DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 075 UD 008 151

By-Goodman, Mary Ellen
Sanctuaries for Tradition: Virginia's New Private Schools. Special Report.
Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.
Report No-SRC-19
Pub Date 8 Feb 61
Note-28p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
Descriptors-Board of Education Policy, Clergymen, County School Systems, Curriculum, Educational Facilities, Educational Finance, *Private Schools, Public Schools, *School Closing, School Community Cooperation, School Organization, *School Segregation, *Southern Schools, Students, Transportation
Identifiers-Charlottesville, Norfolk, Prince Edward County, Virginia, Warren County

Virginia's anti-integration massive resistance laws of 1956 resulted in the closing of the public schools and the establishment of private schools for white youngsters "Foundations" were organized in Warren and Prince Edward Counties as well as in Norfolk and Charlottesville, to perpetuate segregated, traditionally oriented education. This special report chronicles the organization of these "Foundation" schools. The political and economic facets of the school crisis and the role of the students, community support, financing, transportation, and organizational structure of the private schools. One section of the report is devoted to the future of the private schools in Prince Edward County where no public schools are open (as of 1961). (NH)

ED029075

SPECIAL REPORT

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION--GENERAL

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL
63 Auburn Avenue, N.E.
Atlanta 3, Georgia

08151 E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SANCTUARIES FOR TRADITION: VIRGINIA'S NEW PRIVATE SCHOOLS

mary ellen goodman

UD 008 151

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM COLLECTION

SRC: 19
February 8, 1961

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

WHY PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

Under Virginia's "massive resistance" laws of 1956 its governor was authorized to close any school ordered by the courts to desegregate. Governor J. Lindsay Almond first exercised this authority in September, 1958, when--by telegram to Warren County Superintendent of Schools Q. D. Gasque--he ordered Warren County High School to close its doors. This action triggered the Foundation school movement in Warren County, as subsequent school closings set off similar reactions in Norfolk and Charlottesville and in Prince Edward County.

Events at this stage vary only in detail from one community to another. In each case self-selected leaders drew large numbers of excited people together for meetings and discussions. In Warren County the high school PTA assumed responsibility. From its emergency meeting came a "fact-finding committee" to review the situation and recommend action. The fact-finding--and a consultation with the governor--led to establishment of the Front Royal Educational Foundation. A "Foundation" appeared in the other three communities too. As in Front Royal, these organizations were led by determined, articulate, and uncompromising segregationists with prominent local lawyers, editors, and businessmen in key roles.

First actually to open the doors of its school was the Foundation in Norfolk, followed in a few days by the Front Royal Academy in Warren County. The Foundations provided schooling for white children because there were no public schools for them in the Fall of 1958 in Norfolk, Charlottesville, and Warren County.

Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman, of Houston, Texas, is a widely recognized authority on racial relations and problems of youth. Her doctoral dissertation at Harvard was written on the topic, "Genesis of Race Awareness," and she is the author of Race Awareness in Young Children (Addison-Wesley Press, 1952). She has taught and directed research at Wellesley College and Tufts University, and has been a Fulbright Research Scholar in Japan. She was Coordinator of Conference Studies for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

But the public schools re-opened in these communities in the Spring of 1959. The no-school emergency had passed, yet the Foundation schools were continued, by and for people who "wouldn't send children to public schools which had been integrated."

Segregationists, in the communities other than Prince Edward, now accept the fact that public education, with at least token integration, is unavoidable. They therefore embrace the "freedom of choice" philosophy and concentrate on strengthening the Foundation schools.

"Freedom of choice" is made possible by a system of tuition grants enacted by the state. A parent in Virginia may elect for his children to attend the public school in his district, or any non-sectarian private school (anywhere in the country), or a public school not in his district. If the parent chooses a private or non-local public school, he can by right collect a grant for tuition up to $250 for elementary and $275 for high school students; the state and the local school district jointly pay the amount.

In the Foundation schools, supporters intend and expect to perpetuate both racial segregation and a mode of education focused on "fundamentals" and conservative in content. Few will admit, as does one erstwhile leader, that of these two goals the first is crucial, and the second a justification. And no doubt these goals are differently weighted in different communities. One headmaster reports that in his opinion "segregation is less important to most of these parents than is conservative--what they call 'traditional' --education." A Foundation president in another community says that "the integration issue is still strong, but less so than it was. Now the real issue is the right to have for your children the kind of education you want."

Other views popular among Foundation school enthusiasts have to do with the over-all educational welfare of the community and with the traditional "Virginia gentleman's" preference for private schooling. It is argued that the whole community has benefited and will benefit enormously by the "dual" school system; many leading citizens, some moderates included, are convinced that

creating Foundation schools has reduced community tensions (the "safety valve" principle) and probably averted open violence. A number, including middle-ground leaders and even some liberals, believe that "competition" in education is a good thing, that the existence of the private schools will serve--as it has already--to keep public school people "on their toes" and lead to improvements in the public schools. Crowding in the public schools is said to be relieved (in Charlottesville and Front Royal). Moreover, it is argued, public education in most Virginia localities has always fallen short of national standards and the "best people" have always sent their children to private schools.

The people who are now sending their children to the Foundation private schools see themselves simultaneously as community benefactors and as citizens alert to the hazards of "progressive education" and "subversive ideas." In addition they are, as they see it, supporting and "fighting for" such sacred principles as "freedom of association," "individual liberty," and the "rights" of the individual, community, and state; also, and--underlying all others--the "purity" of their race.

The Foundation people, having worked out a solution which keeps community peace and serves their own causes, quite naturally enjoy a sense of triumph. This goes far to reduce their bitterness about the Supreme Court, the collapse of "massive resistance," and the existence of token integration in their own communities. "We're not too bitter now," says one ardent segregationist leader. "We once were--you can be sure; we felt our rights had been infringed and that we were imposed upon. This was true too. But we've done what people--the defeatists--said couldn't be done. We're very proud of our school--so are the children--and of our product."

These are, then, the opinions of the private school supporters. They are proud of what they have achieved. Later pages of this report may help to determine whether this pride is justified.

In Prince Edward County, bitterness is not a thing of the past. Foundation leaders there remain adamant, uncompromising, and militant. With the passage of time their position becomes

more difficult, however, because (1) they remain conspicuously isolated, no other Virginia community having followed their lead; (2) the County's people are becoming uncomfortable and less sure; and yet (3) to shift from a position so long, vehemently, and publicly defended is to risk some loss of "face."

Foundation leaders and supporters in Prince Edward admit to none of these--or any other--difficulties. Elsewhere some uneasiness is at least implicit, even as past achievements are recited. This is particularly true in Norfolk, where the Foundation school serves only a small proportion (about 1%) of the city's children in grades seven through twelve. With present facilities the Tidewater Academy could accommodate no greatly enlarged enrollment; nevertheless, school officials would welcome greater evidence of public interest. The relatively large and cosmopolitan population of Norfolk offers the least advantageous context for Foundation schools (as among the four communities) and the most competition from established independent schools.

As the remainder of this report is read, certain controlling facts should be remembered:

a. There is a suit now pending in federal court, which seeks to require the re-opening of Prince Edward's public schools and the ending of all direct or indirect public aid to the private schools.

b. Virginia during 1958-59 and 1959-60 spent $1,535,500 on 11,700 tuition grants. By February, 5,057 grants had been made for 1960-61 at a cost to the state of $690,175, with probably about the same amount paid by localities.

c. According to the latest survey (Richmond News Leader, November 30, 1960) tuition grants in the following numbers have been approved in the four localities treated in this report:

	Grants Approved		1960-61 Grants for	
	1959-60	1960-61	Public Schools	Private
Charlottesville	628	557	2	555
Albermarle County*	237	315	29	286
Warren County	509	494	21	473
Prince Edward County	0	1,324	0	1,324
Norfolk	1,203	1,550	n.a.	n.a.

*Surrounds Charlottesville

THE COMMUNITY AND THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Impact of a School Crisis

The closing of public schools, the setting up of segregated private schools, the re-opening of public schools and the choosing between public and private--each of these steps is accompanied by upheavals, stress, and pain. Says the mayor of one community which has been afflicted:

> I would hate for any community to go through what we did. I would do anything to avoid it again.
>
> Too many scars are left ---. They're still with us ---.I don't know how much we'll have to go through--or how many years it will take--before this feeling is gone.
>
> After all the trouble over schools, and all the bitterness, people are edgy. Friendships of years have been smashed, parents and their children have come to swords points. It's gotten into every aspect of community life--social life, business and banking, politics, even the churches.
>
> It's the biggest thing that's ever come in my lifetime.

Politics and the School Crisis

While the crisis is on, the career of every public office holder and every candidate for public office is affected. Says a highly informed observer: "We have had sharp political division, and this school situation has fed into it. Also I suppose the school problem has been exploited to some extent for political advantage."

While segregationist sentiment is at its height, politicians court disaster if it becomes known--or even rumored--that they are less than extreme in their segregationist views. But the temperature drops with remarkable speed. The "die-hard segregationist" is now unpopular with the electorate, at least in the communities whose public schools are open and whose worst school crisis is over.

Political implications extend beyond the local level. Throughout the controversy concerning schools, Senator Harry Byrd has once again proved his absolute adherence to an absolutely conservative position. His status as the hero of the ultra-conservatives has been enhanced. For people of this persuasion Governor J. Lindsay Almond, by his retreat from the "massive

resistance" position, has become "Benedict Almond," the unforgivable defector and prime target for the bitterness engendered by accumulated disappointments and frustrations. But to the many who saw the futility of massive resistance, Almond may not be a hero but he is a hope.

Economics and the School Crisis

No one claims that the school situation was economically good for the community, and even some segregationists will admit that it "didn't do the community any good."

The economic effects when people move from the community, or decide not to move into it, are obvious and direct; every resident is a buyer of many goods and services. But it is not easy to prove that the school crisis was, in any given move, the reason or even the most important reason. It no doubt was, for some considerable numbers of families, at least one of the important reasons for moving out or not moving in. Such is the conviction of numerous informed observers , and some cases are provable.

For example: several faculty members have left the colleges in Prince Edward County primarily because of dissatisfaction with living conditions, and especially with the school problem. Moreover, it has been difficult to replace these people, and the colleges as well as the community are adversely affected. Other faculty members--those who have young children--admit that they are staying "on a year-to-year basis." They are unlikely to stay much longer unless the school crisis dissolves.

Prince Edward County has undoubtedly suffered economic losses, though segregationist leaders will not admit it. It is, however, unarguable that closed Negro schools have cost the county the buying power of its Negro teachers. In addition, an undetermined number of Negroes now quietly go out of the county to buy whenever they can. There is no organized boycott, but simply a natural reluctance to spend in a community which does not provide schools. Since more than half the population is Negro, this shifting of patronage has no doubt been felt, just as any significant emigration of Negroes would be. However, since many of the rural Negro

families own the farms on which they live, migration is neither easy nor likely.

One prominent citizen in Prince Edward says that "the dollar volume of business is up here, notwithstanding adverse weather and general business conditions." Another argues that tobacco farming is the central economic activity of the county, and this activity isn't much affected--"It doesn't much matter whether schools are open or shut." Other local businessmen privately disagree with these views.

It is said too that if new industry has not come into the county this has nothing to do with lack of public schools. Segregationist leaders claim, "the white children are now getting a better education than before," so lack of public schools can be no real deterrent. But it is noteworthy that, in replying to a charge that closed public schools had discouraged new industry, the Farmville mayor on December 23, 1960 could only say: "An egg grading plant was established in this community and was successfully operated until the economic condition of the country caused its closing." (Richmond News-Leader, 12/24/60)

In the other three communities, effects of the crisis are diminishing economically as well as in other ways, and there is optimism--or hope, perhaps--that "we may have people moving into the community /Front Royal/ because they know there's freedom of choice here, and a fine /Foundation/ school, fully accredited, with a fine faculty. Several families have moved in to send their children to the Academy. This might mean something to the community."

There is, however, another and more immediate side to the story. A businessman and community leader (who is by no means opposed to the new private schools) reports:

> The support of the private school has affected the community. economically. When the drive started for school funds, we had a falling off in collections on our charge accounts. And we weren't the only ones ---. A doctor told me he had noticed it too. It even showed up in churches--a falling off in the collections. It shows in country club memberships ---. Probably it will affect the United Fund Drive. All this is

because people are putting money into the private school. These effects aren't great, but they add noticeably to what is an economically slow period anyway.

This comment was made about Front Royal. Norfolk--and probably Charlottesville--have not been so conspicuously affected. The Foundation movement in these two communities is small relative to their size and resources.

Front Royal differs too in that "it is a labor town; labor is strong here. It was union people--mostly salaried workers--who were most concerned about integration and who most wanted the private school." Union funds to the extent of nearly $50,000 went into the support of the private school movement in the 1959-60 school year. This money was collected through a payroll deduction system authorized by management of the American Viscose Corporation, Front Royal's one big industry; the deduction system has now been discontinued. Ironically, some 150 of the union's then approximately 1,800 members were Negroes. The whole operation was challenged by the national union, and the local has been prevented from investing its funds in bonds of the Foundation.

Religion and the School Crisis

Clergymen and their congregations have espoused every shade of opinion on the school question. In each of the four communities a minority of religious leaders stood firmly and openly for public schools, with integration, in conformity with law. Fewer still were supported in this stand by even a majority of their congregations, and several left or were withdrawn from their pastorates as a result of the dissension. Says one observer: "The ministers who are still around didn't publicly play much of a role" in the controversy. There are two striking exceptions in Norfolk, one in Charlottesville, and another (non-white) in Prince Edward. With these exceptions the generalization holds.

Many segregationists probably agree with one of their number who deplores "Ministerial Association people getting into the [school] fight. --- It is," he argues, "none of their business. They shouldn't be in politics at all ---. Besides, you'll notice

that they wind up sending their own children elsewhere than to the integrated public school."

A leading and highly respected elder statesman among ministers states a view not greatly different. "I am not a crusader," he declares. "I must leave this moral issue alone and concern myself with the many others. This one is a long-range spiritual thing."

Apparently a majority of religious leaders have taken some such view of the school crisis. A critic charges that "they have failed to present it as a moral issue" to their congregations and to the community.

There are some who clearly do not view it as a moral issue. One minister now teaches in a Foundation school, is a member of the Foundation Board, and gives religious sanction to the segregationists' position. Another candidly conforms to prevailing public opinion and to tradition. He as candidly admits that he found it "a very difficult question, even for a Christian minister," when a white child came asking for his counsel; this child had been meanly treated by white friends after they observed her in friendly conversation with a Negro classmate.

Few churches have refused their facilities as temporary havens for Foundation schools. The Unitarians of Norfolk, holding firm on this issue behind the conspicuous courage of their young pastor, refused the use of their property by a private school on the ground that they could not be party to the circumventing of Federal law. The more usual response has been that of an upper-middle class Presbyterian church in Prince Edward County. Here the deacons "voted overwhelmingly to let the Foundation come into the church, arguing that if the churches refused there would be no schools."

In Prince Edward there are, of course, no schools for the Negro children, who represent more than half the children of the county. "All church people are disturbed about the Negro schools being closed," a prominent minister explains. "But they see the Negroes as caught in this situation, and feel that the blame falls on the NAACP. --- They [church people] are very sincere and not at all consciously superior in their attitudes. They have convinced

themselves that they're fighting for the integrity of the race."

For this minister and the majority of his congregation the "issue" behind the school crisis is neither law nor morality but rather the "integrity of the race." And on some such grounds religion generally has made common cause with the mores to support and preserve segregation.

FOUNDATION SCHOOLS OPERATING OCTOBER, 1960

LOCATION & NAME	GRADES	ENROLLMENT	PERSONNEL	FACILITIES
PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY*				
Pisgah (Rice)	1 - 7		Headmistress, plus four teachers	Rooms in Pisgah Baptist Church.
Liberty (Green Bay)	1 - 7		Headmistress, plus three teachers	Rooms in cement block addition behind Liberty Christian Church.
Spring Creek (Darlington Hts.)	1 - 7	374	Headmistress, plus two teachers	Rooms in Spring Creek Baptist Church.
Worsham Academy (Worsham)	1 - 7		Headmaster, plus four teachers	Rooms in cement block addition behind Worsham Baptist Church and in basement rooms of Church.
Patrick Henry (Prospect)	1 - 7		Headmistress, plus three teachers	Rooms in Prospect Methodist Church.
Prince Edward Academy Lower School (Farmville) (31 in Kindergarten)	Kindergarten - 7	527	Headmistress, plus 18 teachers	Scattered through several buildings (e.g., two 4th grades in the Women's Club building; three 1st grades in Methodist church).
Prince Edward Academy Upper School (Farmville)	8 - 12	474	Headmaster (and coach); plus 26 teachers	As above; scattered through several buildings (especially churches, but also former stores and an old residence) and said to be only two or three minutes walk apart. Prince Edward Foundation schools use a total of 10 buildings in the town of Farmville.
TOTAL ENROLLMENT		1,375		
CHARLOTTESVILLE				
Robt. E. Lee School	1 - 7	225	Principal, plus 12 teachers	New, modern, well furnished and equipped (cinder block construction, said to be convertible to residences).
Rock Hill Academy	8 - 12	420	Headmaster, Dean of Studies, plus 15 teachers	Offices, library, and some classrooms in an old mansion. Most classrooms in four new brick buildings. Separate cafeteria building.
NORFOLK				
Tidewater Academy	7 - 12	192	Principal, plus 12 teachers full-time and two part-time (music)	Entirely housed in a 26-room mansion.
FRONT ROYAL				
Mosby Academy (elementary school planned)	8 - 12	483	Principal, plus 21 teachers	Housed in substantial new cinder block building; 22 rooms and a cafeteria in use. Further classrooms may be added soon.

* Note that all facilities are temporary in Prince Edward County. Elsewhere all are permanent.

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS NOW

All Foundation school enthusiasts stress one central belief; to have a good school you don't need a "fancy building" or "fancy equipment"; what you do need--and little beside--is excellent teachers and eager, interested students.

Foundation leaders and supporters are emphatic and unanimous in their public statements about the excellence of Foundation teachers and the interest and willingness-to-work shown by the school children (and their parents). It is not difficult to find parents and children who agree, nor is it difficult to appreciate the unusual efforts exerted since the Autumn of 1958 to bring about the functioning Foundation schools of today.

Accreditation. All are accredited by the state, and most achieved this status "right away." But in Front Royal, for example, this meant that emergency schools newly opened in temporary quarters were judged satisfactory for such facilities as a library--because "the town library was made available"; and a laboratory--because the Randolph-Macon Academy "made its laboratory facilities available." Moreover, "the fire marshals worked with us."

The Foundation schools do not accord with "the letter of the law" in all respects. However, they are accredited, so presumably they accord with the "spirit of the law" as interpreted by its agents. Accreditation standards in Virginia are evidently flexible, and define minimum requirements.

None of the schools has, at this date, been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Buildings and Equipment. Discrepancies between the "letter" and the "spirit" of the state standards are most conspicuous in physical equipment and facilities. In Prince Edward County, schools are still operating in such temporary quarters as church buildings, erstwhile stores, and clubrooms. A new high school building is now being constructed. Libraries, science laboratories, and physical education facilities of Foundation schools tend to be makeshift, minimal, or entirely lacking. There are exceptions to this generalization. Rock Hill Academy in Charlottesville has fine science laboratory facilities, and even a language laboratory. Physically, this school and its partner elementary school (Robert E. Lee) represent the best in Foundation schools to date. Both schools give evidence of more adequate financial support than has apparently been available to Foundations elsewhere. However, the new Mosby Academy in Front Royal is substantial and in process of becoming better equipped; and the "old mansion" converted for use by the Tidewater Academy in Norfolk provides a physical setting adequate for the school at its present enrollment.

Personnel. Quality of school personnel is less easily evaluated. Foundation school administrators tend to differ markedly in background and experience from their public school counterparts, but this fact does not in itself provide a reliable basis for evaluation. It does, however, provide an important clue to "philosophic" differences between Foundation and public schools.

Foundation enthusiasts tend to be highly critical of teachers' colleges, and of conventional teacher training requirements (as Foundation people understand both). They maintain that teachers' colleges stress theory and method too much and subject matter too little, that their graduates tend to be weak in inclination or ability to discipline students as well as to drive home the "fundamentals" (an opinion strongly held by some Foundation leaders), that they tend toward "dangerous" ideas. On the other hand, some of the nicely printed bulletins and brochures of the Foundations are replete with grammatical slips and awkward syntax. This would seem to indicate that the private school people are not themselves thoroughly grounded in the "fundamentals."

Most Foundation schools are headed by people whose background is not that of the usual professional educator. Business, the armed services, and athletics loom large in the experience of Foundation school heads. The Principal of Mosby Academy is a notable exception; in this case a public school man of many years experience has joined the Foundation school. However, since he is now in his seventies, the exception may prove temporary.

Beginning July 1, 1961 another professional school administrator will direct one of the operations. The Charlottesville Educational Foundation has created a new post, that of superintendent of all its schools, and appointed to it the present superintendent of public schools in South Norfolk. The choice has added interest because the appointee is, of all the professional school men of Virginia, the one most prominently identified with belief in segregation. He is at present also a member of the State Board of Education and of the Board of Rock Hill Academy.

Teachers seem to differ little in training and experience as between public and Foundation schools. Critics of the latter report that the majority of teachers willing to go to Foundation schools are near or even past retirement age, that they are former teachers who have come out of a retirement into which they went as housewives and mothers, or that they are people who do not hold valid teaching credentials. The facts partially support the criticism, but they do not conclusively prove that Foundation teachers are on the average less competent.

But these facts do provide another illustration of practices which are in accord with Foundation philosophy. From the Foundation point of view classroom performance far outweighs any other basis for evaluating teachers, and such formal criteria as age or professional training and experience are of secondary importance. Moreover, attitudes and opinions about integration, states' rights, and related issues inevitably play a part in determining who shall

teach in Foundation schools. An advocate of integration, or even a person skeptical of the purpose or future of the Foundation school movement, would be unlikely to seek such employment or to be regarded as a congenial potential colleague if he did.

Public school people have shown considerable reluctance to cast their lot with the Foundations. In view of this, and of the teacher shortage general in the country, it must be supposed that Foundation schools have not had unlimited choice of teachers. Prince Edward is of course an exception, since there are no public schools and the white teachers have had no choice, if they wished to remain in their profession and in the county.

Salary scales (though not divulged) and fringe benefits are represented as being the same as or better than the public schools'.

Guidance counseling is provided in Foundation secondary schools, in accord with state recommendations. Training and experience of persons carrying these responsibilities are said to meet state standards, as is the time allowed for guidance and counseling.

Curriculum. Curriculum meets at least minimal state standards and is much like that of the public schools (though with fewer electives). Admittedly, however, physical education, the arts, and (in all but Rock Hill Academy) the sciences must be offered on a basis adjusted to minimal physical facilities or to none at all. "Calisthenics" must suffice where there is no gymnasium; "history of the arts" must take the place of the practical arts when there are no rooms equipped for drawing, painting, modeling, band, etc.; discussions (and perhaps some demonstration) must substitute where there is no "science laboratory ---installed in a suitable room," including "tables in sufficient number to permit effective individual work"--as specified by the State Board of Education.

The schools do not advocate or intend to offer physical education as offered in public schools, but football teams are already thriving and enthusiastically supported at the secondary schools, and other team sports are or soon will be available. Science laboratories are being supplied as rapidly as possible, but there is little concern with provision for the arts or for such "crafts" as shop and home economics. At Mosby, however, home economics is being taught (adjusted to limited facilities) and shop is planned when the Academy building has been completed. Prince Edward teaches shop and agriculture. Rock Hill, on the contrary, has no intention of teaching shop; its ambition is to have a "good" independent school type of curriculum, whereas Mosby (particularly) aspires to a "good" public school curriculum.

It is believed that music, drama, sports, journalism, etc., should be handled on an extra-curricular basis and on this basis alone. At Tidewater Academy the policy is: no extra-curricular activities except those which are wanted by a number of students, and wanted enough so that the interested students themselves will--

with some help from faculty and parents--organize and carry through to get what they want.

It is an explicit and widely held tenet of Foundation education that curriculum should be centered on the "fundamentals"--the "tool subjects" plus science and languages--to the near exclusion of all else. Rock Hill Academy gives "a five-year math program, with algebra in ninth grade, ---a five-year science program, a four-year language program--which may include Russian by next year and now includes Latin, French and Spanish." In Rock Hill's partner elementary school, "French is started in second or third grade for those who can also keep up with the fundamental work."

All Foundation secondary schools stress college preparation, with "business education" and "distributive education" as secondary interests. One school hopes in time to move away from even the vocationalism implied in "business education," but another (Tidewater) is expanding curriculum in this area. All report that their graduates seem to have met no unusual difficulties in qualifying for admission to college. Percentage of graduates going on to some type of higher education is said to be "more than half" from Tidewater, and the same proportion from Rock Hill and from Prince Edward. The latter boasts that "one or two" of its graduates "received competitive scholarships on a national basis." It must be remembered that these schools have operated too short a time to be either credited or blamed for most of the academic preparation of their students.

Do the Foundation schools deliberately teach the conservative social-economic-political views characteristic of Foundation members generally? Considerable differences appear. For Tidewater Academy and Prince Edward the answer seems to be at least a qualified affirmative. At Mosby the answer seems to be an almost unqualified negative, and the Rock Hill policy is similar. The following statements bearing on this question were made by Foundation or school officials:

> The Academy offers emphasis on the American heritage through study of our history and of the Constitution and through observance of important historical holidays. We seek no sectarianism but can put emphasis on Bible teachings. We do not approve of the "gradualism" through which, by one legal move and then another, religion is being put out of American schools. --Norfolk Foundation officer.

> We've stopped arguing integration-segregation. Our emphasis is on education--especially the fundamentals--the three R's, and on Americanism and the Constitution. We hope that these things /religion, regional history, traditions, etc./ are explored to the fullest by our excellent teachers. Opening the day with prayers or Bible reading is optional with them. --Prince Edward Foundation officers.

We want our school to emphasize expression, ---foreign languages, ---government---. I don't know how the teachers feel /i.e., on social and political issues/, but they haven't been instructed to teach any particular point of view. ---And as long as I'm associated with the Foundation, the children will be taught all sides /of an issue/. Their conclusions will be their own.

We have no Bible readings or prayers, and our point of view toward race relations is not discussed in school, and I'd prefer that it not be. Other controversial subjects--political for instance--can and should be discussed.

--Front Royal Foundation officers.

Our teachers are anti-integration. This we make sure, both because we ourselves don't believe in integration and--more important--because we can't have teachers here who'll be making speeches and flag waving. However, we're not teaching prejudice.

We do not teach religion nor is there any unusual emphasis on Virginia tradition.

--Charlottesville Foundation educator and officer.

Critics of the Foundation schools hold that their students are inevitably being taught conservative, anti-democratic, and prejudiced points of view. They argue that even if these views are not taught explicitly they are certainly taught implicitly. Since such views are the premises on which the Foundation movement is built, since they are shared by all adults connected with Foundation schools, the "atmosphere" of these schools cannot fail to convey such ideas to the children.

One of the critics has stated his objections publicly; he is a person whose opinions command respect, both because of his professional position and his close familiarity with the situation. Dr. Gordon Moss, Dean of Longwood Teachers College in Farmville has said (as quoted in Newsday, December 23, 1960):

> I wouldn't let my son go to it /Prince Edward Academy/ for anything in the world. Maybe the kids are doing all right in French and math and English--after all, they have the same teachers they had in the public schools--but they are learning principles that are far from what I would call proper education. How, in a government class, can they teach democracy in such an undemocratic school?

Schedule. Foundation schools meet or slightly exceed the State requirement for a school year of 180 days of at least five 45-minute periods. The school year follows the same pattern as--or one similar to--that of the public schools. To achieve the prescribed daily schedules presents a problem only in Prince Edward where lunching facilities are entirely lacking. There

students may have a drink and sandwich or other snack begun between classes and finished during a class. A real lunch must be postponed until the school day ends at 1:30 p.m.

Individual Attention. Teacher-pupil ratios of 1 to 22 or thereabouts are usual, though Tidewater boasts a 1 to 14 ratio. However, not all classes are small. At Mosby, for example, they range from eight students (in Spanish, French, physics, and geometry) to 35 (the upper limit set by state law) in some other subjects. Other schools report much the same range.

The Students. The abilities of students and of their achievements in Foundation schools are even more difficult to assess than the quality of teachers. Objective tests are either lacking or results not divulged, or it is plausibly argued that, since all but a fraction of the students' education had been accomplished before the Foundation schools existed, tests must reflect largely that earlier training. Headmasters and principals are unanimous in voicing the impression that their students "run the gamut" and are, on the average, in no way notably different--in capacity to learn--from public school students. Public school administrators will not comment on the quality of students who have withdrawn except to note that, while superior students often withdraw to conventional private schools, this selective factor does not appear to operate with the new private schools.

Though it might be easier to raise academic standards if students were carefully selected, a selective admissions policy is not anticipated at most of the schools. They anticipate that, should applications rise, the schools would expand. At but one school is there talk of a possible selective policy in the future, and even here such policy has by no means been set; a move toward making the school "exclusive" is likely to meet stiff opposition and be insupportable for financial as well as other reasons.

Foundation spokesmen are unanimous in the view that their students are more highly motivated and that disciplinary problems are fewer. Parents of students now in these schools seem to agree, and students are said to "just love the school," and to be deeply "interested in making the school a success. The students are more interested in school, and the parents more interested in them."

Most Foundation leaders and educators say that their students represent all socio-economic backgrounds. "Some are wealthy--some are poor--it's about the same as in the /public/ high school," says a Front Royal leader. His counterpart in Charlottesville also asserts that a "cross-section" of community families are represented. But he adds that these are, after all, families who "don't believe in integrated schools," and "the working people feel stronger than do the prosperous about this."

That this may be true seems likely in view of certain observations. Among Foundation officers the "FFV" types seem to be less

well represented than in the first year of Foundation activity. Differences of opinion have inevitably appeared (e.g., on questions of fund raising, policies affecting the future of the schools, etc.), and in two of the communities erstwhile top leadership--"aristocratic" in lineage and following the law by profession--has quietly eased out, to be supplanted by businessmen and others of less distinguished antecedents.

In one community marked by this trend there is emphasis (by a present officer) upon the democratic character of the Foundation school student body, and upon its lack of a "caste system" with an "elite" such as is said to dominate the student body in the public high school. In the Foundation school, says this officer, the children have formed new friendships and there have been opportunities for "the rural child"--and others not of the high school "elite"--to "come forward as never before."

In the other community which has experienced a change in Foundation officers a parent makes much the same point, speaking of the leadership opportunities her children enjoy in the Foundation school. Her emphasis, however, is on the advantages of a small school, where children who would otherwise have been "lost in the crowd" can be important in student activities (football, cheerleading, yearbook staff, etc.), and their parents too feel "needed and wanted." While the size factor is undoubtedly important, it is also noteworthy that as the "elite" have left Foundation leadership their children have left the Foundation schools.

Apparently most white children who might have objected to integrated classes have withdrawn to private schools (a fact which leads some public school people to feel grateful that the private schools exist). However, some students unenthusiastic about integration have stayed with public schools, because of attachment to friends, athletics, extra-curricular activities, teachers and administrators, or other features of the public schools.

Community Support. The four communities differ markedly with respect to attitudes toward the Foundations and their schools. Community awareness and interest vary from low in Norfolk to high in Prince Edward County, and an observer is tempted to the oversimple conclusion that size of community is the one crucial factor.

While there are other important factors, these do tend to be associated with size. Norfolk, for example, has grown not only large, but also heterogeneous; its native Virginians do not alone determine now what happens in Norfolk, and the non-native and semi-transient part of the population weakens the solid front required to hold the line when there are pressures toward change. The newcomers lack "bred in the bone" adherence to Virginia traditions. What is equally important, they lack those multiple and years-long interpersonal ties in the community which so reinforce adherence to its traditions.

Prince Edward is the other face of the Norfolk coin. Its population is small and relatively homogeneous. Its natives do emphatically determine what happens--or so they have in the school crisis at any rate. And it is extremely difficult or hazardous, psychologically and even socially and economically, for natives to break with or even question native leadership. Breaking with tradition is not a comfortable business at best, and it can become extremely painful when "everybody" who means something to you, "always" has and presumably always will, turns his back--or does worse--the moment your dedication to tradition is observed to waver. And observation is constant and keen in the small community; freedom from surveillance is as rare as freedom to differ, as some few who have met privately to discuss ways of reopening the public schools have discovered.

The Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties are strong in the county. This is the Virginia organization which shares the same general opinions and purposes as the Citizens Councils of the lower South. Farmville, in fact, was the place of origin for the Defenders in 1954, and the state president resides in the town. There is, reportedly, much overlapping of membership between the Defenders and the Foundation; the former group has undoubtedly used its influence to enforce solid support for the private school, and to discourage any public disagreements.

With these facts in mind it is not difficult to understand why Norfolk's Tidewater Academy, though operating in the largest of the four communities, is the smallest of the four Foundation secondary schools. But those responsible for Tidewater quite naturally fail to see their community in perspective or indeed to see that their own devotion to tradition leaves them on a shrinking island eroding in the rapid tides of change around them. They observe--correctly--a widespread indifference or even resistance to what they conceive as their heroic stand against a disaster. They expected both appreciation of their efforts and a rallying round in support. Instead they discover a "lack of cooperation with our school--a lack of support--a lack of gratitude" and they say: "We don't understand---."

In Prince Edward County, a crisis atmosphere still prevails because the public schools remain closed. Since the fight on this level is not yet lost, public emotion can be sustained via the press and a tight network of personal relations, and with it the belief that it can be won.

The wall of resistance to change shows no breaks, but cracks are apparent. A heavy legal blow will open these fractures which are now kept carefully covered. "The people of the county are still behind us," says the Foundation's president, and "we have full cooperation--without it our program could never have worked. --- There is the barest minimum of opposition. It centers in Longwood /the state teachers' college in Farmville/, aided by a handful of people in the county." The opposition is, however, considerably more than "minimum," and if community pressures have so far kept it

largely underground it is all the more notable that it has taken root.

However, active "opposition" may in the long run prove to be one of the weakest of the several hidden forces slowly eroding that "full cooperation." Emotions will cool, the "cause" lose its glamour, and peace, prosperity, and public schools begin to look like an attractive package deal. Out in the county even now the question, "How do folks around here like the new schools?" gets answers notably low in enthusiasm or militancy. A general store clerk replies tersely: "Better'n none." The owner of a crossroads filling station observes thoughtfully that private schools are for people with money, "the rest of us got to have public schools. Besides, not educating the colored folks is bad business; we got to get along, and it's hard to get along with a man has no education."

Financing. Foundation schools have many problems to meet but none comparable in importance, from an immediate point of view at least, to those of financing. The system of tuition grants, enacted by the state in March, 1959, represents their financial life blood, but all capital needs must still be supplied through gifts and contributions and through fund-raising projects; thus, for example, Mosby Academy in Front Royal has launched in February, 1961 a fund drive to add an elementary school to its plant, in the expectation that a pending court suit will result in desegregation of the public elementary school next year.

The tuition grant measure (as it now operates after revisions) provides that elementary pupils may receive up to $250 and high school students (grades 8 through 12) up to $275 annually; the grant may not exceed the per pupil cost of operating public schools in the locality. State funds are invested to the extent of $125 annually for an elementary and $150 for a high school pupil, and the remainder is paid from local school funds. There is also in the law an authorization for a local government to supplement the grants with non-school funds; only Charlottesville has chosen to do this, and the tuition grant for its students is therefore the largest in the state.

Though grants are paid to parents, rather than to the schools, the practice still amounts to public subsidy of private education and may be judged an intent to thwart the law. With the GI Bill of Rights as a precedent, some lawyers seem optimistic about the survival of the program. Most, however, agree that, until completion of the legal tests, no one can be certain that the grant system has a long future.

Most Foundation officers, members and enthusiasts speak optimistically about the future in spite of this uncertainty. It is said that the schools would survive, though tuition grants were stopped, because most of the parents could afford to pay an equivalent amount. A few Foundation leaders frankly say that the schools

would lose their less affluent families, and hence become--with respect to socio-economic level of the families served--more like conventional private schools.

This possibility is vigorously rejected by a "faith can move mountains" segment among Foundation school leaders. These people argue that a system of scholarships could and would be set up so that "no child who wanted it would be denied an education" of the Foundation school type. It is believed that local fund drives, and possibly the jettisoning of all other fund drives in the community, along with solicitation of gifts from "freedom of choice" enthusiasts elsewhere, could be counted upon to supply needs for "scholarship" money.

There are many observers, however, who predict that the schools will not survive without tuition grants. These predictions are based on the assumption that interest will gradually decline as communities become accustomed to desegregation; that parents will find that public schools are better schools; and that parents will not make sacrifices to keep their children in private schools unless these are clearly superior.

It is true that money in surprising amounts has already been given for Foundation schools. The Prince Edward School Foundation reported nearly $250,000 of a $300,000 goal raised between July 1 and late September, 1960; only $21,000 is reported to have come from sources outside the county, and some 1,610 individual donors are said to be represented. Both facts are notable in view of the county's limited population (about 14,000) and its predominantly agricultural economy. Nearly 4/5 of this amount was "pledges" rather than cash, however, and all of it was earmarked as capital funds, for buildings and facilities.

The Prince Edward Foundation reports that during the 1959-60 school year, when tuition grants were not accepted (due to fear of legal complications), and capital outlays were small, over $300,000 in contributions was collected and the operation is said to have closed the year "in the black." But contributions during that year were relatively painless because county taxes were reduced due to "savings" in costs of public education (since no public schools were operating). Taxes now are higher than before, and returns on fund campaigns may slow for this and other reasons, despite a generous tax offset allowed for contributions to the Foundation.

Elsewhere the story is similar, though tuition grants were utilized in 1959-60 and hence operating costs were covered. In Charlottesville some $350,000 (about $200,000 in cash and pledges, the rest in loans) has gone into capital outlay. The Foundation there went in the red for 1959-60. For its new permanent building and equipment, the Front Royal school used $110,000 raised from the sale of unsecured debenture bonds, and erected the building on a $20,000 tract given by 20 men. Gifts amounting to another $75,000, needed to complete its building and equipment, are being sought. The Tidewater Academy in Norfolk operates in a 26-room

"mansion" said to have cost the Foundation $75,000. Yields from its fund-raising efforts have been disappointing. New and continuing solicitations are being made, but meanwhile resources are meager.

In December, 1960 the Foundations in Charlottesville and Front Royal received from an anonymous donor or donors gifts of $20,000 and $30,000 respectively; the Front Royal group stated that it did not know the source.

Almost all families with children in Foundation schools--and a good many whose children are in other private schools or even out-of-county public schools--apply for tuition grants (whether or not they need the money). Most Foundations levy small additional charges (for example, at Tidewater: membership and registration fees of $26.00 per family per year, plus $6.00 per month; at Prince Edward: $15.00 per year; at Front Royal: small fees for materials; at Rock Hill: about $15.00 per year).

Foundation people argue that their schools cost the average taxpayer nothing and at the same time relieve him of the costs of educating part of the community's children. But others contend that public school expenditures do not go down when only a fraction of the children are drawn out of public schools. Therefore, the community as a whole is paying twice, or approximately so, for the education of that fraction of its children. During 1959-60, over 1,200 tuition grants were made to Norfolk residents at a total cost of $275,000. Fifty-eight per cent of this amount came from city funds, but the city's school load was not reduced by 1,200 children. Many of these would ordinarily have been in private schools and paying their own way. Tidewater Academy enrollment accounted for fewer than 200.

It can be argued too that those who make gifts for Foundation schools are paying again after taxes. Certainly it is not only the enthusiasts who contribute to the Foundations; businessmen with their own children in public schools, like others concerned to safeguard their relations with Foundation leaders, make contributions. Moreover, purchase of Foundation bonds may be in effect a contribution, since even friends of the Foundations admit there is no assurance that they will ever be paid off.

Transportation. Foundation school students, other than those in walking or biking distance of their schools, use public transportation, school buses, or private conveyances. In Norfolk, the Virginia Transit Company has instituted special service to the Academy from several areas, and a similar arrangement has been worked out in Front Royal and in Charlottesville.

Prince Edward alone has developed a school bus service. Patrons, Inc., a parents' organization, owns and operates 15 regulation school buses (with a 16th in reserve for emergencies). A "contribution" of $1.00 a week is asked for this service, and parents are expected to pay (since the fixed costs to Patrons, Inc.

go on in any case) whether or not they use it. Some dissatisfaction with this principle arises among parents. In November, 1960 the county Board of Supervisors voted $35.00 reimbursement for each child for transportation charges to parents living one-half mile or more from school.

Organizational Structure. Behind the Foundation schools stands an organizational pattern which is complicated, and deliberately so; it obviously "has a purpose." Should legal assaults be made, it would be more difficult to strike down three or four organizations than one. Hence in Warren County the structure has four distinct though interlocking parts: (1) the Front Royal Academy, which owns the land on which the school stands and the building in which it is housed; (2) the Front Royal Foundation, which operates the school and pays rent to the Academy for the building; (3) the Mosby Service Organization, which is equivalent to a PTA; and (4) the Mosby Academy, which is the people--administrators and faculty--who make up the school.

In Charlottesville the Foundation effort works through three corporations and a parents' "Auxiliary." The corporations are: (1) the Charlottesville Educational Foundation, which owns the school properties; (2) the Rock Hill Academy, which operates the secondary school; and (3) the Robert E. Lee School, which operates the elementary unit.

In Prince Edward and Norfolk the structures have three parts: (1) the Foundation organization; (2) the school organization; and (3) the parents' (PTA or, in Norfolk, PTSA) organization. Also in Prince Edward there is Patrons, Inc., the transportation organization.

FUTURE OF THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"The uproar is quieting and they're settling down to run a good school---." This capsule observation on the present and hopeful prediction for the future seems as appropriate to Front Royal and Norfolk as to Charlottesville (about which it was made). For Prince Edward the story is of course different; the "uproar" will not be over until after keys are turned, and doors thrown open in those public school buildings which now stand forsaken, with blinds drawn, in their weed-choked yards.

The Future in Prince Edward

"The Prince Edward Story---" (told in pamphlet form by the Farmville Herald in late 1959) has not yet reached its crucial chapter. An uncertain equilibrium prevails in the County, while people wait for something to happen, something to upset the precarious balance.

Foundation leaders declare that "private education is here to stay whether the public schools open on an integrated basis or not." And, they add, "there will always be private /segregated/ schools available to all--regardless of economic status." The Foundation's legal counsel admits that there is now "no other way segregated schools can be maintained except by operating private schools for whites." He predicts, however, that though public schools might become legally integrated, "you are not going to have an integrated system here factually. You might have a legally integrated system attended only by Negroes."

Complaints concerning non-operation of public schools are now pending before a U. S. District Court. Should the resulting judgments require re-opening, this already over-due event might still be delayed until the Fall of 1961. When public schools do re-open, a sizeable proportion of the white children may stay in Foundation schools.

The crucial question is: how large will that proportion be? In view of past events, it is to be expected that every effort will be made by Foundation leaders to maintain absolute solidarity among

whites, and to discourage return to public schools by so much as a single white child. While it seems unlikely that such complete conformity can be achieved, an episode of intense--even if largely covert--struggle may be building up.

By Autumn, 1961 or earlier, the Foundation may be operating its high school in permanent quarters. Permanent quarters for an elementary school in Farmville, and several more in the county, are also planned. It had been hoped that public school buildings and facilities could be purchased. That hope was frustrated by the former school board. The present board is unlikely to move now that federal court action on the property disposal question is pending.

The old school board resigned in April, 1960. When it did, it released a 14-page statement. The excerpt from it which follows is long, but it states well and authoritatively some of the causes for concern about a Prince Edward type operation:

> In its decisions the School Board has been guided by the fundamental belief that education must be provided for <u>all</u> the school age children of the entire County. Anything short of this we regard as contrary to the best interests of all of us in the long run. We know that educated citizens are absolutely essential to the very existence of democracy in local affairs as well as in state and national ones. If a community leaves uneducated any large portion of its citizens, because they cannot afford its cost, or for any other reason, it inevitably creates for itself enormous problems in welfare, delinquency, crime and unemployment. It means numbers of illiterate laborers who are difficult to absorb in the labor force. Today business and industry are demanding a higher level of training of its employees than ever before.
>
> We are aware that the Prince Edward Foundation has obtained contributions from those who have school age children and those who do not. No white child was denied admission to the Foundation's schools for the session 1959-60 because his parents could not make a contribution or because they could afford only a small gift. For this we stand grateful. Yet the people of Prince Edward County must face the question whether this method of voluntary support of schools can be depended upon--year in and year out--through good times and bad to pay the cost of education for all. Education must meet standards of quality over a period of many years and be conducted by teachers and administrators of dedicated purpose and training if it is to continue to be effective to meet the needs of our people.

> Unless some new system of education for all can take over the whole job of the public schools and have its cost guaranteed in a reasonable manner, we fear the economic consequences to the County. This year, for example, when the people of the County have paid all of the cost of education in the County, we have seen at least a half million dollars not come into the economic life of the County which did come in earlier years. We refer specifically here to two items. In the past we have received approximately $400,000 from the State for operation of public schools. Also in the past the large taxpaying corporations in the County have paid approximately $100,000 in local taxes. This year, this money did not come to the County in any form.

If by Fall of 1961 the malady of Prince Edward is past its crisis and the "uproar is quieting---," then perhaps both county and Foundation will "settle down to run good schools." It will be high time, after two long years of one of the strangest aberrations in the history of American public education, and two years of almost non-existent education for one-half of the County's children.

Social Differences and the Future of the Private Schools

A Prince Edward segregationist observes that "the poor whites might send their children to the public schools." And, he adds, this would be a return to the kind of class differentiation familiar in pre-public school days, when "poor whites" did not send their children to school at all.

If only the "poor whites" and the Negroes attended public schools, and if school taxes and appropriations were controlled (as in Prince Edward in the past) by a white elite become indifferent or hostile to public education, then low-quality public schools might be expected. This is a possibility in the future of Prince Edward County; it is not a likely development in the other three communities.

Just discernible trends in these other communities suggest a quite different course. The "elite" shows a tendency to gravitate back to the public schools or to conventional private schools. Just as they abandoned the massive resistance posture without much creaking and groaning so they seem now in process of abandoning--in act if not in word--the movement associated with "freedom of choice." They show a flexibility markedly more developed than is

common among the "best people" of Prince Edward or, indeed, among many people in their own communities.

Realism and the Growing Middle Ground

"It is a matter of realism," says one community leader, explaining how his own course differs from that of a friend prominent in the Foundation movement. "I suppose I'm just as much a segregationist as he is, but I'm a realist. Things have changed--we have integration now. Several more counties have been integrated even this Fall, and one of these days only Southside Virginia will be left. Once you have integration, you can't go back. It's too late to go back."

Except in Prince Edward the "realists" have swung the balance of power. In the other communities it has perhaps been easier for them to speak out.

The future of the Foundation school movement will be seriously affected by the extent to which "realism" develops in a community. It is not the "realists" who give to the Foundation movement a passionate "all or nothing" devotion and support. And such support it must have in order to meet the extraordinary tasks of organization and financing involved in creating new private schools, operating them, and building them into sound educational institutions. The schools are in fact, as their ardent supporters point out, the results of intense effort, dedication, and even sacrifice. No large proportion of the citizens in any of the four communities has participated whole-heartedly in this effort, and the proportion willing and able to carry on the struggle indefinitely is even smaller.

Time quenches the fires of indignation while the achievement of integration without catastrophe teaches its own lesson. Intransigence melts away and increasing numbers of people find themselves on a middle ground--perhaps still opposed to integration in principle, but no longer caring enough to fling themselves and their children on the altar of a lost cause.