161, 248.

Kline, Allan B. "A New Direction in National Farm Policy," The Nation's Agriculture, XXIX, No. 11 (December, 1954), pp. 4-23.

Lewis, John Fulton. "School Building Bogey," The Nation's Agriculture, 32, No. 6 (June, 1957), pp. 10-11, 20, 22.

Luce, Henry R. "The Character of the Businessman," Fortune, LVI, No. 2 (August, 1957), pp. 108-109, 182-185.

Miller, K. R. "Democracy is a Challenge," Vital Speeches, XXIII, No. 19 (July 15, 1957), pp. 585-587.

Symonds, Percival M. "A Course in the Technique of Educational Research," Teachers College Record, XXIX, No. 1 (October, 1927), pp. 24-30.

_____. "The NEA and the NAM," The Journal of the National Educational Association, 31, No. 1 (January, 1942), p. 6.

Special Publications

American Farm Bureau Federation. Farm Bureau's Platform for America. Chicago: American Farm Bureau Federation, 1956.

_____. Farm Bureau Policies, Boston: American Farm Bureau Federation, 1958.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Policy Declarations. Washington, D. C.: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1957.

_____. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, What It Is, What It Does, How It Works. Washington, D. C.: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1957.

_____. Education - An Investment in People. Washington; Chamber of Commerce, 1956.

Horsch, Vada. NAM Past and Present. Presentation made to NAM New Regional Personnel, September 4, 1951.

The National Association of Manufacturers. Champion of the American Competitive Enterprise System Since 1895. New York: The National Association of Manufacturers (n.d.).

_____. Does Public Education Need Federal Aid? A Review of the Case For and Against Federal Aid to Education with Specific Reference to the Findings of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the White House Conference on Education. Government Economy Committee, National Associations of Manufacturers, New York, 1956.

The National Association of Manufacturers. Handbook of NAM Activities and Services for Education - Industry Cooperation. New York: Department of Education, The National Association of Manufacturers, 1953 and 1955.

_____. Industry Believes: Policies on Current Problems as Adopted by the Board. New York: The National Association of Manufacturers, 1957.

_____. Main Street vs. Washington, D. C. Government Economy Committee. New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1957.

_____. This We Believe About Education. A statement concerning education in America. New York: National Association of Manufacturers, 1955.

Public Documents

U. S. Congress, House. Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings, Federal Aid for School Construction. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1954.

U. S. Congress, House. Subcommittee on the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings, Federal Aid for School Construction. 85th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957, Part 1.

U. S. Congress, House. Subcommittee on the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings, Federal Aid to States for School Construction. 85th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957, Part 2.

U. S. Congress, House. Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings, Federal Aid to States for School Construction. 85th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957, Part 3.

U. S. Congressional Record. Vol. 93. Saturday, July 26, 1947.

_____. Vol. 93. Monday, June 30, 1947.

_____. Vol. 95. Thursday, January 13, 1949.

_____. Vol. 102. Thursday, April 12, 1956.

_____. Vol. 103. Monday, March 11, 1957.

_____. Vol. 103. Monday, March 11, 1957.

Letters

Letter from Melvin W. Sneed, Director, Laws and Legislation Branch, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., April 1, 1957.

Letter from Dwight D. Eisenhower, President, Columbia University, New York, New York, June 7, 1949, to the Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Interviews

Interview with the President of a local Chamber of Commerce, September, 1958.

Interview with a member of the Board of Directors of a State Farm Bureau.

Interviews with sixty persons engaged in business, industry and farming.

Interviews with fifteen persons in professional fields.

Reports

Quattlebaum, Charles A. Federal Aid to School Construction. A Report prepared in the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress, April, 1954. Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

VITA AUCTORIS

Father Everest J. Michael Farnand, O. F. M., was born July 1, 1917 in Hibbing, Minnesota. He received his elementary education in parochial and public schools in Hibbing, Minnesota; Webster, Wisconsin; Davenport, Iowa; and Ft. Smith, Arkansas. He attended St. Joseph High School, Westmont, Illinois. He received a B.A. degree in Philosophy from Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois in 1941.

In 1944 he was ordained to the priesthood in the Franciscan Order, Sacred Heart Province of St. Louis, Missouri.

In 1947 St. Louis University conferred the degree of M.Ed. upon completion of studies.

Teaching and administrative experience was gained in high schools in the States of Missouri, Illinois, Indiana and Minnesota and in higher education at St. Louis University, Quincy College and the University of Dallas.

Doctoral studies were begun at Peabody College for Teachers and Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee in 1955, and St. Louis University in September of 1956.

Since the reception of the Master's degree, he was active also as assistant pastor, chaplain of hospitals and mental institut ns, and director of Mens' and Youths' organizations.