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Mr. Steetle:

This afternoon, we have with us the Dean of Louisiana State University, Dr. Paul M. Hebert, to discuss How Many People Should Go To College. Dean Hebert, how would you approach the problem of how many people should go to College? Could you begin by telling us something about college enrollment throughout the nation this Fall?

Dean Hebert:

Yes, Mr. Steetle. The most reliable figures compiled concerning our school and college population are those of the United States Office of Education. That office has estimated that the total enrollment in all types of institutions of higher education this year will be two million seven hundred thousand. This represents a decrease of fifty thousand from enrollment figures last year. This estimate forecasts that the enrollment of veterans in college this year would show a substantial decrease but, on a nation-wide basis, it is considered that the decrease will be partially offset by an increase in the freshman enrollment. It is evident that the impact of the Korean crisis, the calling of reserves into the active service, the draft, and the effects of mobilization are already being felt by the colleges to a greater degree than had been anticipated. These conditions may result in a somewhat downward trend on many college campuses this Fall.

Mr. Steetle:

Do you think that this downward trend will continue throughout the emergency or may we expect enrollments to rise?

Dean Hebert:

Well, it is, of course, difficult to predict the lasting effect of our present international situation. I would say it is bound to have some
effect on our college population. On the other hand, it seems clear that much emphasis is being put upon the necessity of maintaining in our Colleges and Universities a large reservoir of manpower in the process of being educated for the wide variety of needs that this emergency may exact. This may well have a counterbalancing effect on college enrollments.

Mr. Steetle:

Dean Hebert, what can we expect of college enrollment during normal times?

Dean Hebert:

Since the turn of the century, there has been a phenomenally steady increase in the size of the college student body. That trend has been interrupted only twice - during the depression and during World War II. College enrollment between 1900 and 1920 expanded from two hundred thirty-seven thousand to almost six hundred thousand; between 1920 and 1930 the figure increased by approximately half a million to one million one hundred thousand; by the end of the next decade in 1940, the enrollment had increased to almost a million and a half. Postwar enrollment has risen to two million seven hundred thousand. All of this means that more and more people are believing that a college education is as essential today as a high school education was a generation ago and a grammar school education was a century ago. Figures from our own State of Louisiana are a case in point. In 1929-30, the total resident college enrollment in Louisiana was slightly over eleven thousand; by 1939-40, it had increased to twenty-six thousand and in the last decade we have had an increase to thirty-five thousand six hundred forty-one students enrolled in Louisiana colleges. Thus, while the Louisiana population during the past ten years has increased by approximately 25%, the college enrollment has increased more than 300%. This is evidence
of the interest of Louisiana people in providing a college education for as many of their sons and daughters as may be possible.

Mr. Steetle:

Dean Hebert, looking forward to the accomplishments of the next decade in higher education, how would you answer the question - How many students should go to College?

Dean Hebert:

To answer that question, Mr. Steetle, we must find the answer to several other questions. For example, what should be the objectives of a college education? Can we achieve these objectives for a larger number of Americans to their individual profit and to the advantage of our society? What is the relationship between education at the college level and the maintenance of the ideals of our democracy? Should a college education be approached from the Jacksonian ideal of embracing the masses or should it be more selective, after the suggestions of Jefferson and seek to sift out the most mentally capable or the intellectually elite? Assuming that we are to set about the serious business of expanding our population in colleges and universities, how will the cost be borne? What should be the respective roles of states, communities, the federal government, and of private institutions? What kind of an education should the college provide? And how is the balance to be maintained between desirable general education and specialized education? How can we make a broadened educational opportunity economically possible for all American youth of talent? Can we wisely plan to balance the supply and demand for well educated men and women in the wide variety of fields of knowledge and in the special and professional callings exacted by the kind of society and the kind of world in which we live?
Mr. Steetle:

You have posed a complex series of questions. What are the answers, Dean Hebert?

Dean Hebert:

I could not possibly propose definitive answers to these questions, but they all have a bearing upon this major inquiry of How Many Should Go to College. Perhaps, the boldest forthright answer to the question of How Many People Should Go to College is that of the President's Commission on Higher Education. That Commission, composed of leading educators and distinguished laymen, interested in education and in its potentialities for dealing with the crisis of our times, studied trends in college enrollment and aptitude for college work and concluded: "that in 1960 a minimum of four million six hundred thousand young people should be enrolled in non-profit institutions for education beyond the traditional 12th grade - of this total number, two and a half million should be in junior college; one and a half million - senior college and six hundred thousand in graduate and professional schools."

Mr. Steetle:

How would this compare with our present situation, Dean Hebert?

Dean Hebert:

Well, I have referred to it as a bold proposal because it actually suggests that college enrollments ought to be doubled by 1960. In other words, the enrollment should be, according to the Commission, approximately twice the number in college at the time the Commission rendered its report in 1948. Some critics of the plan have called this "fantastic" contending that neither the faculties nor the facilities can be made available by 1960. But, supporters of the proposal point to the fact that the college population of today already
doubles that of a decade ago. They also point to the rising national income and argue that it may be no more fantastic by 1960 to spend the estimated four billion dollars per year that such a plan would require than it was to spend one billion dollars for college education in 1948. They maintain that the task can be performed and that it must be performed as an inescapable necessity of the very times in which we live.

Mr. Steetle:

How did the President's Commission arrive at its estimate of how many ought to go to College by 1960, Dean Hebert?

Dean Hebert:

The Commission did not make this as an absolute prediction of what will occur, but as a recommendation of what ought to be in the light of the mental ability of the estimated propulation of college age to profit from college. It was estimated, for example, that on a nationwide basis, 50% of the people of college age have the mental ability to complete at least two years of college beyond high school and that nearly one-third have the capacity to finish an advanced liberal or specialized education. The Commission concluded that the nation should provide educational opportunity for these larger numbers. Recognizing the difficulties that are involved, including economic and financial barriers, the Commission also recommended plans for staffing and financing. Included in the plans for achieving these objectives are recommendations for increasing the number of community colleges and multiplying their activities and a system of federal scholarships and fellowships for selected students who continue their education beyond high school and federal aid to the states for institutions of higher education.
Mr. Steetle:

You referred earlier, Dean Hebert, to liberal education versus specialized education and you also raised the question of the relationship between an expanded educational system at college level and maintaining our Democratic ideals as a nation. Does this mean that the content of a college education would necessarily be different or that there would be less need for specialized education?

Dean Hebert:

Most colleges and universities are striving constantly to improve the educational programs of their institutions. We find an increasing emphasis placed upon a broad background of general education even for specialized fields and professional callings. This summer, for example, the dean of the Faculty of Medicine of Columbia University, a noted authority in the field of medical education, in his report to General Eisenhower, actually recommended the abolition of "pre-medical education." Out of a considerable experience with the education of medical students, this dean concluded that a specialized curriculum designed to train a student for medical school was not as desirable as a broad cultural education. He concluded that college should not seek to prepare a student "for medicine, dentistry or public health, but for life." Much similar thinking is going on in other professional fields today. The effort is toward achieving a proper balance between the specialized and vocational subjects in an institution's curriculum on the one hand and a desirable general education on the other.

In proposing that we should be educating four million six hundred thousand in colleges and universities by 1960, the President's Commission emphasized the role of education in a democratic society as opposed to the authoritarian state. The Commission selected three principal goals as those which should come first in our time. In the language of the Commission, they are:
to bring to all the people of the Nation:

"Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.

"Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.

"Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs."

These objectives, selected as the common core for which American higher education should strive, are posed upon the assumption that the diversity of our institutions of higher learning will be maintained and that each will continue to make its contribution. The crisis of our time involving as it does the maintenance and growth of freedom of thought, faith, enterprise and association and embracing the necessity for fostering equal liberty and opportunity for individuals and groups, exacts definition of such common goals if our system of education is to perform the social role of refuting the authoritarian way of life.

Mr. Steetle:

Does this emphasis upon a broad education mean that we will require fewer specialists?

Dean Hebert:

There certainly will not be less need for the specialist but rather we must give constant attention to increasing the broad base from which our specialists with the requisite ability are chosen. Vannevar Bush, facing the problem of obtaining a constant flow of able scientists, refers to what he calls the facts of the educational pyramid and points out that to increase the quota of students of the highest ability at the apex of the pyramid it is necessary
to enlarge the number of students of high ability who go to college.

So, if we can have an increasing number of students in our colleges, we have the means of perpetuating our democratic heritage while also providing a larger reservoir of talent from which our ablest leaders and scientists are selected.

Mr. Steetle:

Dean Hebert, is it true that a college degree is not as good a guarantee of a job in 1950 as it has been? Isn't it true that we are getting an oversupply of college graduates in many lines while shortages exist in other areas of work?

Dean Hebert:

It is, of course, true that a surplus of trained personnel is now appearing in a number of fields in which personnel has been scarce during and since the war. On a nationwide basis, this is particularly true in the field of engineering and in certain related applied sciences. On the other hand, it is true that shortages still exist in many other fields. Doctors, grade school teachers, nurses, social workers, for example, are still in great demand. This indicates that the colleges and universities must be on the alert, through guidance and placement services, to minimize the difficulties resulting from oversupply in certain fields. Because the shortages in scientific and engineering fields were so well known, there has been in the post-war period a great rush into these fields. This is a very good illustration of a case in which it is difficult to know beforehand whether we are over-training or not training enough people. The kinds of exact abilities and specialized training our technology of the future may require will always be difficult to predict. Certainly, the
colleges and universities must make careful analysis of demand and supply trends in all fields in order to be able to direct students into work in which there is the greater probability of placement. If those who go to college recognize that the quality of their training is all-important and that occupational flexibility should be maintained by avoiding over-specialization, employment problems will be much easier to solve.

Mr. Steetle:

Dean Hebert, do you have words in summary on this subject of how many should go to college?

Dean Hebert:

Yes, Mr. Steetle. I believe that beyond question, the nation needs more men and women with advanced training and education. I believe with the President's Commission that as long as we have a considerable number of persons capable of such training and education, this nation should take every possible step to expand the number of such capable students in our colleges and universities. This is an obligation not only to the individual but it is a safeguard for the protection of society. We may not be able to avoid error concerning always to predict the exact need in particular fields - but by increasing the educational level of a considerable number of our population under programs with breadth and versatility we are certain to be building a stronger democracy and a more enlightened citizenry.
When we face the facts that only one out of five of the persons of college age is in college; that we spend less than 1% of our national income on such an essential as advanced training and education; that our needs for highly qualified personnel in the physical and social sciences, in world affairs, in public life, in agriculture, in the professions and in industry are likely to grow in proportion to the leadership we are now called upon to exercise in all of these areas - the conclusion is inevitable that we cannot afford to waste any of our talent. The total college population should grow in numbers and we must constantly improve the quality of the education these larger numbers will receive. The American Council on Education has recently pointed out that the period of military preparedness which we face is likely to be long and that "it is imperative that there be a continuing flow of trained manpower to meet both immediate and long range needs of our national security." I would urge, therefore, that more of our young people of ability should ask themselves - Is it not my serious duty further to improve myself for such responsibilities by pursuing a college education? We need to make more affirmative answers a reality.
A **closed shop** is generally regarded as one in which membership in a particular union is necessary to obtain and retain employment.

A **union shop** is a plant operating under a contract under which the employer may hire anyone he wishes, but union membership becomes necessary to retain employment after a stipulated time.

In the absence of legislation, the courts will generally hold the "closed shop" to be legal. But some courts have said it is a "restraint of trade" and other courts have recognized union actions designed to force an employer into securing a closed shop agreement.

The Wagner Act of 1935 expressly recognized the closed shop if entered into between an employer and the duly certified bargaining representative and as a result the power of Unions resulted in the...
During the war, the War Labor Board in its effort to keep production uninterrupted ordered the "maintenance of union" clause in many contracts when the parties themselves were not able to agree upon a clause as to union security.

**Maintenance of Union clause or agreement** allows non-union workers who are in the plant to continue to remain non-union, but forbids union members who are such at the time of the agreement from joining the union after a stipulated escape period.

Congress in the 1947 amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, virtually eliminated the closed shop agreement this was to enable employers to hire whom they pleased. The 1947 Act also severely limited the power of unions, under the
permissible "union shop" to absolutely withhold or withdraw from employee membership in their organizations. The Federal Act now requires a union to secure the authority of a majority of the employees in the unit before it may secure a union shop contract.

It is in reference to the argument that no one should be compelled to join a union to obtain or retain employment — the controversial "right to work" — a number of States have recently enacted "anti-closed shop" or "right to work" statutes which absolutely prohibit all types of union security provisions.

(Arizona, Ark., Ala., Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, Nebraska, North Dakota, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Alabama.)
The power of the states to forbid union security contracts and to prohibit employer discrimination was upheld in *Lincoln Federal Labor Union v. Northwestern Iron & Metal Co.*


and *American Federation of Labor v. American Text & Dock Co.*, 335 U.S. 538,

69 S. Ct. 260, 93 L. Ed. 207 (1949).

These anti-union security statutes or "right to work" laws were challenged as being an abridgement of freedom of speech and assembly, an impairment of contracts and a violation of the due process of laws clause of the 14th Amendment. The statutes were further attacked on the ground that they constituted a denial of equal protection of the laws.
The Court records that it was within the power of the legislature to protect union members against employer discrimination, and that it was likewise within the power of the legislature to protect non-union workers from discrimination.
Union security is a state of affairs requiring union membership as a condition of employment. Included in this category are the closed shop, union shop and maintenance of membership. These forms of union security contain a common feature in that each makes membership in a union a condition of employment. The closed shop and the union shop are different in that under the closed shop the worker must belong to the union before obtaining a job while the union shop requires union membership after the worker is hired. Under the maintenance of
membership, the worker is free to elect whether or not he desires to join the union. Once he does join, however, he must maintain his membership in the union for the duration of the contract period or forfeit his job.

Closed St.

Union Shop Polls. NLRA conducted 46,119 polls or union shop elections; in 44,795 of the referenda 95 or in 97% of those conducted Union shop agreements were authorized. In the polls, 6,542,564 workers were eligible to vote, of whom 5,547,478 or 84.8% cast valid ballots. Of those voting, 5,071,988 or 77.5% of the workers voted in favor of union security.
Taft-Hartley made it unlawful to discriminate against employees with respect to hire or tenure on the ground that the worker was not a member of the union at the time of his application for employment. This outlawed the closed shop. At the time of the passage of the Act, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 33% of all workers under collective bargaining agreements were covered by closed shop agreements. In some industries, for example, printing, the closed shop has been a characteristic feature of union-management relationships for years.

Under NLRB decisions, affirmed by the Sup. Ct., employees cannot strike or engage in peaceful picketing to obtain the "closed shop".
Right to Work

What does the term "right to work" mean as applied to this legislation?

PropONENTS of the bill say it is legislative protection from coercion in the exercise of the right to join a labor organization—is that so?

How many of the States have so-called "Right to Work laws"?

Do we have an existing situation in Louisiana which warrants this legislation?

Typical statute in

Exactly what would this "right to work" law provide?

Alabama statute is a typical statute vs. the Louisiana act similar.
Why is union security necessary from the viewpoint of organized labor?

What was the philosophy of the Wagner Act on this subject? Ans: Union security was to be a matter disposed of through the process of collective bargaining, free from government intervention.

What changes did the Taft-Hartley Act make? Ans: (1) The closed shop is made illegal. (2) Union shop and maintenance of membership are lawful provided certain conditions are met. Thus employers may not discriminate against an employee for non-membership in a labor organization if such membership organization is lawful.
was not available to the worker on the same terms generally applicable to other members, or if membership was terminated or denied for reasons other than failure to pay dues or initiation fees.

Union security agreements, moreover, cannot compel a worker to join a union as a condition of employment unless at least 30 days have elapsed from the date of contract or beginning of employment, whichever is later.

To protect employers - Taft-Hartley makes it unlawful for unions to compel employers to discriminate against workers in any way prohibited by the statutes.
What bearing does the Union Shop Election Amendment to the Taft-
Hartley Act have on the question of right to work?

(Prior to 1951, the Taft-Hartley law contained secret provisions for a secret election on the "union shop" issue. Its theory was (1) that workers in a secret election would reject a proposal requiring membership in the union as a condition of employment; (2) that there was a cleavage between the interests and objectives of union members and union leadership; the secret election would in theory be a device to throw off arbitrary union leadership.)

But in actual practice - the polls, prior to the elimination of the secret election in 1951, indicate that "the worker’s overwhelming number believe that all who share in the fruits of collective bargaining should assume its obligations and responsibilities and suggest an endorsement by workers on the point of merit that Union membership..."
as a condition of employment is the prerequisite for effective, stable and responsible labor organizations... Uni
shop polls conducted by a government agency merely
confirmed that which already had been decided upon in the
Union halls.)

Q1. Is it true that the workers themselves do not want union security provisions?

Q2. Is the policy of the Unions on these matters arbitrarily decided by the Union leadership?
Dr. Authorize elections. Are there a protection to the workers against being required to join a union as a condition of employment?
Has the Taft-Hartley act, as implemented by decisions of the NLRB, been effective in eliminating the closed shop?

If some employers and employees are convinced that the closed shop fits their needs is a sound policy to eliminate and out law this form of union security?

In other words, let us take the case of a particular plant where experience has demonstrated that the closed shop makes for peaceful and stable labor relations, providing for effective operation, and for the employer a skilled, efficient and adequate labor supply when and where needed—what effect would this law have on that situation and if it is affected is it sound in policy to do so?
Is it true that many employers defend the closed shop and advocate its restoration to legal status?

I recently saw an interesting viewpoint expressed by Paul M. Geary, executive vice-president of the National Electrical Contractors Association, an important employer group. I quote from Mr. Geary, he said:

"The foundation of this progress [in labor-management relations] is the responsibility of both parties - the employer and the employee. You cannot hope to have a responsible union unless you give it means of achieving responsibility. That is, the union must have a measure of security. The closed-shop type of contract which has been in effect between labor and management in an industry assures the union of security and gives it an opportunity to concentrate on helping to improve production - the only road to greater benefits of labor, management and the public alike."
As employers, we feel that legislation outlawing the closed shop impairs the employer's right of contract.

If an employer prefers to deal only with a group of men who have sold him their worth and responsibility, should he not be permitted to do so? To ban the closed shop is merely to restrict further the employer's right to bargain and to contract persons of his choice."

End of quotation - Does the quoted viewpoint from this employer have validity?
Some argue that we should have the closed shop but should regulate the abuses that surround it. When a Closed shop is in operation, denial of membership is tantamount to denial of employment and this could be done unfairly. Would it be possible to get at some of these abuses—of unfair denial of union membership, of unreasonable apprenticeship terms, of excessive union fees, etc.? Would that be a means of assuring the safety of the individual worker to seek employment within the industry?
What effect would the bill have on the Union hiring halls? Are these helpful in Casual and intermittent employment industries?