together even for a week or two, and nurses should be particularly careful to see that both the educational and professional credentials of those who are to present nursing subjects, are satisfactory. This cannot be left to people outside the profession, as even experienced educators have the vaguest ideas, very often, of what qualifications would be required. Provision would need to be made, also, for living accommodations, and it is desirable that social life and recreation should not be neglected.

Should we not make a special effort within the next two or three years, to develop at least one good summer school or institute for nurses in each state?

CONDITIONS OF STATE AID FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS¹

BY I. L. KANDEL, PH.D.

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

The problem of state aid for education presents some difficulties in this country. Two traditions have been developed—one of publicly provided and publicly maintained education entirely under public control, and the other privately endowed institutions independent of external control. The one represents the native development of the democratic ideal, the other the survival of the Anglo-Saxon distrust of state action. Much may be said for each type of educational provision. A situation has, however, been reached where further expansion to meet the increasing public demands and needs is impossible, if education must continue to depend on private philanthropy. The comparative failure of the numerous drives recently undertaken for educational endowments requires the consideration of new methods of educational support.

Democratic opportunities have made possible, and democratic idealism has prompted, unparalleled gifts for the general good. The size of individual endowments has increased considerably in recent years, but the present annual average of gifts for education—about sixty million dollars,—is less than the individual resources of half a dozen banks or trust companies, and the total endowment of our colleges, about half a billion dollars, is less than the individual resources of half a dozen banks or trust companies. Estimating the present wealth of the United States at two hundred and fifty or three hundred billion dollars, endowments represent perhaps one per cent. of the total and give little indication of exceeding such proportion. It seems further that future educational philanthropy may be directed to the

¹ Read at Teachers College Alumnae Conference, February, 1920.

encouragement of new experiments in education rather than the perpetual conduct of much needed types of training.

The problem to be faced, then, is how to secure financial support for new educational endeavors. Is it possible to introduce a third method of maintenance in addition to the other two already mentioned? The expansion of state enterprise is only limited by public will and this, in turn, is affected by education and propaganda. It is on the whole a simple problem.

Independent institutions are in a different situation—particularly on the Eastern Coast where the private institutions predominate. The practice of state aid to private institutions for higher and professional education is not unknown here. New Hampshire makes a grant to Dartmouth College; Vermont until recently supported the three institutions for higher education in that state; in Massachusetts, state aid to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Worcester Polytechnic Institute was only withdrawn last year; New York State gives aid to a number of institutions in return for scholarships; Pennsylvania makes large grants to universities, schools and hospitals; Maryland assists a great variety of institutions from the Johns Hopkins University down to a private academy; while Virginia supports a few small colleges in addition to the state university.

Opposition has recently arisen against such support for privately endowed independent institutions. This has arisen from the fact that there is not in this country any well defined principle of public aid to private colleges. Hitherto such appropriations have been made without any public supervision. Public aid without public control is questionable policy. It tends to lead to a political scramble in which the undeserving institution puts forth specious claims for support. It has meant politically that a balance has to be maintained between all kinds of claims. Personal and local interest often prevails over the public good. State aid should only be granted with state control, if the power of the state is not to be put at the disposal of any enterprise calling itself philanthropic or educational.

This principle has been developed on an extensive scale in England, where public and private institutions flourish side by side and may receive aid from the national exchequer provided they submit to public inspection and meet certain uniform minimum standards. Fruitful experiments in education and social welfare may be and have been initiated by voluntary agencies and are now receiving state support, if they have not actually been incorporated in the public systems. Taking examples from your own field:—the feeding of children, schools for mothers with visiting nurses, medical inspection and treatment, play centers and physical welfare, all began as voluntary

efforts and are coming under state supervision. The great universities, finding themselves in a situation similar to that of our own private endowed universities, now find that they must accept the national principle and submit to public supervision, if they are to receive state aid.

There are, however, certain principles of public support for education which have been recognized by the leading authorities in this country and which bear on our problem. Thus Dutton and Snedden state:

It is becoming more widely an accepted principle that in those fields of social action in which private or philanthropic effort are insufficient, and which state aid can reach, public support and control are justifiable. Under both monarchical and democratic governments may we look for a widening of state activity in the direction of providing more abundantly the resources which make for widespread individual well-being.

And Cubberley in his latest work writes:

Just how schools should be supported must be determined by a consideration as to their nature. If they are only or largely of personal or local benefit, such as telephone service, street lighting, pavements or streets, then they should be supported by individual or local taxation. Being conceived, though, as essential to the welfare of the State as a whole, then their support should be by the general taxation of all, and not from taxes or fees paid by the parents of the children educated.

And elsewhere,

The needs of our democracy are alone the test, and these needs are to be determined by majority action and in the majority interest, and not imposed by rule or to meet the needs of a class.

Do these principles have any bearing on the problem of training nurses? The question of training still seems to be somewhat in the same stage as the training of teachers was, not so long ago. There are still many who are satisfied to go on with the handy motherly person, and one still sees advertisements of correspondence schools which offer complete training in a few weeks. If nursing is to be kept on this level, no argument can be produced for public support of training institutions. Short periods of apprenticeship combined with motherliness will be enough. But the whole attitude to the problem of health is changing.

The function of the medical profession is not merely curative, it is preventive, and preventive medicine means a public health programme, and a public health programme implies education. To be in a position to carry out this programme, the period and quality of training for the nurse must be extended. Even during the war in spite of the great shortage, England found it necessary to employ at least two nurses for every doctor in the school medical service.

Bedside nursing whether in the house or in the hospital is not the only function of the nurse. The scope of her field is now enlarged from merely dealing with individuals who are ill. Infant-welfare, the school medical service, medical social service, the prevention of tuberculosis, coöperation in industrial welfare, and district visiting are all functions that have in mind not the care of the individual but the promotion of public health. An expanding programme of social betterment now includes health insurance as one of the greatest public needs. The whole problem is now placed on a public footing. It is to the interest of the public to have a healthier environment for healthier citizens. In this programme the nurse must play an important part.

How is the number of nurses to be increased and how is the state to guarantee the quality of her training? It is not enough merely to license nurses. The state not only licenses teachers; it controls their training. Private and philanthropic effort are insufficient; state activity is widening, and for these reasons the state should take its part in training those on whom will fall a share of the conduct of the public health programme. Cubberley's statement is, that if an activity is conceived as essential to the welfare of the state as a whole, then its support should be by the general taxation of all. If the present tendencies are realized, the nursing profession will become as essential as the teaching profession. The objection that many nurses may be trained who will not enter public or semi-public service will not hold, since more and more the scope for the private nurse will become limited. In any case, many teachers do enter private schools and many use teaching as a stepping stone for other walks in life.

The precedent has, however, been established already. State universities are beginning to provide training courses for nurses. Further, the state is providing, in coöperation with the federal government, grants for vocational preparation, from which the individual benefit is likely to be greater than the public. The same principle of state aid should then be extended to the training of nurses, and if state institutions are to be supported wholly in this work, then private institutions doing the same work with similar ends in view should be entitled to assistance. But any argument for such assistance must fall to the ground unless those who are interested in it are ready to accept the careful scrutiny and supervision of the state, that is, of the public that is paying the money.

The ultimate basis then for public aid to educational institutions is the interest of the public or public service; but the public must be assured of the quality of that service, and this can be secured only by careful control and supervision of the institutions that give the training.