The proponents of general Federal aid to education have chosen the flag of national defense under which to sail their ship of general Federal aid to education across the Congress and the country. S. 3187 is, in my opinion, not sufficiently adapted to defense needs to be considered a defense bill. I seriously doubt that it will improve our relative position in the fields of science and technology.

This bill contains a variety of programs, and by this variety, apparently attempts to adopt as many of the suggestions offered as is possible, and more by far than is practical.

It contains a scholarship program for college work.

It also contains a student loan program.

In addition to the scholarship program and the student loan program, there is provided a program of national defense fellowships, which is one-half grant, one-half loan.

There are grants for equipment and facilities for the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in primary and secondary schools.

There are institutes for school teachers and counselors.

There is also a separate type of institute for teachers of foreign languages.

The bill provides for Federal participation in the establishment of a counselling program.

It also provides for research and experimentation in teaching by radio, television, and motion picture.

The vocational program has not been forgotten, an additional program having been added with an authorization of a 20 million dollar annual appropriation.
A science information center has been thrown in too, this latter being, in effect, a national library of science.

It must be admitted that almost no branch in the field of education has been overlooked for Federal participation by this bill. Obviously, the proponents of this measure have adopted a shotgun approach.

Despite the inclusion in this bill of so many types of programs, and such a variety of approaches, I repeat that this bill will not appreciably contribute to the national defense. Neither the scholarship program, nor the student loan program, limited in any way to persons undertaking a course of study considered to be critical to our national defense. Under one of these programs, a participating student might study social welfare work, domestic science, or for that matter, flower arranging. Only those programs designed for the advancement of modern foreign languages are limited to any extent so far as curriculum is concerned.

Even were strict curriculum requirements imposed on these programs, a major deficiency from a national defense standpoint would still exist. In the student loan and fellowship programs, it has been provided that a recipient can repay the loan by serving in the teaching profession. In no other program in this bill is there any requirement that the participant serve in any capacity in the field which the government has assisted in his training. As far as the language of the bill is concerned, a person, by participating in the scholarship program and the national defense fellowships, might, with financing from the Federal Government, obtain his doctorate in nuclear physics, and upon his graduation enter upon employment with a stock brokerage firm, and never thereafter utilize, in the national defense
No State or local study reveals that needs cannot be met at the State and local levels. Federal intervention, in fact, is neither needed nor desired.

How does the Administration justify its proposal for intervention in science education, guidance, and scholarships in view of these studies and the findings of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958:

"The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

There is no evidence that the American people, State or local school boards or educators in general want the Federal Government to supervise or standardize education in the United States in the fields of science, guidance or scholarships.
Governors of various States have made statements opposing Federal intervention in education. Among these Governors are:

- Governor Price Daniel of Texas
- Governor William G. Stratton of Illinois
- Governor James P. Coleman of Mississippi
- Governor Milward L. Simpson of Wyoming
- Governor George Bell Timmerman of South Carolina
- Governor Albert Chandler of Kentucky
- Governor James E. Folsom of Alabama

Governor Harold W. Handley of Indiana wrote on July 22, 1958,

"Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

"Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually."

Less than two weeks ago, Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., on August 4, 1958, in opposing H.R. 13247, said:

"Education, historically and legally, is the obligation of the states and their localities and there is no emergency or any other circumstance which would justify the surrender of this responsibility to the Federal Government.

"I, therefore, strongly oppose H.R. 13247 which would inject the Federal Government in a new field of Federal aid to education. The Commonwealth of Virginia is instituting a new program of scholarship and loan aid to promising students and for many years has encouraged other scholarship arrangements for the benefit of young men and women of promise, who required assistance beyond their own means in completing their education.

"There is no demonstrated need for the proposed federal scholarships and as has been true in so many other federal aid programs, this proposal undoubtedly would constitute the beginning of permanent additional expense and burden upon the taxpayers of the country. There
is no field or activity which is more important to be retained under local control than education, and I view this suggested legislation as an entering wedge to destroy such control."
interest, one iota of his taxpayer-financed scientific training.

For these reasons, the bill under consideration is sadly lacking in provisions which would make it effective from a national defense standpoint.

I am not ready to concede that there is sufficient justification for the Federal Government to enter into the field of education. If such justification exists, however, Federal participation should be limited to that area best designed to meet the needs of national defense. It would be much better, if national defense requires Federal aid to education, to concentrate on a tremendous student loan program, whereby the opportunity for training would be made more readily available to those who have initiative and talent. Even such a loan program should be limited to students pursuing courses of study in science, mathematics, foreign languages, and other such courses closely and directly related to the national defense. The bill should spell out requirements for participants to utilize their training at least for some minimum period in the national defense interest.

Furthermore, there is, generally speaking, no requirement that the Federal program of student assistance be limited to those persons who actually need help in order to obtain advanced education. The lack of this limitation can only result in a duplication of non-Federal student assistance programs and in assistance to those financially able to pay for their own education.

Except in those fields related directly to the national defense, the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to invade the field of education. No where in the Constitution is the word "education" or any synonym thereof used. The Framers of the Constitution wisely recognized that education is a responsibility of
the State, the community and the parents. The Constitution declares in the Tenth Amendment, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This clearly places education in the realm of State responsibility.

I realize that there are members of this body, members of the other House, and those among the general public/who would place expediency before adherence to the Constitution. These groups take the position/that the Federal Government must move into the field of education/since the State and local communities are unable to perform the job adequately. No argument could be more fallacious.

There can be no doubt that the Federal Government, necessitated by spendthrift Congresses such as this, has usurped an overwhelming majority of the tax sources, thereby severely limiting the ability of the States and local communities/to provide for those needs which lie within the realm of their responsibilities. This area, in itself, is one to which those concerned with inadequacies of State and local finances/might concern themselves. Nevertheless, the individual States and local communities are almost without exception/in a more sound and healthier economic condition than the Federal Government. It is astonishing to me, that we could contemplate a national debt of 280 billion dollars, which must surely go higher, and at the same time point to financial inability on the part of a State or local community. Such a viewpoint is absurd.

While considering relative economic abilities, it should not be overlooked/that the Federal Government returns less value per dollar of tax money received/than does the State government, just as the State government returns less value per tax dollar received/than does the municipal government. In other words, the further the dollar
goes from home, the less value is returned. The tax dollar can be compared to the corn which is taken to the miller for conversion into meal. In each tax dollar we should not forget that the miller also has a toll chute, and the largest toll chute of all is that of the Federal Government.

Another factor so often overlooked or disregarded by the proponents of Federal spending is the fact that regardless of which level of government provides the service, it is the same individual taxpayers who must foot the bill. The Federal Government comes no closer to being a Santa Claus than does any other government.

The total cost of this bill over a four year period is estimated to be between one and one and a half billion dollars. This is exclusive of $220 million in student loans, $10 million in loans for science equipment and facilities, and an undetermined amount of loans in the fellowship program. It is obvious that this bill proposes for the Federal Government to continue its practice of exercising leadership with money rather than with ideas.

I realize most fully that there are deficiencies in our national approach to education. I further realize that these deficiencies reflect on the national defense. They concern me most deeply. Unlike the proponents of this bill, however, I am far from convinced that money alone, whether from the Federal, State, or local level, will provide a solution for these deficiencies. This is amply illustrated by the fact that any person of ability, who has a fair degree of ambition and initiative, can today, without government assistance, obtain the best formal education available in this country. There are innumerable types of financial assistance available to the person with ambition and initiative. For instance, in my own State of South Carolina, there are 88 separate sources of
scholarships of which I am aware. Of these, there are 29 colleges which offer scholarships, 7 governmental agencies, 21 business and industrial firms, and 31 civic and fraternal organizations and professional groups. In addition, there are 79 separate sources from which students may obtain educational loans. In addition to scholarship and loan funds which are available, almost every college in my State has available part-time job opportunities for deserving students. I am sure that South Carolina is not unduly exceptional in this regard.

There appear to be two major deficiencies in our educational process, neither of which can be readily or directly improved by the mere expenditure of funds.

The first deficiency is a nebulous one, characterized by an existing state of mind in an overwhelming number of the parents, teachers and of general public throughout our land. It is the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative. This country was founded upon a system of free enterprise. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country prospered. It prospered because a man could gain in return for his industry and initiative the respect of his fellowman, as well as financial independence. This philosophy of free enterprise, which was and is the backbone of this country, is being replaced by an assumption that the Federal Government can be all things to all men, which is another way of expressing the underlying philosophy of the welfare State.

If we would encourage from our people an upsurge of initiative, industry, and inventiveness, we must bring a halt to the welfare legislation and programs which invariably encourage indolence in any
people subjected to their insatiable influence. This bill, with its generous grants and stipends, including travel and dependency allowances, fairly begs an indolent student attitude.

The second major deficiency of our modern educational process lies in the application of what is erroneously called "progressive" education. Actually, this deficiency is inclusive of a number of erroneous concepts which are now being widely applied to the harm of unsuspecting students and general population of the country.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. I have heard it advanced as an adjunct to this philosophy that environment alone determines the net resulting product in individual attitude and mentality. We must first recognize that we can -- and at the State and local level -- provide equality of opportunity for formal education. We cannot, however, provide or guarantee an equality of ability or knowledge through education; for the Creator, in His great wisdom, made no two men alike, either physically or mentally. We must, therefore, return to a recognition of individuality in the application of the educational process, rather than attempting to use a common mold for all students.

Another fallacious and destructive practice identified with progressive education is that of stressing methodology at the expense of substance. This, and not the lack of funds, is, in my opinion, primarily responsible for the lack of capable teachers and professional educators. I do not believe it is possible for any person, regardless of how well versed in methods of teaching, to ignite in a student the spark of interest which is vital to true education, unless that person has an intimate knowledge of, and interest in, the substantive subject matter he seeks to teach.
This is one instance in which we might profit from the best in the European educational system. The testimony of Dr. Wernher von Braun is to me most persuasive. Dr. von Braun, testifying before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, said:

Furthermore, I would say that in teachers' training, European schools and universities care very little about methodology, about how people teach. They say if this man is a good mathematician or a good physicist, and if he is really fired up by a message he has to give to his pupils, then you need not train him in how to teach, and what techniques and little tricks to use, because he will do a good job anyway. On the other hand, if there is no fire burning in the man, then he is a poor teacher to begin with, and with no amount of methodology training can you make a good one out of him. So you might as well eliminate him right away.

Progressive education ignores the fact that it is primarily the obligation of the family, the church and the community to teach, by example and advocacy, the art of human relations. It is the duty of the educator to train the minds of the students in order that they may reason to a sound and logical conclusion by the recognition and assimilation of factual knowledge.

Dr. von Braun was most persuasive on this point also, and I again quote from his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

With regard to elementary schools, and to some extent also to colleges, there is the question of emphasis on human relations and similar things versus emphasis on just plain intellectual training.

I do not remember that I ever attended any classes in Europe on family life or human relations, or subjects like boy-girl relations at college. We just learned reading, writing, and arithmetic in the lower schools. Later on they taught us technical and scientific subjects, but nothing else.

This whole area of "social adjustment of life," which plays such an important role in American education, is given very little attention in Europe.
Discipline is the cast off of progressive education. No amount of money can make up for the failure to teach discipline/which must be applied from without in formative years/in order that it may be applied from within in mature years.

Progressive education can not be eliminated by Federal funds. Its elimination can be accomplished only through a re-evaluation of our educational purposes/and a return to sound principles and courses of instruction. A national leadership, not with money, but in ideas, would be most helpful in this regard. Such leadership, by stressing the parental, local, and State shortcomings and responsibilities, through a constructive and cooperative approach, can do much toward obtaining a reassertion of parental concern and action/toward revitalizing the American school system. It is a national problem, but one that is soluble at the local level only.

In conclusion, I reiterate that S. 2157 is not designed to overcome national defense deficiencies in the field of education, which is the only basis upon which a Federal education program/could be constitutionally undertaken. There are neither curriculum limitations nor requirements/for proper utilization of training for national defense/after completion of Federally financed education.

Even were the deficiencies of education correctible by the expenditure of funds, the Federal Government is the least economically sound unit to undertake this program; and in addition, the Federal Government is the most expensive and wasteful of any unit/through which the taxpayers' dollar is applied.

If this bill were enacted, with its grants and stipends, more harm by far/would be done through the destruction of individual initiative, than good accomplished from the additional opportunities provided, even though these programs did not overlap existing
financial assistance programs, which they do. The real deficiencies of education, occasioned by the growing trend toward welfare statism and the application of progressive education, will have failed of recognition and be pushed into the background of oblivion until these deficiencies are once again seared into our consciousness by a question of survival.

Let no one deceive himself, this is no defense measure. View it unmasked for what it is -- general Federal aid to education. True, the bill has time limits and the money authorizations could be larger, but it is an entering wedge, and a more "general" approach is hard to imagine.

Education is one of the few fields in which authority of State and local governments have to date remained comparatively potent. There have been minor Federal inroads before, but this bill will constitute an irreparable breach in the ramparts. There is little Federal control in the bill as proposed; but its ineffectiveness, assured by a fallacious approach, will be the excuse for imposition of Federal regulation by future legislative acts. Experience demonstrates that it is more politically expedient to pile bad legislation on bad legislation, than to resort to repeal of an unworkable existing program.

Before this measure is voted on, the Senate should realize the dangerous and fallacious philosophy which the bill exemplifies.

END