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ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) ON SENATE FLOOR, AGAINST 'FEDERAL' AID TO EDUCATION PROPOSALS, FEBRUARY 4, 1960.

Mr. President, Senate consideration of a proposed program of general "federal" aid to education involves questions that stem from the very roots of our constitutional federated republican form of government, and therefore, our action on this proposal, may seriously impair the opportunities for continued exercise of individual liberty by the present and future citizens of the United States. It would behoove us to first examine the principles which are affected by such a proposal as the pending business before we become involved in the relative merits—or should I say, preponderantly, at least, the demerits—of the specific programs which are proposed. Accordingly, I have so arranged my remarks.

Currently, it appears to be a common and fashionable fallacy to conceive of our governmental system as a composite of the best features of those democratic or representative type governments which pre-dated the late eighteenth century deliberations of self-emancipated Americans. Such a conception stems from the height of sophistication unadulterated by logical analysis.

Our system of government is novel, and under close scrutiny bears little resemblance to either governments which preceded it, or for that matter, which ostensibly embraced its mechanics but not its total safeguards in the fond hope that they might dance to the tune of individual liberty without paying the full price to the piper.

Only once in the recorded history of mankind have events conspired to bestow on a society both an attitude of public opinion conducive to acceptance of an original philosophy of government, unimpaired by the design of a predecessor government, and also the leadership of men learned in the truths proven by the ageless but
unsuccessful struggle of man to maintain his liberty against the various forms of government formerly designed. Fortunately for those who have enjoyed the fruits of the labors of these great men between the formation of our United States and the present day, those to whom we refer as our founding fathers not only were cognizant of the lessons of history, but also possessed the capabilities of translating their knowledge into the formation of a government in which the deposit of power was on balance with the individual's ability to control it in the interest of his own protection.

Two basic and transcending facts underlay the consideration of those American patriots faced with the awesome task of devising the new government. First, they were conscious of the essentiality of some form of government possessed of a sufficient degree of powers to maintain peace and tranquility. These men were fresh in the memory of a too-weak government which they had so recently experienced in the form of a "continental Congress," which existed under the "Articles of Confederation." In other words, they were conscious of the necessity of removing the government from close proximity to a state of anarchism.

Secondly, they were equally impressed with the fact that "government" or the "State" was invariably the tool of tyranny and the greatest enemy of the individual's liberty. This lesson, learned from an academic consideration of history, had been indelibly impressed on their minds and hearts by the despotic occupant of the British throne.

Those Americans charged in the late 1780's with the invention of a form of government were faced with the difficult and previously unaccomplished task of devising a method of balancing the surrender to the state of sufficient powers to accomplish its intended purpose, on the one hand, against the imperative need to provide protection against its transformation into a tool of tyranny to suppress individual liberty.
Obviously, no single device was or is capable of providing the necessary balance. More important, but less often acknowledged by our sophisticated society of today, no combination of previously used devices was sufficient to adequately accomplish the purpose. As a consequence, the form of government they conceived was comprised of a combination of previously proven and useful safeguards and supplemental innovations specifically designed and weighted to bring the conflicting objectives into balance. Among the proven safeguards utilized was the process of subjecting those who were to exercise the power of the "state" to election at the hand of the people for a continuation of the right to wield that power; another was the utilization of a written Constitution, although they improved on this device by elevating it above the status of other laws, principally by conditioning its amendment to the most widespread approval.

These, and other tried and proven devices, contributed much to the successful accomplishment of their awesome task. It was the innovations, however, which transformed their efforts from the realm of attempts to the realm of achievement.

Foremost among the innovations were the numerous devices which can be characterized within the concept of "split" sovereignty. Departing from the unbroken precedent in previous governments of concentrating the necessary powers of state in a resultant all-powerful sovereign, these wise benefactors of succeeding generations chose to repose varying but lesser degrees of power in a number of sovereigns. The division of powers was accomplished by geographic and jurisdictional circumscription. To several sovereigns they reserved broad jurisdictional powers circumscribed by smaller geographical limitations. These were the States, in whom all sovereignty rested previously within
their boundaries. To the sovereign created without geographical limitations they accomplished a delegation of jurisdictionally narrow powers, specifically enumerated. Following the concept of "split sovereignty" to its practical and logical conclusion, they went further and split the powers of the geographically unlimited sovereign by a division of them among the three branches which comprised that sovereign. In effect, they accomplished a division of the powers derived from the people among what was fourteen sovereigns at that time. Being designed as an implementation of sound principles, rather than an expedient, the structure they erected is now comprised of fifty-one sovereigns--fifty States and a National Government.

Anyone who pictures this structure, as originally conceived and intended, as a pyramidal design has a basic misconception of the safeguards which have provided the essence of novelty, and more importantly, the safeguards of liberty in our government. The relationship between the National Government, and each of the fifty States includes no conduit of authority. There was an act of delegation of sovereign powers initially via the Constitution, and only by amendment of the Constitution--a distinct action within itself, rather than a conduit--can a further exchange of power between sovereigns be accomplished consistent with the original design.

Tyrannical and despotic action can be avoided only so long as the balance between the inherent danger in the powers imposed and the safeguards of individual liberty is maintained. The diminution of any safeguard imperils the balance. The dissolution of any safeguard insures the lack of balance and the deprivation of individual liberty.

The process of erosion stemming from the impatience and lack of wisdom of many of those in subsequent generations has dealt harshly
with the safeguards instilled in the noble institutions inaugurated by
the founding fathers. Many of the safeguards have been reduced in
weight, thereby imperiling the balance. In the consideration of
proposals for a program of "aid" to education by the National Govern-
ment, we stand on the threshold of action that could remove one of the
most weighty safeguards--State sovereignty--and thereby insure a lack
of balance and the destruction of individual liberty. It speaks well
for the governmental system originally instituted that the form has
remained fundamentally unaltered despite the pressures created by the
ambitions, impatience and stupidity of some of those who have gained
positions of power in the interim. It is the substance, rather than
the form, that has suffered from a continual series of usurpations,
occurring almost invariably at the National level.

Among those powers of sovereignty remaining as principal vestiges
of the States, only two now comprise the fabric that binds this safe-
guard into a whole. These two are the police power and the challenged
but surviving control of the educational systems. The deterioration
or removal of either cord will surely cause the complete unraveling of
the already pierced and worn, but composite cloth of "split sovereignty"

Proposals for a program of "aid"--and I challenge the accuracy of
the term in this instance--to education by the National Government
contain inseparable ingredients of control, which, when mixed with
State authority, will form an indissoluble compound unalterably
destructive of State sovereignty and individual liberty.

Let me here and now acknowledge the chorus of denials of the
intention to control, the unquestionably sincere protestations, by the
advocates of action by the National Government's financial intervention
in the field of education. Despite the sincerity which prompts the
denials of intention for control by the National Government, and despite the absence of specific language in the proposals which would effectuate that control, control of education by the National Government remains a basic ingredient of the program. In the light of precedent, arguments to the contrary lack cogency.

Even the most superifical perception must acknowledge that control of the purse necessarily includes power over all dependent on the contents of the purse. Reliance on benevolence is no substitute for autonomy. The indivisible power of control which accompanies any subsidy was recognized and clearly enunciated by the Supreme Court in 1942 in the case of Wickard v. Filburn, (317 US. 111), in which the Court stated: "It is hardly lack of due process for government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Indeed, the conscientious performance of duty by an officeholder requires no less than to insure to the best of his ability that the taxpayers' funds, once appropriated, are wisely utilized.

The precedents in which one must place reliance, rather than in arguments and statements of intention, clearly indicate that National officeholders have been conscientious, even zealous, in exercising control over funds passing through the National treasury. Although this has by no means insured wise application in every instance, it has demonstrated not only the will, but also the ability, to control activities that are recipients of the "largess" of the National Government.

Specific examples are numerous. Let us consider, first, a precedent in the specific field which we are now considering—that is, grants by the National Government for educational purposes. In 1917, the Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act. Although it did not involve
a program of grants to "general" education, it did authorize appropriations for grants to the specific field of vocational education. It is worthy of note that much of the impetus enabling the passage of the bill stemmed from the national peril created by the First World War. Even with regard to this program of grants to a limited area in the field of education, the question of "Federal" usurpation of the exclusive responsibility and obligation reserved to the States in the field of education was raised in the debate. Then, as now, the proponents of the program sincerely disclaimed any intention or purpose to inject "Federal" regulation or control into the operation of vocational educational programs which they sought to assist.

For instance, Senator Page, on July 24, 1916, denied such intention, and I quote from Volume 53 of the Congressional Record, at page 11465:

"The bill does not seek to take from the States the great burden of the maintenance of schools. It does not seek to deprive the States of the privilege of proceeding in matters of education in their own way. Nothing has been more carefully safeguarded in this bill than the autonomy of the States in the matter of schools."

Mr. President, those were unquestionably sincere words, well phrased and aptly sufficient as words can be to allay the fears of those who divined the specter of "Federal" control lurking behind the Smith-Hughes Act. Subsequent events have refuted the words of Senator Page and confirmed the worst fears of those who saw in the well-meaning but illusory language of the Smith-Hughes Act the strong arm of centralized authority. There is now in existence a 108-page booklet of regulations propounded by the National Government with regard to the program established by the Smith-Hughes Act. That
regulation is synonymous with control is attested to by no less authority on the use of verbiage than Mr. Webster himself. This precedent alone is more cogent than the assurances of my protagonist colleagues to the contrary. Their words bear a familiar ring of similarity to those successfully spoken by Senator Page in 1916.

Illustrations in fields other than that of education, either general or specialized, illustrate the principle and truth that "Federal" control follows "Federal" grants. Even in programs in which the question of control by the National Government has not been raised, we find most impressive examples. The Interstate Highway Program was undoubtedly drafted to accomplish the exclusion of control from the grantor of funds. A recent press report, however, indicated that the State of Oregon was compelled to change the color of the center lines of its highways from yellow to white in order to be in compliance with this "no control" program. The color of a highway center line may be considered by many as a small matter, but viewed from another light, it is indicative of the extensiveness of the control which inevitably accompanies or follows any grant by the "Federal" Government.

Let us now examine the objects of the proposed program in an effort to pinpoint the urgency, and the impatience with the fetters imposed in the interest of individual freedom.

A campaign to secure grants from the National Government profess- edly to assist education, typified by unreliable propaganda and self-serving agitation, has prevailed almost continuously for the last 15 years. Initial success or even encouragement was denied to those who sought this end, largely because the proposals were initially considered from an objective viewpoint without either hysteria or emotion. I am far from satisfied that emotion and hysteria--not to mention a
contemplation of political fortunes--is absent from the consideration now being directed to these proposals.

As I have previously stated, I question the accuracy of the use of the term "aid to education" to describe the function contemplated by the utilization of Federal grants in this instance. Education is more than the process of spending money or building schools, or hiring teachers, to promote the general well-being of a group of individuals. At the hands of professional educators, we find no degree of unanimity as to the meaning of the word "education" itself. My personal preference is to consider education as the process by which an individual mind is disciplined to a point that it can discriminate between fact and fiction, and utilize the facts to reason to a sound conclusion. To this process money may be essential, but make no mistake--money provides no assurance of the success of the process.

An analysis of the propaganda on behalf of the proposed programs reveals that the principal pitch of the agitation is tuned to a comparison of the educational product of our own system with that of our international antagonist, the Soviet Union. Most of the propaganda is quite blunt in this regard. For instance, I have seen in a number of publications the assertion that Russia, with approximately the same total number of students as the United States, is now training 40 times as many students in physics as the United States; 18 times as many students in chemistry as the United States; 15 times as many students in trigonometry as the United States; 8 times as many students in foreign languages as the United States; and 4 times as many students in mathematics as the United States. The assertion is almost always so phrased as to convey the impression that the Russian system is therefore superior, and further, that the reason for the superiority
lies in a greater financial effort being exerted by the Soviet Union in the field of education. In actuality, such is not the case. If indeed the Soviet Union is training such proportionately larger percentages of those students in the fields enumerated and to an equal degree of proficiency, their success lies in some other quarter than surpassing the United States in financial effort. Available information indicates that the United States is spending three times as much per capita on education as the Soviet Union. The UNESCO report, "The Financing of Education," indicates that the Soviet Union expenditures for education equals $34.17 per capita compared with a $103.94 per capita expenditure in the United States in 1956. Even in percentages of gross national product devoted to the education process, the United States makes a greater effort in the field of education by spending 4.3 per cent of the gross national product—and this is computed for the fiscal year 1955/56—as compared to 4.1 per cent of the gross national product so employed in the Soviet Union. Even these figures are favorable to the Soviet Union as is readily evident from a consideration of the activities which are included in the expenditures to which I have referred from the Soviet Union. The "educational-cultural activities" of the Soviet Union include subsidies to finance deficits of state-controlled political rallies and rural clubs; deficits of radio, press and television systems of the country; state-owned theaters and national symphony orchestras, public libraries, orphanages, lecture series to popularize scientific and engineering knowledge and establishments, including money which directly supports military development programs—all of which are in addition to what we normally consider the activities included in the educational field. Whatever advantage which may exist, if any, in the Soviet educational system, clearly does not stem from a superior financial investment.
I do not mean to imply that our educational system in the United States is beyond improvement nor even that it is without deficiencies in some instances, both financial and otherwise. As a matter of fact, a study of the current educational system in the United States reveals certain deficiencies which bear no relation whatever to lack of funds. The testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee suggests the conclusion that leadership in ideas, rather than money, would best serve to improve the system for national defense needs. One of the deficiencies to which I refer is the use of so-called "progressive" education practices and concepts.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. 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 continuing to attempt 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.
Progressive education ignores 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.

Discipline is the castoff 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 cannot be eliminated by funds, whether
from the Federal, State, or local level. National leadership, not
with money but in ideas, by stressing the parental, local, and State
shortcomings and responsibilities, could do much toward the solution
of this problem which is national in scope, but which is capable of
solution at the local level only.

In the long run, we as legislators, must share with other
national leaders the blame for a major part of our educational
inadequacies. Rather than having encouraged ambition, initiative,
and inventiveness, we have, by the enactment of welfare legislation
and programs, encouraged indolence among the citizens of this
country. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and
not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country,
including the educational system, remained strong and competitive.
Free enterprise and free competition insure that one may gain
in return for industry and initiative, both the respect of his
fellowman and financial independence. Attempts to make the
Federal Government be all things to all men, on the other hand,
insure the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the
destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative.

There are also, as I have acknowledged, deficiencies in some
instances in the area of financial support for education. I am
personally inclined to think that these deficiencies are more limited
in number than appears to be the consensus of opinion. My conclusion
is based on specific statistics dealing with the expenditures for
education in the United States in both past and recent years. For
instance, between the years of 1952 and 1956, general expenditures
of Federal, State and local governments for education increased by
48 per cent, while for all other purposes expenditures increased only
4 per cent. The source of these figures is the United States Bureau
of the Census. Between 1932 and 1958, per capita expenditure for
education increased from $43.93 to $111.67. This continuing increase
in per capita expenditure can be more readily appreciated when
considered in light of the fact that expenditures for education in
percentage of national income have increased from 1.4 per cent in
1890, to 5.75 per cent in 1958. Using even another gauge, we can
compare the trend of public school expenditures with personal
consumption expenditures. Between the fiscal years 1929/30 and
1955/56, personal consumption expenditures doubled; and public school
expenditures tripled. These latter statistics are based on constant
dollars so that they do not reflect the effect of inflation we have
experienced in the interim. It is also notable that during this
same period public school enrollment increased 21 per cent and the
population increased 37 per cent.

To put it mildly, these figures absolutely refute such
assertions as that made by William G. Carr, Executive Secretary of
the National Education Association, who stated, and I quote, "To put it succinctly, in terms of every need, America's schools are not holding their own. Indeed, they are rapidly losing ground, and have been doing so since about 1930." This statement of Mr. Carr's, quoted from Teachers For Tomorrow, is but one example of the fallacious and misleading statements publicized with regard to this question. Judgments of this body should be based, not on assertions of persons who have axes to grind, but rather on substantiated and reliable facts.

I would be remiss if I did not mention at this point that the excellent support which the education process in the United States has received, has been forthcoming in spite of, rather than with the assistance of, the National Government. Indeed, to me this record is astounding, especially in view of the fact that the National Government has continuously usurped additional sources of revenue with its tax system.

One conclusion stands head and shoulders above all else when the foregoing facts are considered impartially. Regardless of our accomplishments as compared to those of the Soviet Union, our deficiency exists in the amount of education we are receiving for each dollar spent, much more than it does from a deficiency of dollars to be spent for education.

In the area of school construction the arguments of the proponents of this program appear baseless from a statistical point of view. Certainly, and I say this advisedly, the figures on classroom shortages published by the U. S. Office of Education give no such basis, neither from their superficial significance, nor from the point of view of their reliability. To illustrate my point,
it is only necessary to review the estimates by the U. S. Office of Education of the size of classroom shortages in recent years. In 1950, the U. S. Office of Education estimated that as of 1950, the backlog of need exceeded 250,000 classrooms. In the fiscal year 1952/53 the Office of Education, based on the results of the "Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey," estimated the shortage at 312,000 classrooms. In the fiscal year 1953/54 the Office of Education reported that the classroom shortage had grown to 340,000. Then in the fiscal year 1954/55, the U. S. Commissioner of Education testified before a House of Representatives hearing that the classroom shortage had reached 370,000. On October 5, 1956, newspapers quoted the Office of Education as estimating the shortage at 250,000 classrooms. The official release, which was dated October 4, 1956, estimated the shortage at 336,000 classrooms. Subsequently, in 1956, the Office of Education released a survey of school building shortages for the fall of 1956, as reported by State Education Departments, indicating the national shortage was 159,000 classrooms. In a circular released on January 23, 1958, the Office of Education released its fall 1957 survey of classroom shortages, as reported by State Departments of Education, showing the national shortage as 140,400 classrooms.

Keep in mind that the figures quoted do not represent projections of shortages for future years by the Office of Education, but profess to specify the shortages actually existing in the specified period. If taken at their face value, these figures indicate that our action here today, as far as school construction is concerned, is much ado about nothing. These figures reflect a decrease between the fiscal year 1953/54 and January 28, 1958, of classroom shortage.
from 340,000 to 140,400. This would appear to indicate that during the last five years, the current need was not only being met, but that the previously existing shortage has been reduced by approximately 200,000 classrooms, or more than cut in half. Therefore, if these official figures are to be relied upon, the entire existing classroom shortage, whatever it may be, will be eliminated very shortly without any "busy-body" attitude on the part of the National Government. I would make it clear that I, for one, do not consider the figures on classroom shortages, promulgated by the U. S. Office of Education, either accurate or reliable. I have every reason to believe that the figures quoted by this agency are overstated in every instance, and in some or many, not only overstated, but grossly exaggerated. My conclusion in this regard does not stem entirely from the unrealistic fluctuations apparent on the face of these figures, although that is some basis for judgment in itself. However, I have a much more substantial ground for my disbelief. As is indicated by the reports on classroom shortages from the U. S. Office of Education, the figures were obtained by surveys of State education agencies through the media of questionnaires, prepared and promulgated by the U. S. Office of Education. To put it bluntly, the questionnaires are rigged. I will be specific. The most current report of the U. S. Office of Education indicates that the State of South Carolina has a classroom shortage of approximately 1801. In order to ascertain the accuracy of this figure, I contacted the State Department of Education in the State of South Carolina, who acknowledged that the total figure shown on their completed questionnaire to the U. S. Office of Education, was, in fact, 1801. It was the explanation of what comprised this figure, however, which revealed the deception.
In the first category of deception, fell 789 of the classrooms of the 1801 reported as the existing shortage. The questionnaire submitted presupposes the maximum ratio of 36 pupils per room, and in every instance where the number of pupils exceed 36, a shortage of one classroom was indicated on the questionnaire. This result was reached despite the fact that in a given school there might be 40 pupils in one room, and across the hall, only 20 in the other. In other words, despite the fact that the total number of pupils was only 60, the fact that one room contained more than 36 and was therefore overcrowded under the standards adopted by the U. S. Office of Education, there resulted a shortage of one classroom. So much for 789 of the 1801 classrooms reported to be the shortage in South Carolina. Now let us turn to what was described to me quite candidly as the "synthetic shortage," and this consisted of 1012 of the total 1801 shortage. The 1012 classrooms were found necessary for replacement of existing classrooms which did not meet optimum standards of construction, space and arrangements. There is no denial that these classrooms could be improved, but it is unquestioned by authorities in the State of South Carolina that the classrooms designated for replacement, and thereby included in the shortage, are adequate at the present time. One specific example of the type of classroom which did not meet the standards, and therefore was shown as a shortage because of the need for replacement, was in the case where an auditorium had been partitioned into three classrooms. Certainly the design of such an arrangement would not be that which an architect would recommend for new construction, but it does provide housing which is warm, dry and comfortable. These facts go a long way toward explaining the astronomical shortages reported from time to time by the U. S. Office of Education.
Another point which highlights the inaccuracy of the application of the term "aid to education" in this instance arises from the effect which financial assistance by the National Government would have on local initiative in matters pertaining to the educational process. If in the recent Congressional hearings on education bills, there was one conclusion by the witnesses which approached unanimity, it was on the essentiality of maintaining and stimulating local initiative. Education is not a matter that can be isolated in a classroom designed for that purpose, any more than education can be considered only in terms of physical plant. It is a process which, if successful, must draw from the totality of the individual's experience, including not only that obtained in a classroom, but also the experiences in the home, the community and the church. Perhaps in this modern age, when "homework" is not as fashionable among the more sophisticated of our school personnel, they might argue that the out-of-school experience contributes less than it formerly did. Nevertheless, only those who refuse to acknowledge reality would deny that the attitudes of parents are reflected to a major degree in the attitude of a child toward the educational process.

There are compelling reasons to believe that parental apathy constitutes, at present, a substantial handicap. If there be any truth in the adage that wherever a man's treasure lies, there will his heart be also, the remaining parental interest may be tied, to a degree, to the parents' direct financial support of the local educational system. Should the National Government, far removed from the scene, undertake by a vast program to usurp this responsibility, parental apathy is sure to increase. The result would be damage rather than "aid" to education, regardless of the
number of classrooms constructed with Federal money. A house does not a home make, and neither does a classroom educate a child.

The most perplexing question raised by this entire proposal concerns the apparent assumption that the National Government has a source of income that transcends the financial ability of the combined citizenry of all the States of the United States. It is quite true that the National Government now collects three-fourths of all taxes. Regardless of that fact, however, in the past 30 years the National Government's revenues have been inadequate to meet budget expenditures 25 times. In total, National taxes have brought in only three-fourths of the National outlays and the other one-fourth was covered by raising the National debt 270 billion dollars, an average of nine billion dollars a year.

The National Government has no source of revenue save the taxpayers, each of whom is subject to taxation by one or more of the several States. How then can the argument be made that, since the States and local communities are not capable of adequately supporting the educational systems, the National Government must do it for them? Perhaps those who propound this argument are thinking in terms of borrowed funds. If so, their thoughts are not only unsound from a fiscal viewpoint—the National deficit is now approximately 292 billion dollars—but also fallacious, for the States are in better financial condition and therefore better able to borrow than is the National Government itself. There is no magic in the Federal Treasury.

The entire matter may be summarized quite succinctly. State sovereignty is one of the principal weights holding the balance between the tyrannically inclined power of the National Government
and the safeguards of individual liberty. The proposal now under consideration for grants by the National Government to the educational system in the various States will be accompanied by control from the National Government. This control would destroy one of the last vestiges of State sovereignty and imperil the individual liberty which that sovereignty was instituted to protect. That such control will follow is established by a clear pattern of precedence far more convincing than the denials and protestations to the contrary.

The educational system is not being neglected in the United States from a financial standpoint. We are devoting approximately three times the expenditures per capita for education as is Russia. It is more education for the dollar rather than more dollars for education which is needed.

There is no sound basis for assuming that the States cannot and are not meeting their classroom needs, on the whole. Figures to the contrary are obviously unreliable and are compiled in an effort to accomplish a desired impression.

To adopt this program would have the effect of destroying local initiative, thereby damaging, rather than aiding, the educational system.

The National Government is inferior in financial ability to the States collectively; it struggles with a debt of $292 billion. The National Government can send no funds to the States which it has not first, either by taxation or inflation, taken from the citizens of the States.

To adopt such a proposal would be the height of foolishness.