

# 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.

March 1958

### SENATORS CLARK AND MORSE WEIGH VALUES

Senators Joseph S. Clark (D., Pa.) and Wayne Morse (D., Ore.) teamed up this week to put themselves on record as considering adequate federal aid to education to be more important than advancing integration or maintaining the present interpretation of separation of church and state. This coast to coast teamwork developed in a hearing before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, chaired by Senator Lister Hill (D., Ala.).

A careful reading of the 38-page stenographic record of the testimony given by Senator Clark reveals the clear assumption that federal aid to education is not politically available unless the segregation issue is kept out of the debate and unless church schools are included in the provisions.

Both these senators advocate the use of funds raised by the income tax as being the only source which can provide an adequate support for American education. State income taxes cannot equal the need because business and people tend to move away from high-tax states. The political balance on this economic point is such that either the segregation issue or the parochial issue results in defeat, the senators hold.

With reference to the tax situation, Senator Clark put it this way:

"For example, the single biggest industrial plant in Pennsylvania is the new Fairless plant of the United States Steel Com-

pany in Bucks County. The plant is located in one relatively small school district and pays its property taxes to that district. Yet, most of the workers brought into that county to work in the plant live across the boundary in another school district, which has not much to tax beyond homes.

"The property tax may have been rather effective in early America, where wealth was largely represented by agricultural land, other real estate, and tangible goods which were rather evenly distributed. But, in today's corporate society, wealth and ability to pay are concentrated in huge aggregations. Neither local property taxes nor state taxes--which are largely sales and excise levies--tap these concentrations. The Federal tax system does.

"State and local school districts can be blackmailed, and are, by threats from taxpayers to move out.

"Each new tax increase is met by the cry, 'You're creating a climate bad for industry.' A small group of big taxpayers, or even a single taxpayer, can often exercise an inordinate influence on a local school budget or bond issue.

"The Federal Government, because its tax incidence is universal, is not subject to this kind of pressure."

A United States Chamber of Commerce representative presented testimony at the same

hearing in opposition to federal aid, either scholarships or grants-in-aid.

Senator Clark made the point that if the central government of the U.S.S.R. would quit supporting their educational program and leave that to the provinces, America would no longer need worry about Russian educational advances. Both Clark and Morse made it clear that they hold education to be more important than "integration" or "separation" which they also prize.

#### THE ACTUAL RECORD

The most pertinent section of the stenographic record dealing with these topics is as follows:

Senator Clark. "I do not want to go into this at great length, and I will not, but I do think that we are going to pretty nearly have to take out from under the table and put right on top of it the questions of race and religion, which are such an awful handicap in the Congress in passing adequate legislation on this educational subject.

"I am keenly aware as anybody of this, because the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania consists of practically every category of American citizen, in every spectrum, in almost every kind of religion, and our population is changing.

"I, for one, would strongly oppose before this committee and on the Floor of the Senate any effort to use an education bill for the purpose of forwarding integration. I do not believe there is any member of the Senate who is a stronger advocate of school integration than I am. I believe it has worked in Pennsylvania. I think, over the long run, it can work elsewhere, but I just do not think we ought to use this means of an educational bill for that end.

"I would like to go publicly on record for the fact that I would hope very much that we are going to keep the whole school integration problem out of the school bill, which I hope this committee will come out with.

"Similarly, we have a very serious problem with respect to religion, and I think we ought to face that, too. I would like to

run away from it because it is as acute in my state as it is anywhere in the country. I think our statistics show at the moment that there are 2,800,000 Roman Catholics, 2,900,000 members of the Protestant church, 350,000 members of the Jewish religion, and the balance of our 11,000,000 citizens are not affiliated with any church, one way or the other.

"So this is a real hot potato with me.

"Yet, I must say that, particularly in the field of higher education and despite all the argument about separation of church and state, of which I am largely in accord, that we have got to find some way by which we can put to work all of our schools, whatever they be, in the interest of getting better training for our American boys and girls at the graduate level.

"I must say this is the dilemma which I have not found the answer to. But I see no bill which will adequately provide for classroom construction for colleges and universities. I am sure the reason is because many of us, and I hate to do it, I hate to be courageous about this, will not face up to the fact that we are going to bring a swarm of hornets down our necks.

"Senator Morse. Will you yield?

"Senator Clark. I will yield.

"Senator Morse. I do not want to take any time, except to pinpoint this matter.

"I want to say that I not only share but I have shared Senator Clark's position for years and have been active as the Senator from Pennsylvania, except that I have stressed it on the grade and high school level.

"I take the position that the national interest is as great in a boy or girl going to a so-called private religious school or private non-religious school, as going to a public school. There are many facets to this, but let us take a look at the public contribution these schools make by using this.

"Suppose you and I could press a button right now and close the doors of every pri-

private school in America and the youngsters appear at the public school doors tomorrow morning. You would have a pretty good idea of the public contribution these private schools are making.

"So the problem, it seems to me, is to find the line of distinction between the educational contributions and work of the private schools and its other activities, religious or otherwise.

"In my judgment, what a boy or girl gets in a public school by Federal aid a boy or girl in private school should get by Federal aid.

"You do not have to tell me how impolitic that is in many places, but I think the principle is so answerably sound that some of us have to be willing to lead with our chins.

"Senator Clark. I think the Senator and I concur.

"I will leave this subject with this one sentence. Whether an American boy is a Baptist, Lutheran or Roman Catholic, he is still a good American, and he is getting a good education in those private schools, in modern institutions--not all of them--as he is getting in the public school system, and sometimes he is getting a better education.

"I think we ought to face up to that fact and be prepared to meet it head-on. I, for one, would be."

#### THE ISSUES

In these debates several major issues or questions are emerging as points of analysis.

1. Is there a difference between the use of government funds for support of private and church colleges as compared with the use of such funds for elementary and secondary schools? Note Senator Clark's "particularly in the field of higher education...."

2. Can the general educational content of a school be separated from the religious objectives of the sectarian school so that government funds can be made available for the general education contribution of a private school? (Note Senator Morse's idea.)

3. Is there a difference between the aiding of private non-sectarian institutions and the aiding of sectarian institutions which are committed to religious objectives, religious curricula, and a religious climate?

4. What supervision of an educational program must accompany the use of public funds for such a program? Note Clark said "not all of them...."

The testimony did not raise the constitutional issue as to whether it is legally permissible to use public funds for support of private or sectarian institutions. Neither has the discussion so far faced up to the issue of religious liberty involved in taxing the total population for the advancement of a program of religious education.

The political estimates involved above may be right or wrong at this point. Certainly they constitute a challenge to all who believe in separation of church and state to demonstrate the political significance of their interest in education.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, before which the hearings were held, and which will report an education bill for consideration of the full Senate body, consists of the following members (Democrats in left hand column, Republicans in the right hand one):

|                                |                               |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| James E. Murray<br>(Mont.)     | H. Alexander Smith<br>(N.J.)  |
| John F. Kennedy<br>(Mass.)     | Irving M. Ives (N.Y.)         |
| Pat McNamara (Mich.)           | William A. Purtell<br>(Conn.) |
| Wayne Morse (Ore.)             | Barry Goldwater<br>(Ariz.)    |
| Strom Thurmond (S.C.)          | Gordon Allott (Colo.)         |
| Ralph W. Yarborough<br>(Texas) | John Sherman Cooper<br>(Ky.)  |

For members of the corresponding House committee, see the January "Report."

#### WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY

Few Washington conferences assemble as much "top-level leadership" from government and from non-governmental organizations as did the conference on foreign aspects of national security on February 25. This

bipartisan effort in behalf of public support for foreign aid was addressed by the President, the Vice-President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and several other high level administrators. For the Democrats, Ex-President Harry S. Truman, presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson, and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson appeared.

On the subject of moral foundations the Conference heard Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, President of the National Council of Churches of Christ, Rabbi Theodore L. Adams, President of the Synagogue Council of America, and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Auxiliary Bishop of New York.

On invitation from the White House more than 1400 leaders assembled for the meeting.

Speakers and participants were largely agreed that the United States must have military strength, but that such strength alone will not meet the challenge of our foreign situation. Funds for loans to underdeveloped countries, technical assistance, and respect for the aspirations of the many new nations are all involved.

While the importance of military, technical, and financial aid stood out as important the diversity of motivations for such aid was also clear. The differences between the purposes of the church and those of the state came into the sharpest focus when Dr. Dahlberg spoke of his son who serves as a medical missionary in an underdeveloped area and is trying to serve 200,000 people.

The church-state questions which are involved also came into focus when Bishop Sheen recommended that the United States "utilize the great forces of service and charity which are presently scattered throughout the world. I refer to the thousand agencies of social betterment of Christian missionaries and in some instances Jewish workers who live with the underprivileged people; who speak their language, share their hunger and are identified with the people. I pass over our own organization of which I am the National President, which last year aided 85,000,000 children, sick, orphans, lepers--about 80% of which were not Christian. I call attention to

Protestants who spend \$44,000,000 annually in education, agricultural farms, hospitals, leprosarria, dispensaries in the underprivileged countries of the world.

"Why should not some foreign aid be funneled through these agencies ~~exclusively~~ for social and medical care of the underprivileged. I am not speaking of aid for the purposes of Apostolate, for Our Lord refused to be a Bread-King."

The Bishop's idea is not fundamentally new for the American government has for some years been giving surplus agricultural products to religious and charitable organizations for distribution abroad.

Early this year the Department of Agriculture reported that 3,669,000,000 pounds of surplus food, valued at \$827,000,000, have been donated to religious and voluntary organizations for distribution to needy persons overseas since 1953. More than one-third of the total volume were 1,250,000,000 pounds of dried milk, valued at \$237,000,000. Highest in dollar value were 360,000,000 pounds of butter and butter oil worth \$270,000,000.

Also given to the voluntary agencies were 808,000,000 pounds of wheat and wheat flour, valued at \$55,000,000; 117,000,000 pounds of dry beans worth \$11,000,000; 376,000,000 pounds of cheese, valued at \$167,000,000; 383,000,000 pounds of corn and cornmeal, which cost \$24,000,000; 39,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil, valued at \$9,000,000; 305,000,000 pounds of rice worth \$46,000,000; and 35,000,000 pounds of shortening, priced at \$8,000,000. All of this food was purchased by the government as part of its price support operations since 1953. It was given without charge to religious and other non-profit agencies able to use it overseas in programs of helping needy persons.

The program raises important questions. Is there any likelihood that foreign populations can come to look upon the missionary agency as a tool being "utilized" by the American government? The effectiveness of the strategy seems to rest on the assumption that the motivation of the government can be equated in the foreign minds with the motivation of the churches. It is a safer guess that they will not be fooled. They may resent an attempt.