



University of Pittsburgh's Cathedral of Learning (right) and men's dormitories (left)—  
 "Pitt is reluctant to trade even a minor measure of state control for larger appropriations."

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA: A CASE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

*West of the Alleghenies the distinction between public and private colleges is clear and well understood. No one doubts that the universities of California, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois are public institutions while Stanford, Chicago, and Oberlin are private. But along the Eastern seaboard the distinction is much less clear—many universities under some degree of private control receive much of their financial support from taxation. The situation is especially complex in Pennsylvania, as is made clear in the following article by a former Harrisburg newspaper man, now a reporter for the Washington Star.*

By JAMES WELSH

**H**IGHER EDUCATION in Pennsylvania is a source of confusion even to well-informed residents. It is a jumble of contradictions, chief of which is the virtual lack of distinction between what is public and what is private.

The University of Pennsylvania and

the University of Pittsburgh are "private" institutions, and while Temple's status is changing, it is still under private control. Private as they are, Penn, Pitt, and Temple, along with more than a dozen other "private" colleges, get millions of dollars a year in tax money from the Pennsylvania legislature.

Pennsylvania State University is in a different position, but not by much. Most people assume it is Pennsylvania's state university. It is and it isn't. Penn State is supported in the manner of a state university, yet it is expensive, exclusive, and not really public. "I have been in public college work for years," a visiting college administrator remarked, "and I have never seen anything like what goes on in Pennsylvania. There are no rules. It's a jungle."

What the rest of the country can learn from Pennsylvania is problematical. It offers examples of practices other states might be thinking about before long. But Pennsylvania never should be held up as a model of how to go about them. More so than elsewhere, the essential concept

of public higher education—that college should be put within reach of all who can benefit from it—is in danger of going down the drain in the nation's third most populous state. And a good argument can be made that the state's unparalleled way of distributing money to colleges is, in part, responsible.

**P**ENNSYLVANIA can boast 139 institutions of higher education, some of them among the most renowned of American colleges and universities, others tiny and virtually unknown. They're a complex lot. Besides Penn State, fourteen swiftly expanding state colleges are bearing the brunt of rising enrollments. Sixteen private institutions share state tax dollars, while the others are private institutions that receive no state help. Finally comes a community college system still struggling to get off the ground.

Compared to other states, Pennsylvania does badly by its colleges. Measured in dollars per capita, it is spending less than half what the average state spends on higher education. At \$8.20 it

was forty-eighth among the fifty states last year. If private college subsidies had been subtracted, Pennsylvania would have dropped to last—behind New Jersey and Massachusetts.

By far the most conspicuous side of the Pennsylvania system is the shape and magnitude of state assistance to private colleges. The practice isn't entirely limited to Pennsylvania. But in other states where it exists, notably Maryland and Vermont, the amount of money involved is relatively insignificant. This year Pennsylvania will spend about \$95,000,000 on higher education, and \$35,000,000 of it, no strings attached, will go to private colleges. The big three, Penn, Pitt, and Temple, will share more than \$20,000,000. Their medical schools, along with three independent medical schools, will get another \$9,000,000. The rest will go to an odd assortment of colleges that includes Drexel Institute of Technology, the largely Negro Lincoln University, and schools with specialties ranging from art to osteopathy. Not surprisingly, the private-college presidents and trustees are keenly sensitive to the political winds from Harrisburg, and the colleges with the most at stake mount brisk lobbying operations during the legislative sessions.

How do these schools justify taking public money? Penn, Pitt, Temple, and their followers have worked up an entire litany of justifications for it. "This money is not a gift of the public," Penn's President Gayelord Harnwell once said. "It is, in a very real sense, a buying of services. The state is putting money into existing universities to get a job done. It's better than building new colleges."

On a fee-for-service basis, Pennsylvanians are getting little more from Penn than the people of any other state are getting. It is, of course, located in Pennsylvania, and it has all the credentials of a fine university. But no public representatives sit on Penn's board. Its tuition is right up there with those of other Ivy League colleges. And Pennsylvanians make up only about half the enrollment.

Temple caters to a different clientele. The closest thing to a poor man's college in Philadelphia, Temple is big, with well over 20,000 students, about 80 per cent of them commuters and the big majority from Pennsylvania. Until this year they paid \$760 tuition, which is high by many standards. In Philadelphia, though, with its Penn-Swarthmore-Haverford-Bryn Mawr price range of \$1,500 and up, Temple's tuition appears quite reasonable.

"Neither a state university nor a city college, it is party to a pact of understanding that gives it something of the character of both," President Millard Gladfelter once described Temple. If that sounds ambiguous, it is because Gladfelter and Temple very well meant

it to be. Now the university is moving farther into the twilight zone between public and private. With surplus funds, Governor Scranton and the legislature this year moved to boost Temple's appropriation past the \$10,000,000 mark, permitting a tuition cut to \$450, and to give the university "state-related" status. As part of the deal, Temple agreed to add a number of publicly appointed trustees to its board. But no more than about one-third of the total trustees will represent the public.

At the other end of the state lies Pitt, a very different kind of place. Over the last decade, under the swashbuckling leadership of Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield, Pitt reached aggressively—and fairly successfully—for academic distinction. It also reached hard for state tax dollars. "I'll take every dollar I can get from private sources, and every dollar I can get from public sources," Litchfield once told a reporter.

Litchfield now is out at Pitt. But his words echo with a new, ironically imperative, meaning. Overextended, Pitt is broke. In July, its overall deficit a staggering \$19,500,000, Pitt cried for help. The State Legislature moved immediately to tack \$2,500,000 to a \$5,800,000 appropriation originally earmarked for Pitt. The big question, of course, is where the university goes from here. Pennsylvania badly needs a western state university, and in many ways, Pitt is the logical candidate. But its \$1,400 tuition would prove troublesome. And Pitt is reluctant to trade even a minor measure of state control for larger appropriations.

Pennsylvania's generosity to its select private colleges has roots that go back to the nineteenth century. Besides the weight of custom, however, the state-aided colleges have a lot of things going for them—some more reputable than others. Penn, Pitt, and Temple dominate the college scene in the state's two big metropolitan areas, which means that the big-city governments, business groups, and newspapers side with whatever helps these universities. A second asset is the alumni support the Big Three has built into the Pennsylvania legislature. They can claim far more alumni-legislators than the public colleges can, largely because they all have law schools while the others, including Penn State, have none.

Then comes the system of senatorial scholarships. Dating back more than fifty years, it is a cozy arrangement between some of the colleges that get money and some of the legislators who set the appropriations. It is as disreputable as it sounds. By now the fifty senators are empowered to give away \$2,500,000 in scholarships a year, more than 80 per cent of them to Penn, Pitt, and Temple. Senators can't go so far as to "appoint" students to these colleges. The students must gain admission on their own. But once that is done, the senators have only to notify the colleges for the scholarships to be granted. No questions are asked about merit or need.

On the other side of Pennsylvania's higher education fence stand the fourteen state colleges, the one major bul-

*(Continued on page 86)*



University of Pennsylvania's Medical School—"The University of Pennsylvania, along with dozens of other 'private' colleges, gets millions of dollars a year in tax money from the Pennsylvania legislature."



# TEACHING THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN CALIFORNIA

*The American people are devoted to their Constitution and to the individual rights it guarantees, but they have repeatedly demonstrated their difficulty in translating the broad principles of freedom into action in specific cases. The problem, almost invariably, is ignorance of the practical, everyday meaning of these principles. To make sure that future generations are better informed about their rights and responsibilities as Americans, the Constitutional Rights Foundation (609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017) is cooperating with public education agencies in California to improve teaching about the Bill of Rights in the state's schools. The foundation is a nonprofit organization made up of public-spirited educators, lawyers, businessmen, labor leaders, and motion picture personalities. The state-wide program it is sparking is described here by the editor of the California Teachers Association Journal.*

By J. WILSON McKENNEY

ONE OUT OF FOUR U.S. high school seniors believes that "the government should prohibit some people from making public speeches." Sixty-three per cent of these graduating teenagers would not allow Communists to speak on the radio in peacetime, and 42 per cent agree that the police or the FBI may sometimes be right in giving a man "the third degree" in order to make him talk.

These are the findings of H. H. Remmers and his associates at the Purdue University Division of Educational Reference. Since 1951 they have tested repeatedly the attitudes of young U.S. citizens, and have concluded that these young people display an appalling lack of comprehension of the content and meaning of the Bill of Rights.

But failure to understand that liberty is indivisible is far more widespread. Many Americans who recently tested their own elementary knowledge of the Bill of Rights by participating in the Columbia Broadcasting System's "National Citizenship Test," demonstrated that ignorance is not limited to the young (see box on page 88). The evidence indicates clearly that Americans are fervently attached to the concept of freedom—in many wars they have fought bravely in its defense. Yet, too often, their understanding of the practice of freedom has been as superficial as the war-time slogans for which they fought. Young and old, they are largely ignorant of the basic charter of their freedom and, in practice, are often oblivious to—even approving of—its violation in specific, emotion-laden instances.

In California, however, something tangible is being done about this gap between principle and practice. The State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF), have combined forces to see that future generations of high school graduates are better educated concerning their freedoms, their liberties, their rights and responsibilities as citizens, through better teaching of the Bill of Rights.

California's attack on ignorance of the principles of individual freedom was launched in 1963 when CRF representatives persuaded the State Board of Education to look into the nature and extent of teaching about constitutional rights in the schools of the state. It was found



"Howard had committed the 'crime' of ordering, for a voter registration drive, the drawing of a poster showing a chained Negro in prayer."

that a few school districts had prepared resource materials for their teachers, but the record was spotty, and no comprehensive approach to the subject had been developed.

As a result, the Board prepared a policy statement that strongly endorsed teaching about the Bill of Rights in the schools and called for improved instruction in the field (see box on page 69). Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy of Los Angeles was appointed chairman of a four-man committee of members of the Board charged with responsibility for seeing that the policy was implemented, and a fourteen-man advisory committee of attorneys, educators, and civic leaders, headed by Richard C. Maxwell, Dean of the School of Law at the University of California at Los Angeles, was appointed to aid the committee.

The immediate need, the Board decided, was for a teachers curriculum guide for use within the existing social studies program in the last two years of high school. With a \$30,000 grant from CRF, State Superintendent of Schools Max Rafferty set up a Department of Education project to develop a guide that would provide tangible aid to teachers in treating the subject in greater depth. This guide, the *Bill of Rights Source Book* for teachers of American history and government, is now being published and will be distributed to eleventh- and twelfth-grade teachers throughout the state. It presents applications of the Bill of Rights to current controversies—from school segregation and sit-ins to school prayer and released time—with legal and historical background. The *Source Book* does not aim at developing a particular point of view, but at stimulating an informative dialogue among those with differing points of view.

While the guide was in preparation, CRF launched, in 1964, the first of an annual series of Bill of Rights Teachers Contests to encourage more secondary school teachers to venture into the field. Modest cash prizes and state-wide recognition are offered to teachers who have developed effective classroom approaches to constitutional liberties.

Among the first year's contest winners, the direct approach appeared to be most popular. For instance, Gregory L. Goodwin, a Bakersfield American history teacher, reported how he had presented to his classes "a petition to insure personal liberties."

He wrote at the top of a sheet, "We, the undersigned, urge that the following points of personal liberty be considered legal and binding upon the government of the United States of America. If necessary, they should be added to the Constitution in the form of Amendments." He then listed seven brief statements which, with minor word changes, accurately