

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS



The American Baptist Convention
The Southern Baptist Convention
The National Baptist Convention of America
The National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.
The North American Baptist General Conference
The Baptist General Conference of America



1628 16th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C. ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ C. EMANUEL CARLSON, Ph.D., Executive Director

This monthly newsletter is sent free to editors, executives, and institutions. In order to cover cost of production and mailing a charge of \$1.00 per year is made to all others.

February 1958

HILL-BURTON BILL TO AID EDUCATION

The January Report from the Capital reviewed a number of bills offered for the strengthening of American education, particularly in the area of science and mathematics. The most significant addition to that list of bills is S. 3187 (H.R. 10381) which contains the Democratic party proposals to be set alongside of the administration suggestions reported previously.

While all these bills are referred to committee and a revised recommendation may be brought to the floor, the chances of the Democratic proposals are normally better in a Democratic-controlled Congress. An estimate of the preliminary conference work can be made from the sponsorship of the bill. In the Senate it carries the names of Senators Lister Hill (D.-Ala.), John Sparkman (D.-Ala.), J. W. Fulbright (D.-Ark.), James E. Murray (D.-Mont.), John O. Pastore (D.-R.I.), William Langer (R.-N.D.), Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn.), Robert S. Kerr (D.-Okla.), Irving M. Ives (R.-N.Y.), Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.), Estes Kefauver (D.-Tenn.), Henry M. Jackson (D.-Wash.), Thomas C. Hennings, Jr. (D.-Mo.), W. Kerr Scott (D.-N.C.), Ralph Yarborough (D.-Texas), Stuart Symington (D.-Mo.), Warren G. Magnuson (D.-Wash.), Theodore F. Green (D.-R.I.), William Proxmire (D.-Wis.), Dennis Chavez (D.-N.M.), A. S. Mike Monroney (D.-Okla.), Paul H. Douglas (D.-Ill.), Mike Mansfield (D.-Mont.), John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), Russell B. Long (D.-La.), John A. Carroll (D.-Colo.), Richard L. Neuberger (D.-Ore.).

The companion bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 10381, was introduced by Rep. Carl Elliott (D.-Ala.).

The purpose of the bill is stated in these words:

"To strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes."

The 74 page bill is drafted under fourteen titles, the first of which is made up of general provisions and definitions. Title I declares the need for federal aids, reaffirms that "States and local communities have and must retain control and primary responsibility for public education," and prohibits any construction of the bill which would involve federal control of education.

STUDENT AIDS THROUGH SCHOLARSHIPS, LOANS, AND WORK

Titles II, III, and IV outline in turn programs for 40,000 scholarships per year for people completing their secondary school work, for \$40,000,000 of student loan funds per year, and for \$25,000,000 of grants to educa-

tional institutions per year with which to afford student work opportunities. This program would run for six years.

The scholarships, to be known as "National Defense Scholarships," would be \$1,000 per academic year for not more than four years nor beyond the completion of the first baccalaureate degree.

Any state wishing to participate would establish "through its State educational agency, a State commission on scholarships and student loans broadly representative of scientific, educational (at both the secondary and higher educational level), and public interests in the State." The state commission would submit to the U. S. Commissioner of Education a plan for their state which would meet the requirements of this bill.

The state commission plan would have to determine which institutions in the state are "institutions of higher education," what the requirements for student eligibility would be, and plan for an annual review of the proficiency of all recipients in the state.

The scholarships would be distributed among the several states on the basis of the proportion of the nation's population ages 18-21 which is resident in that state.

"Each State commission shall, in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability, select persons to be awarded such scholarships who show exceptional aptitude for higher education, giving special consideration to those with superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language."

Twenty thousand additional scholarships, to be granted on a similar basis, are authorized for the first year of the program to go to students who are already attending college and who are therefore ineligible to compete for National Defense Scholarships.

The "National Defense Student Loans" would be similarly administered by the state commission but would be distributed to students on the basis of need, enrollment, capability and residence.

The loans to a student are not to exceed \$1,000 in a given academic year and are not to run for more than four years, nor beyond

graduation. The loans would bear interest at two percent beginning when repayment is to begin, namely, one year after the person ceases to pursue a full-time course of study. Repayment would be by graduated periodic installments running for a ten-year period. No interest would accrue and no payments be made while the person is a full-time student, spends not more than three years in the Armed Forces, nor while he serves as a full-time teacher in an elementary, secondary, or higher educational institution. Each academic year of teaching will cancel twenty percent of the principal and interest due at the beginning of that academic year.

The student work grants program is reminiscent of the National Youth Administration program of the depression. It provides grants to institutions of higher education to help pay for student work programs, but not more than fifty percent of the cost of the program in a given school. Distribution among the states would be on the basis of the proportion which student population in that state bears to the total nation wide student population in higher education.

GRANTS FOR SCIENCE TEACHING FACILITIES

Part A of Title V proposes an appropriation of \$40,000,000 per year for six years to "State educational agencies" to be "expended solely for projects, approved by the State educational agency, for the acquisition of science teaching facilities for use in elementary and secondary schools."

In order to participate a state would have to submit a plan through its state educational agency setting forth principles for determining the priority of projects, plans for public hearings on each project, and providing for standards on a state level for the teaching facilities to be acquired.

The state would have to match the Federal money, and the Federal grants would be distributed on the basis of an "allotment ratio" which would be based partially on per child income in the state.

Part B of Title V proposes \$40,000,000 per year for six years "to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education which carry out programs for the acquisition of science teaching facilities." The grants would be through the U. S. Commissioner of

Education directly to the institution and would be made under the regulations and the supervision of the Commissioner.

The distribution among the States would be based on the number of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in institutions in that state. The institution would make application setting forth its program, and showing the cost thereof. The Commissioner would not be permitted to grant more than fifty percent of the total cost of any proposed program.

It will be noted that many of the institutions benefited in Part B will no doubt be private institutions.

SUMMER SCHOOL, EXTENSION COURSES, AND FELLOWSHIPS

The bill provides, in Titles VI and VII, for aids to teachers who are willing to press ahead in their studies, \$75,000,000 per year for six years with which to pay teachers who go to summer school, \$25,000,000 to pay other teachers who take extension courses, and funds for granting annually 1,500 fellowships bearing stipends of \$2,000 or more per year, plus costs of instruction, with \$400 additional for each dependent.

For the first two of these the Commissioner would make grants on the basis of state plans submitted through the state's educational agency. In making plans for the fellowships he would be aided by the "National Advisory Council on Science and Education," the organization of which is provided by the bill.

ADDITIONAL PLANS

Funds (\$15,000,000 per year) for State programs of guidance and counseling are proposed in Title VIII, with another \$6,000,000 per year for institutes in the field to be held at institutions of higher learning on a contract basis. Title IX projects consultants (\$10,000,000 per year) in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, so as to keep teachers in the secondary schools well informed regarding developments in their fields.

Title X plans for research and experimentation in the use of radio, television, and motion pictures by means of grants-in-aid and contracts. Other titles provide for "Con-

gressional citations" to the highest five percent of the graduating high school classes, an extension of vocational education, and a "Science information service."

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Speaking in behalf of the bill at its introduction, Sen. John O. Pastore (D.-R.I.) said:

"When only three-fourths of one penny out of every dollar of our national product is spent on higher education, when only 30 percent of our high-school graduates get to college, it is high time that we have a brave attack like this upon the problem."

Sen. William Proxmire (D.-Wis.) requested "that the Hill-Elliott and Morse-Clark bills make a comprehensive package that will enable Congress to do the education job that must be done."

(The Morse-Clark bill, S. 1134, introduced in February, 1957, would provide one billion dollars a year exclusively and entirely for primary and secondary education. Half the funds would be distributed among the states on the basis of school-age population. In order to equalize to some extent the educational opportunities among the states by providing additional help to states having less financial resources on which to draw for education, the other half of the funds available would be distributed in inverse proportion to the income per school-age child in each state.)

Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D.-Texas) said:

"Our most precious resource is the human resource, and it is the most neglected and wasted of all. We dam our rivers, conserve our oil, and enrich our soil, but we let our youth go untrained."

When he introduced the House bill, Rep. Carl Elliott (D.-Ala.) outlined briefly the provisions of the measure and continued:

"The bill is practical. It provides Federal aid only in those areas where such aid will be fruitful.

"My bill is safe. At every point local, State and institutional control of education is maintained, preserved, and guaranteed.

"My bill is urgent. As a nation, we can no longer tolerate the waste of our intellectual talent. We must provide an opportunity for every good mind to enter America's arsenal of brains.

"...this bill will stimulate a mighty upsurge in the quality and quantity of our education. It has no compulsion. It is voluntary. It provides opportunity. Our democratic system will do the rest."

TIME FOR PROGNOSIS

To grasp the full scope of the long range effects of a piece of legislation is difficult even when the law is comparatively simple. To prognosticate adequately the effects of a bill including many items which affect directly or indirectly the life of many professions and many institutions calls for superhuman insight and foresight. The legislators who discuss and enact an education bill will undoubtedly be greatly surprised in the manner in which it works out. Now is the time for the American public to do its best thinking and to respond to its highest motives.

What would this bill really do for the teachers and their profession? One can see how it may cause more people to be carried into it. One can also see how it may enable some to go ahead with studies. Will it hold more scientists in the schools? Will it attract the able people who are dedicated to public service? Will this bill bleed other professions which are of equal importance of the talents needed in their fields?

Our readers will have noted that this bill primarily suggests the use of federal funds for aiding certain people who are in educational work or certain others who are seeking an education at the post-high school level. How will the introduction of special government subsidized categories of personnel affect the total morale of the profession? Is there a possibility that the new categories could cause the withdrawal of other categories, just as the introduction of some "cheap money" causes the "high cost money" to leave the market? If so, we could end up with less rather than more teachers.

Does this measure really place the productive power of the American 400 billion dollar

economy behind American education? With a tidal wave of new college students already coming over the horizon, this bill seems to have the possible power to add a second though smaller wave hard upon the first. And in the face of these two waves the educational institutions will stand with their treasuries as empty and their buildings as inadequate as they were before the first wave appeared. The fundamental burden, the real load, of American education still rests on real estate taxes and such income from sales taxes and state income taxes as the states can pick up without causing people and business to flee to another state.

If this is the net result of the legislation, it could be a stop-gap development but not the answer to the Russian progress which has been attained by placing a large share of the national income into the support of the nation's institutions for the education of the personnel needed for their economic plans.

Finally, it is in order for us to ask, how will all this affect the churches in their distinctive spiritual role and ministry? Could these developments leave mostly second rate abilities for the church-related vocations? Or conversely, in spite of the "preference" given to science and mathematics, will federal scholarships and loans become the means for training the educational if not also the pulpit leadership of the churches? This is not belated pay for services already rendered to the government as were the G. I. education bills. This is pay in advance for services to be rendered to the government in the future. If this includes the leadership of the churches, then many questions arise regarding the religious liberty of the taxpayer and regarding the relationship of the churches to the nation and to their Lord.

Now is the time for prognosis and discussion. The nation needs all the personal and institutional selflessness and wisdom available in order to conceive an educational vision which is adequate for our age and which is consonant with our best national insights.

Hearings on education are now in progress in both the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor.