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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When many Americans first encounter the issue of federal aid to education, they regard it as a controversial political issue of quite recent origin. The truth is that federal aid to the nation's schools is as old as our nation, for it began with the Land Ordinance of 1785 in which a section or square mile of federal land in each township of the Northwest Territory was set aside for the support of education. Between 1785 and World War II, Congress passed a number of education bills, but there were only two acts of Congress which can be said to have had as profound an effect upon American education as did the Land Ordinance of 1785: the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. The Morrill Act granted to each state thirty thousand acres of federal land for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress for the purpose of establishing and maintaining at least one land-grant college of agriculture and the "mechanic arts." Through this act and subsequent legislation, the
federal government allocated approximately seventeen million acres of land to the various states which, in turn, sold most of it for the building and maintenance of land grant colleges. A logical follow-up of the Morrill Act of 1862 was the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 which gave considerable aid to the states for training teachers of vocational subjects and for instructing in home economics and various trades. With the exception of limited emergency federal aid provided for education during the depression of the 1930's and the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, most federal aid to education between 1917 and the end of World War II was provided for vocational education.

Presidential support of federal aid to education is also considered by many people to have started recently, but, to the contrary, most presidents have spoken in favor of it. President Washington, in his last State of the Union Message, called for the establishment of a national university and a military academy and in a number of his other messages he spoke about the need for the federal government to be interested in education. Speaking in his Farewell Address Washington said that in the interests of popular government the national government should promote "institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge" and said that "In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion
should be enlightened."¹

Although many of the presidents from the late eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century spoke favorably about federal aid to education, most of their statements were general and lacked specific legislative proposals for education and, therefore, had little effect toward the enactment of such aid. But the land grants to the states for educational purposes begun by the Land Ordinance of 1785 were continued under the various Statehood Acts beginning with the Ohio Enabling Act of 1802 and continuing through the statehood acts of Alaska and Hawaii. Many state educational systems benefited from this practice, and a total of 98.5 million acres has been granted by the federal government to the states for the support of public schools.² In addition to the Enabling Acts, in 1867 Congress established and President Andrew Johnson approved of a Federal Department of Education which until the mid-twentieth century had as its main function the collection and diffusion of information.


about education. ³

From President Grant's administration in the Reconstruction Period through President Hoover's term of office in the early part of the depression, many of the Presidents spoke even more favorably than their predecessors about the need for federal assistance to education. Yet except for the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, not much aid was provided by the federal government for the nation's public schools.

Contrary to what is often believed, Franklin D. Roosevelt did not actively support federal aid to education during the depression and, in fact, purposely avoided committing himself on this issue. The nation's schools, like other institutions, declined sharply in their ability to continue normal operations. Since, in order to provide relief from the economic distress the nation was experiencing, Roosevelt requested numerous kinds of federal assistance, relief seemed to be in order for the schools. Federal aid for education would have been consistent with Roosevelt's New Deal domestic legislation, but with the exception of indirect aid to the schools, such as the National Youth Administration, general federal aid was not requested except

³In 1869 Congress reduced the Department to a Bureau of the Department of Interior. In 1930 it was moved to the Federal Security Agency and finally, in 1953, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
in his last budget message.\textsuperscript{4}

Although many presidents from Washington through Franklin D. Roosevelt gave some support for federal aid to education, and some federal aid was provided, it was not until Truman came into office that a president began to speak frequently about the subject and that it became an important national political issue. Henceforth, presidents have included federal aid to education more frequently in their public statements, especially in their messages to Congress, and significantly more federal aid has been appropriated.

World War II was a major turning point in the basic structure of American society and caused profound social, economic, and political changes. These radical changes had a definite effect on American education in the post World War II years. Greater demands were placed upon the nation's educational system; perhaps more than ever before Americans expected the schools to cope with the rapid social

\textsuperscript{4}In 1945 the President said: "The records of selective service reveal that we have fallen far short of a suitable standard of elementary and secondary education. If a suitable standard is to be maintained in all parts of the country, the federal government must render aid where needed—but only where it is needed." Quoted in Anne Gibson Buis, "An Historical Study of the Role of the Federal Government in the Financial Support of Education, With Special Reference to Legislative Proposals and Action," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1953), p. 487.
and technological transformations taking place. Yet the schools were becoming less capable of adjusting to these changes. Mounting enrollments caused by the post-war "baby-boom" made the schools even less capable of providing a reasonably adequate education for those of school age. The depression and World War II had resulted in severe classroom and teacher shortages. Local school districts fell far behind in their ability to keep pace with the need for quality education. These conditions caused many people, and especially educators, to begin to look to the federal government for support to meet the growing crisis of the schools.

Because of this crisis, federal aid to education emerged in the post-war years as a significant national domestic issue. The serious problems in education came to be viewed as a national problem, and the President was increasingly expected to deal with such national problems. The time had come when a president of the United States could no longer avoid the issue of federal aid to education.

Regardless of who might have become president, he would have had to deal with this issue. As it happened two presidents served in succession for more than fifteen years immediately after World War II and both were forced to concern themselves with the issue of federal aid to education.
It is fortuitous that they provided an ideal contrast of
their views and their varying degree of support for federal
aid since they were from different political parties and
since they held considerably different political beliefs,
even though they were confronted with quite similar national
educational problems.

This study will examine the presidential messages of
Truman and Eisenhower to Congress, their press conferences,
and other public statements relating to federal aid to
education in an attempt to determine what concerns these two
presidents have had in regard to this issue, to determine
to what extent they supported or failed to support such aid,
and whenever reasonably possible and appropriate, to show
a relationship between their statements and the federal
legislation that was enacted. In addition, this study will
indicate consistencies and contradictions within each
president's statements and similarities and differences
between the two presidents' views on federal aid to education.

Truman and Eisenhower's public statements on federal
aid to education provide the basic research data for this
study, and its basic organization was formulated from these
statements. The statements of the Presidents were selected

5The Public Papers of the Presidents of the United
States, a special edition of the Federal Register, was an
invaluable source for obtaining Truman and Eisenhower's
original public statements on federal aid to education.
as the basis of this study because they seemed to be the most logical and the most consistent means by which to determine the presidents' position on this issue. However, a president often receives much assistance in the writing of his speeches and may in fact, deliver a speech that is completely written by a "ghost-writer." A president's advisors, cabinet members, or other influential members of his administration have considerable influence upon the president's statements. Although a variety of factors influence what the president will say in his speeches, the president himself is by far the most important.

Starting with Truman in 1945 and continuing thereafter many of the presidents public statements are compiled in annual volumes. Rules governing this publication are in an appendix in each of these volumes and are substantially the following:

**Basic Criteria.** The basic text of the volumes shall consist of oral utterances by the president and of writings subscribed by him. All materials selected for inclusion under these criteria must also be in the public domain by virtue of White House release or otherwise.

**Sources.** The basic text of the volumes shall be selected from the official text of:

1. communications to the Congress,
2. public addresses,
3. transcripts of press conferences,
4. public letters,
5. messages to heads of states,
6. statements released on miscellaneous subjects, and
7. formal executive documents promulgated in accordance with law.

This study will include most of Truman and Eisenhower's concerns about federal aid to education, but some minor phases of the issue, such as the school lunch program, will not be included because of the presidents' minimal statements on the subject and because of the relative unimportance of these matters to the broad issue of federal aid to education. Moreover, not all of the controversies that inevitably arise when educational legislation is considered by Congress will be included in this study because the presidents rarely included these controversies in their public statements. Some controversies, such as the disagreement over the dangers of federal control, will be dealt with at length since President Eisenhower raised this issue numerous times in his public statements. Why some controversies, which followed presidential recommendations for educational legislation were not mentioned in the president's public statements, will also be discussed.

The controversies that usually accompany the whole question of federal aid to education will not be analyzed here; neither will this study attempt to describe and elaborate upon all of the programs of education that the
federal government is involved in, except where background information is necessary to help clarify the presidents' statements. An in-depth analysis of such controversies and of such programs of the federal government in education is beyond the scope of this study; these subjects have been written about extensively in books and professional and popular journals.

Further, this study will not try to assess the degree to which the two presidents' speeches reflected their own convictions on the issue of federal aid to education. The assumption is made that what the presidents stated publicly was their official position on a particular issue, was the policy of their administration, and should be taken as such. To question the origin or sincerity of a particular presidential statement could lead to indefinite speculation that would resolve very little. However, those contradictions between speeches that did occur will be discussed.

Finally, this study will neither deal with the complexities of the office of the presidency--its organization.

its legal powers, precedents, or procedures?—nor will it
attempt to trace the political struggle that occurred be­
tween the presidents' requests to Congress and the actual
enactment or rejection of these requests, except where the
president's statements directly refer to such things.

The plan of this study is to examine the public
statements of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower on the
subject of federal aid to education, grouping them by spe­
cific topics separately for each president. There are for
each president three chapters which are organized in approxi­
mately parallel form. They treat successively
(1) each presidents' views on education and his support
of education in specific programs,
(2) the issue of federal aid to education as it figured
in the presidential campaigns, and
(3) each president's support for broad programs of federal
aid to education.

?A number of articles and books have elaborated upon
this matter. Perhaps one of the more interesting and pertinent books in this area is: Richard E. Neustadt, *Presiden­
tial Power: the Politics of Leadership* (New York, John Wiley
& Sons Inc. 1960). This book is concerned with the personal
power of the presidency: how to make the powers of the
presidency work for a president. The author states in the
preface to his book, "My interest is in what a President can
do, as one man among many, to carry his own choices through
that maze of personalities and institutions called the
government of the United States."
We may have reached the stage in the history of federal aid to education when the president of the nation has become the most important political figure in determining to what extent the federal government will provide financial assistance to the nation's schools. If so, more research is needed on the president's involvement in federal aid to education. Perhaps this study will be of some assistance to those who may do such research.
CHAPTER II

TRUMAN'S GENERAL VIEWS ON EDUCATION AND HIS SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

The death of Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945 created a vacuum in presidential leadership that was felt throughout much of the nation. Roosevelt, the first president to exceed two terms in office, was a powerful figure in American life who had symbolized strength and hope to millions of Americans during the trying years of the Depression and during World War II. But for many others his New Deal program had symbolized an erosion of many of the basic principles of American life. He had dominated the presidency for so long the following president was sure to have difficulty replacing him in this high office.

When Truman became president he was relatively unknown and appeared to be inadequately prepared to assume such an important office. The nation anxiously awaited signs of leadership ability from the new president. Some, particularly the conservative Republicans, had predicted that there would be a shift to the political right, but
they were quickly disillusioned when he revealed that he intended to continue and even to further expand the New Deal programs. Truman was to become a strong president, and as Clinton Rossiter was to say later, "Mr. Truman demonstrated a more clear-cut philosophy of presidential power than any predecessor except Woodrow Wilson."¹

Truman's first message to Congress contained a very important sentence that proved to be the key to his domestic program. "Let me assure the forward-looking people of America," he said, "that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people."²

This concern for the "common people" and the willingness to exert presidential power on their behalf were to be expressed in a call for federal assistance to American education, a system that was in deep trouble from previous neglect. But this call did not come in his first year of office.

Most of Truman's efforts during 1945 were expended toward ending the war and preparing for the change-over from a war-time economy to a peace-time economy. His only


significant public mention of education that year referred to his commitment to providing education or training for returning veterans. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act, passed in 1944, was to result in a massive outlay of funds for the educational support of veterans during his two terms of office far exceeding original expectations. Approximately 7,800,000 World War II Veterans attended school under this act at a total cost to the federal government of about 14.5 billion dollars.\(^3\)

**TRUMAN'S GENERAL IDEAS ABOUT EDUCATION**

In many of his public statements Truman spoke of the need to equalize educational opportunities. His first Annual Message to Congress in January, 1946 revealed his belief that "It is essential to provide adequate elementary and secondary schools everywhere and additional educational opportunities for large numbers of people beyond the secondary level. Accordingly, I repeat the proposals of last year's Budget Message [Roosevelt's] that the Federal Government provide financial aid to assist the States in assuring more nearly equal opportunities for a good

---

education."

In his 1948 State of the Union Message Truman spoke of the necessity for equal educational opportunities in a democracy.

...some of our citizens are still denied equal opportunity for education, for jobs and economic advancement... equality can be given specific meaning in terms of health, education, social security, and housing....Another aim of our democracy is to provide an adequate education for every person...we must make possible greater equality of opportunity to all our citizens for an education. Only by doing so can we insure that our citizens will be capable of understanding and sharing the responsibilities of a democracy."

Again in his Budget Message of 1950, Truman said that "If education and research are to play their full role in strengthening our democratic society...we must devise types


Israel, pp. 2932-2933.
of education that will prepare youth more effectively for participation in modern society, and we must provide better educational opportunities for more of our people."^6

It is interesting that Truman's call for equality of educational opportunity shifted from a somewhat reserved statement in 1946 which called for a more nearly equal opportunity for a good education to a more positive request for "equality of opportunity to all citizens" in 1948 and then in 1950 back to "better educational opportunities for more of our people." It was possibly no coincidence that his most positive support of equal educational opportunity came in the year of the presidential campaign.

The lack of equality in education was viewed by Truman as existing on both the state and the local level and was considered detrimental to the nation's well-being.

The high mobility that characterizes our people means that no State is immune to the effects of ignorance and illiteracy in other States. The welfare of the Nation as a whole demands that the present educational inequalities be reduced. Educational inequalities

^6U.S., President, "Annual Budget Message to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1951." January 9, 1950. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1945-1953), Harry S. Truman, 1950, p. 82. Since the Public Papers do not have volume numbers each volume will be identified by the year of the publication.
are primarily due to differences in the financial resources of States and localities. 7

Yet Truman placed far more responsibility for the lack of equality of educational opportunity upon the states than upon the localities.

By pointing out to Congress that in 1948 the ten poorest states were spending about 64 dollars annually for each school child whereas the ten wealthiest states were spending about 177 dollars, 8 Truman indicated his concern for the great inequalities existing in the nation's schools. Truman saw these inequalities as mainly the result of differences in wealth and income between the states. He decried the fact that some of the states that spend the least for education actually paid a higher percentage of their total revenue for education than those states that spend the most. He supported the views of Senate advocates of federal aid to education who argued that in 1945, per capita income ranged from 1,588 dollars in New York down to 570 dollars in Mississippi, yet Mississippi spent 1.7 per cent of its income on education while New York spent

7Ibid.

only 1.5 per cent. But New York's expenditure per child was over four times that of Mississippi's. Truman considered it unfortunate that "States with the lowest incomes have the greatest proportion of school age children and are unable to finance a fair educational opportunity even with greater effort..." Equal educational opportunity required the fundamental education and training of every youth, and this required federal aid to education. For Truman, "equal- ity of educational opportunity...implied some form of federal aid, since equality can be achieved in no other way."

Truman said that educational opportunity was essential to the understanding and to the sharing of responsibilities in a democracy. Education was to be considered "the fundamental necessity for democracy..." The idea of democracy and public schools were equated historically by the president. Yet educational opportunity was not being made available to all children, and Truman considered this


10"Budget Message: Fiscal Year 1951," January 9, 1950, Public Papers, p. 82.


FEDERAL CONTROL OPPOSED

President Truman spoke very little about federal control of schools compared to his frequent expression of concern for equality of educational opportunity. A long standing issue raised frequently by opponents of federal aid to education was the idea that federal aid meant federal control. Conservatives in Congress have repeatedly used this issue as a rallying cry against education bills, and it has often proven to be one of the factors effective in preventing passage of such bills.

In 1949 the Senate passed a general school aid bill (S 246) with the help of Senator Taft of Ohio, who until 1945 had been opposed to federal aid to education because he believed it constituted federal control. Taft explained that he had reversed his position as a result of subcommittee testimony which convinced him that in many states children were not receiving a basic minimum education in spite of the fact that poorer states were spending proportionately as much as the more affluent states. In the Senate debates over the Thomas-Hill Bill of 1946, Taft conceded that "education is primarily a State function...but in the field of education the Federal Government, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, has a secondary interest
or obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."\(^\text{13}\)

Senate bill 246 failed to clear the House Education and Labor Committee in 1949, but was re-introduced and passed by the Senate in 1950. This bill was again taken up by the House Education and Labor Committee which ultimately rejected it by a 12-13 vote because of the controversy surrounding it.\(^\text{14}\) The bill ran into difficulty over the issue of whether federal aid should be granted to private and parochial schools as well as public schools. Moreover, an additional element was injected into the general school bill of 1950 (S 246), namely, the controversy over control.

\(^\text{13}\) "Thomas-Hill-Taft Bill," *Congressional Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 4, (Washington, D.C.: Press Research Inc. 1946.), pp. 647-648. Taft also said that "no child can have equality of opportunity in my opinion unless to start with he has a minimum of education...because of the way wealth is distributed in the United States. I do not believe we are able to do it without a federal-aid system." For a further discussion of Taft's position, see: U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Taft speaking in favor of a federal aid to education bill, 80th Congress, 2nd session, March 24, 1948, *Congressional Record*, XCIV, pp. 3346-3353.

\(^\text{14}\) Voting to kill the bill were Representatives John F. Kennedy (Democrat-Massachusetts) and Richard M. Nixon (Republican-California).
In his earlier years as president, Truman avoided the controversy over control. However, in a discussion over Senate Bill 246 in 1950 this silence erupted into an exchange of views between Truman and John Lesinski, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Lesinski sent a letter to President Truman on March 1, 1950 outlining a resolution adopted by his committee which said that it did not want to report out legislation that could lead to federal control of the schools. It further stated that the committee had grave reservations over what it conceived as sole jurisdiction by the United States Commissioner of Education over any education bill and flatly demanded that Truman submit to them a statement clarifying the authority and redefining the duties of the Commissioner, or otherwise they would not report out any bills pertaining to federal aid to public schools.\(^{15}\)

The next day Truman answered Lesinski's letter stating his position on federal control of schools and criticizing the Committee for its reasoning that federal control over education could result from activities of the United States Office of Education.

I, too, am opposed to Federal control of the schools... On this question, there seems to be general agreement. The resolution you have transmitted to me proceeds, however, by a process of reasoning which I do not follow, to relate this principle of freedom from control to the position of the Office of Education in the Federal Security Agency. If there is to be no Federal control in any case, I fail to see how any Federal control can grow out of any possible relationship between these two offices. 16

Although Truman concurred with the Committee's position that there should be no federal control over schools, the question was, as most often it has been, what constitutes federal control. It was clear that the Committee and Truman did not have in mind the same meaning for the word control.

It was significant that Truman had not directly responded to the Committee's demand for a statement of clarification of the role of the United States Commissioner and, in fact, refused to do so. Instead he rested his case on his past record of opposition to federal control, which, as earlier stated, was not often publicly revealed. The Committee responded by doing exactly what it said it would do; that is, it did not report out of committee any federal aid to education bills. A compromise was in order, and

one is led to speculate that if Truman had sent a statement clarifying the duties of the United States Commissioner of Education to the Committee, the general aid to education bill might have cleared Lesinski's committee.

Several months after the controversy with the House Education and Labor Committee Truman, speaking informally in the West, said again that he did not believe in federal control, that he did not want federal control in the schools, and that he was wholeheartedly in favor of continuing local and state control over education. The federal government needed to provide financial assistance to the states and "let the individual states decide how the money shall be spent."17 Regardless of the President's clear statements of opposition to federal control, the fear of its occurrence remained with Congressmen and with a large segment of the general public, particularly many educators.

Nonetheless, Truman seemed not to be affected by the dangers of federal control that others spoke about. Through his last year in office, he continued to speak often and favorably about the necessity to provide equal educational opportunity. But he treated the controversial issue of federal control as though it had been resolved.

RESEARCH AND PLANNING IN EDUCATION

The controversy surrounding the issue of federal control did not extend to the areas of research and planning even though these are areas related to education in which the federal government has been very involved. Land grant colleges, in cooperation with agricultural experiment stations, have long provided research for agriculture. Much of the present day government support of higher education is in the form of research grants in fields such as defense, public health, and space exploration.

Truman's earliest budget recognized the need for the continuation and expansion of research activities. He believed that "The maintenance of our position as a nation...will require more emphasis on research expenditures in the future than in the past." In the 1946 Budget Message, additional appropriations of 40 million were made to support a federal research agency which had been proposed in September of 1945. This agency was not visualized by Truman as conducting research, but was seen as a coordinating agency of research activities already existing and as an administrator of funds for new research activities. Truman was concerned that the administration of funds for research was too widely scattered, and he wanted a centralizing

Truman knew that careful planning was necessary in order to insure the most effective utilization of federal funds for education. As a result he called for federal grants in fiscal 1947 to be allocated for surveys and plans.

Notwithstanding the urgent need for additional school and college buildings, careful planning will be required for the expenditures to be made under the proposed legislation to aid the states in providing educational facilities. A major share of the grants for the first year would be for surveys and plans.20

Truman believed that raising our educational standards and expanding fundamental research were important for the continued progress of the nation. In his Economic Report of 1949, he warned about the crisis facing education and called for a study "to determine authoritatively our national needs for education facilities and the most feasible methods of providing them."21 He stated that there was an unaware-

---

19 The agency Truman referred to was, of course, to become the National Science Foundation. But even with the establishment of the Foundation in 1950, federal funds for research remained dispersed; only a little consolidation occurred during Truman's remaining years in office.


ness of the extent of the shortage of school buildings, the specific areas in the nation where they existed, and whether state and local governments could lessen this shortage without federal aid for construction.

In order to provide a basis for federal aid to education, one million dollars in the Fiscal 1950 Budget was provided specifically for the surveying of educational building needs and the study of scholarships and fellowships. The President's Economic Report of 1950 also called for grants to states to survey the need for school construction. In accordance with Truman's requests, Congress authorized in 1950 a three year nation-wide survey of the nation's school construction needs. The various states, in cooperation with the Office of Education, were surveying their shortages of school facilities and their resources available to meet these shortages. Information coming from these surveys indicated that there was a great need for school construction throughout the nation and that federal funds were necessary to provide for the needed construction.


23In addition to these surveys, the New York Times conducted its own surveys which showed great inequalities of expenditures for education in the different sections of the country. These surveys also indicated that the percentage of the total national income spent on education was less in 1946 than it had been during the depression years. See "Education Survey" The New York Times, February 18, 1947, p. 27.
The surveys of the late 1940's served to inform the president and motivate his interest in planning for the growing problems facing our educational system, particularly teacher and classroom shortages. They were, at least, partly responsible for the fact that the primary justification for federal aid to education in the 1950's was based on the need for school construction.

NATIONAL NEEDS AND GOALS AS A BASIS FOR AID

The surveys, in revealing severe teacher and classroom shortages in the nation's schools, probably caused Truman to include, throughout his public statements in support of federal aid to education, the idea that education was needed to fulfill national needs and national goals. The proper education of our youth was considered "a matter of paramount importance to the welfare and security of the United States.... It is necessary and proper that the Federal Government should furnish financial assistance which will make it possible for the states to provide educational opportunities more nearly adequate to meet the pressing

24 These surveys perhaps led to charges made in 1947 by a House subcommittee that the federal government spent more on cattle than it did on education or that the United States spent one and one-half times more on cosmetics than it did on education.
needs of our nation." 25

During the Korean Conflict, Truman came more often to link education with national defense. Truman admitted that during the Korean War the nation did not have the resources available to build or staff as many schools as was hoped for during normal times, but he did clearly state:

We cannot neglect the education...of our people without the most serious results for a long-run defense effort...
The quality of essential services must be maintained and improved, as fast as can be managed. This is imperative for the success of the defense job. 26

Truman seemed frustrated by the conflict between the priorities of war and the nation's educational needs. 27 He seemed to look upon the war as a temporary interruption in providing the necessary resources for education.

The Korean War also accentuated the problem of unequal educational opportunities, and Truman expressed his belief that this inequality had a detrimental effect on


27 This frustration was not confined to education but existed in other areas of domestic needs. In this same address he specifically called for sacrifices from businessmen, workers, farmers, and other Americans.
the nation's military effort.

The results of the inequalities of educational opportunities are demonstrated more sharply in times like the present [Korean War]. The military services even find it necessary to teach some inductees reading and writing before they can begin combat training. From the standpoint of national security alone, as well as the enlargement of opportunities for the individual, the nation needs to see that every youth acquires the fundamental education and training which are essential to effective service, whether in the Armed Forces, in industry, or on the farm. I therefore urge the Congress to authorize Federal financial assistance to help the States provide a level of elementary and secondary education that will meet the minimum needs of the Nation.28

The president's call for strengthening the nation's educational system during wartime had an appeal to many, and some significant legislation resulted from his requests. Nonetheless, the Korean war had a way of diverting legislators concerns to other "more important" matters, particularly in foreign affairs.29


29 This is not to say that America's experiences during wars have resulted in a lack of education legislation. In fact, a case may be made for the opposite since some of our most important education bills were approved during wars. For example, the Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Impacted Areas Aid (PL 815-874) in 1950, the Korean "G.I. Bill of Rights" in 1952, and the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965.
For Truman, research and planning in education were important ways of dealing with many of the nation's immediate educational needs and many of its long term educational goals. He believed that if more equal educational opportunity was to be achieved and if the severe shortages were to be reduced there would have to be more planning based on research.

**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED**

Closely related to Truman's concern of providing for the nation's needs by supporting federal aid to education was his support for the establishment of a National Science Foundation. Truman was significantly influenced by a report prepared by the President's Scientific Research Board entitled *Manpower for Research* and released on October 11, 1947 which revealed the nation's severe shortage of scientists. This report proposed three programs to meet the problems causing the shortage:

1. Development of sources of financial support for educational institutions to permit expansion of facilities and increases in instructional staff and salaries.
2. Development of a broad program in support of basic research in the universities to insure a foundation for science and a training ground for experts. To carry out such a program, a National Science Foundation
should be employed to strengthen the weaker but promising institutions.

(3) establishment of a national system of scholarships and fellowships in all fields of knowledge...30

In a statement making public this report the President warned that the nation's scientific progress was being limited by the nation's shortage of scientists. Truman realized the significance of this report and requested the President's Commission on Higher Education to recommend specific ways to accomplish these objectives. Exactly one month later this commission responded to his request in a report entitled Establishing the Goals.31

Truman early recognized the need for improving the nation's scientific program and, therefore, focused his efforts upon establishing a National Science Foundation.


He acknowledged that many agencies of the Federal Government regularly carried on research but pointed out the need for a new centralizing agency.

We need a central agency to correlate and encourage the research activities of the country. While freedom of inquiry must be preserved, the Federal Government should accept responsibility for fostering the flow of scientific knowledge and developing scientific talent in our youth. To accomplish, I recommend again that a National Science Foundation or its equivalent be established.32

Truman's strongest plea for a National Science Foundation in order to balance national research came in his 1950 Budget Message:

The Government is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in research--primarily in applied research....We must consider, however, not only the ways in which the great reservoir of scientific knowledge already at our disposal can best be utilized but also the best paths to follow for the discovery of further basic knowledge. To this end we need a National Science Foundation to stimulate basic research and to assure an effective balance among the Federal research programs. By developing a national research policy and by formulating a truly national research budget it should be possible to relate the activities of public and private institutions in a concerted

effort to advance the frontiers of knowledge.\textsuperscript{33} The attempt to establish the National Science Foundation involved a five year political struggle, beginning in 1946 and culminating in its passage in 1950. The Senate passed a bill in 1946 that would have established a Foundation but the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee failed to act upon it. Congress approved Senate Bill 526 in 1947, but it was pocket-vetoed by the President because he objected to the bill's provision that gave the Foundation's members' power to elect its director, which Truman believed would place the foundation outside of his control. The Senate again passed a revised bill (S 2385) that was changed to meet Truman's objections in the vetoed 1947 bill,\textsuperscript{34} but the House failed to act upon it. In 1949 the Senate passed a bill (S 247) which was identical to S 2385 passed the previous year. The House Interstate and

\textsuperscript{33}"Budget Message: Fiscal Year 1951," January 9, 1950, Public Papers, p. 84. Truman had appointed a Scientific Research Board in 1946 to make a study of the research programs of the Federal Government, and his 1950 budget message used information flowing from its findings to formulate a program for his proposed National Science Foundation.

\textsuperscript{34}The new bill provided that the director of the Foundation would be appointed by the President, with the Senate's approval.
Foreign Commerce Committee reported out a similar bill (HR 4846), but it did not reach the floor. Senate Bill 247 was finally approved and enacted into law in 1950 (PL 81-507). 35

Although Truman called for the establishment of a National Science Foundation in his 1947 budget message, funds were not listed specifically for it in that budget. 36 The 1948 budget was the first federal budget to list funds for a National Science Foundation. That budget estimated five million dollars in funds for the Foundation and called for fifteen million dollars in appropriations. This amount was reduced in the 1949 budget to 2.5 million dollars, and, ironically, Truman's Budget Message of 1950, in the very year of the Foundation's enactment, called only for one-


36 Even though funds were not specifically listed in the 1947 Budget Message, money was provided within that budget for the Foundation. Truman, in his 1948 Budget Message, criticized Congress for not establishing a national science foundation, which he claimed had been expected to spend $5 million in 1947. See "Statement by the President: The Midyear Review of the Budget," August 15, 1948, Public Papers, p. 446.
half million. Although there was probably little relationship between the reduction of the amount provided in the budget and the bill's passage, the fact that it did occur seems worth noting.

Although Truman considered the creation of the National Science Foundation "a major step...toward a better balance in research" in the United States, he also realized that the Foundation could help promote "basic scientific research...to alter the foundation of world power...a strong, steady, and wide-ranging effort in science is as essential to our national security as the production of weapons and the training of military personnel." Moreover, he saw scientific research fortifying "our economic welfare as well as our national strength." In an "Address Before the American Association for the Advancement of Science," Truman emphasized the importance of science to our national welfare. In another speech he said:


39Ibid.

40September 13, 1948, Public Papers, p. 482.
The strength and economic welfare of our country in years to come are largely dependent on the advances that can be made in scientific research. To maintain and expand the Nation's efforts in scientific research and to help assure an adequate supply of trained scientists in the future, I again urge that the Congress enact legislation creating a National Science Foundation...41

And Truman's combining of "national welfare" with "national security" proved to be politically popular with Congress; the National Science Foundation was established in 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE PROPOSED

The attempt to establish a Department of Health, Education and Welfare pre-dates the attempt to establish a National Science Foundation, beginning in the 1920's and culminating in its establishment by President Eisenhower in 1953.

Expanded welfare services during the depression years required coordinated administration, and the Re-organization Act of 1939 directed this responsibility to the Federal Security Agency. All federal agencies whose major purpose was to promote social and economic security, educational opportunities, and the health of the citizens

41"Budget Message: Fiscal Year 1950" January 10, 1949, Public Papers, p. 78.
of the nation were grouped in the Federal Security Agency.

The First Hoover Commission of 1947 recommended a further consolidation of health, education, and welfare services and called for the establishment of an executive department to head them. Truman acknowledged the Commission's recommendation by stating, "The Government's programs for health, education, and security are of such great importance to our democracy that we should now establish an executive department for their administration." Truman spoke frequently of the need to provide health, education, and welfare services and referred to a Department of Health, Education, and Security in several of his major addresses. Several bills were introduced to provide for a Department of Health, Education, and Security; however, no major effort was made by Truman to have them enacted. Priority was given by Truman for the establishment of the Department of Defense, which was accomplished by the National

42 "Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union," January 17, 1948, Public Papers, p. 4. Note the use of the word "security" which, of course, was later to be referred to as "welfare."


By establishing the National Science Foundation and by giving support to the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Truman helped to lay the basis for greatly expanded federal involvement in education.

**FEDERAL IMPACTED AREAS AID ENACTED**

Political efforts to establish a National Science Foundation and a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare generally coincided with the effort to provide aid to federally "impacted areas." The Lanham Act of 1941 began a new concept in federal aid to education by authorizing federal aid to local school districts whose educational responsibilities had become overburdened because of the increased number of children of military personnel and defense workers attending their schools but without equivalent taxes being provided. This type of aid, originally conceived of as being temporary, became increasingly popular with Congress, especially by Representatives of districts where it was most beneficial. The Lanham Act expired after World War II but was continued in effect by four one-year extensions. Then in 1950 two "impacted areas" bills were passed establishing a program similar to the one carried on under the old Lanham Act.
Public Law 815, authorized for two years, provided federal aid to local school districts for school construction located in federally impacted areas; Public Law 874 authorized for four years, provided federal aid to help maintain and operate schools in these same areas.

From the expiration of the Lanham Act in 1946 and until the enactment of the impacted areas legislation in 1950, many Congressmen and the President expressed concern about the uncertainty of federal aid to school districts in impacted areas. The President made this clear in a statement upon signing HR 3829 (PL 306), a bill extending aid for the fourth separate year after World War II.

This is emergency, stopgap legislation to continue for one more year, and to expand somewhat, a program that has been operating on this same emergency, stopgap basis for the last eight years. I am glad to note that both the Senate and the House of Representatives recognized, in the reports of their committees which considered this bill, that it does not offer a permanent or satisfactory solution to the important problems presented by the impact of Federal activities and Federal land ownership upon nearby local school districts. The reports of these congressional committees make it clear that this bill is intended merely to provide authorization for needed funds during the fiscal year 1950 while the Congress gives further study to legislation which will meet these problems on a
fair, uniform and economical basis.\footnote{44}

Truman concurred with many members of Congress that there was urgent need for a permanent, comprehensive federal plan for all the children and all the communities adversely affected by Federal activities. Truman said:

With my approval the Federal Security Administration on April 6, 1949, submitted to both Houses of Congress a legislative proposal designed to establish a permanent program administered by the Office of Education... It is my hope that Congress will see fit to enact permanent legislation... and thus obviate any occasion for more stopgap legislation such as HR 3829.\footnote{45}

An interesting development occurred during the post World War II years of discussion over impacted areas legislation. Some Congressmen supported impacted areas legislation that benefited their own Congressional districts, but opposed general federal aid to education; they made the mistake of assuming that impacted aid to education served the purpose of general federal aid to education. Truman was clear in his disagreement with that position.

\footnote{44}Statement by the President Upon Signing a Bill Providing Aid to Local School Agencies in Federally Affected Areas," September 10, 1949, Public Papers, pp. 476-477.

\footnote{45}Ibid., p. 477.
The need for permanent Federal legislation to assist in the financing of the education of children living on Federal property and in communities adversely affected by Federal activities must not, of course, be confused with the need for broad and comprehensive Federal assistance to states for the education of elementary and secondary schoolchildren...46

The United States Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, while calling for 300,000 new classrooms, also supported Truman's contention by warning that the impacted areas legislation could not be conceived of as a substitute for general aid to education.47

There was considerable criticism about the way in which funds had previously been administered for federally impacted school districts. Truman recognized this criticism and called for reform.

For a number of years several Federal agencies, under separate authorizations, have been helping to finance the education of children living on Federal property and in communities affected by Federal activities. I recommend that the Congress enact

46Ibid.

47"Commissioner McGrath Sees Need for Aid to Education," The New York Times, April 4, 1950, p. 27. McGrath considered aid for teachers of greater importance than school construction, but by the early 1950's the idea of school construction was becoming more acceptable to Congress than other forms of federal aid.
general legislation to establish a single program for all Federal agencies. In a special message to Congress Truman stated, "The Reorganization Plan #16 will place the responsibility for its future administration in the Federal Security Agency..." Reorganization Plan #16 of 1950 was prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949. It transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and more specifically to the Office of Education, the functions of the General Services Administration that had previously administered federal aid to federally impacted school districts. Truman, justifying making this change, stated:

By placing the function in the agency of the Government [Federal Security Agency] best informed in matters of public school administration and presently charged with the payment of other grants for educational purposes, the plan will provide additional assurance that the funds appropriated for assistance to overburdened school districts will be most advantageously expedited.


Plan number 16 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 went into effect May 24, 1950, giving the Federal Security Agency the sole responsibility for giving financial assistance to federally impacted areas and thus eliminating a variety of arrangements that had previously caused delay and duplication in services.

The Korean Conflict caused many additional school districts to become overcrowded, and as a result, pressure was exerted upon Congress and the President to extend the benefits available under public laws 815 and 817. However, a bill (HR 5411) passed by both the House and Senate, was pocket vetoed by the President in 1951 because he believed it would further segregation in the public schools. At the heart of the dispute was Senator Lister Hill's (Democrat-Alabama) amendment which would require schools receiving federal aid to conform to state laws. The amendment would have, in effect, forced some non-segregated schools on federal property in the South to segregate. At the heart of the dispute was Senator Lister Hill's (Democrat-Alabama) amendment which would require schools receiving federal aid to conform to state laws. The amendment would have, in effect, forced some non-segregated schools on federal property in the South to segregate.51 A bill (HR 8145) to extend PL 815 and 874 was again introduced.

---

51 Two of the strongest opponents of HR 5411 were Representatives Jacob K. Javits (Republican-New York) and Eugene J. McCarthy (Democrat-Minnesota). For the opposing arguments and other information pertaining to this bill see "Aid to Defense Area Schools," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, VII (Washington D.C., Congressional Quarterly News Service, 1951), p. 194.
in 1952, received a House subcommittee's approval, but did not reach the floor.

In his final budget message, Truman revealed his evaluation of impacted area legislation during his years in office and its relationship to general federal aid to education:

These programs to aid school districts affected directly by defense activities have been very useful. They do not, of course, help the thousands of other school districts which are struggling with the problems of overcrowded schools, underpaid teachers, and obsolete or inadequate buildings. I hope the Congress will consider ways and means of helping the States to meet these needs.32

There was an implication within this statement by Truman that future federal aid for impacted areas schools districts needed to be broadened into a program of federal aid not only for impacted areas but for most of the other schools of the nation.

Truman's strong support of equal educational opportunity and his refusal to acknowledge the possible dangers of federal control contrasted sharply with the views of many Congressmen, particularly those who opposed general federal aid to education. But his efforts to establish the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, to expand research, and his plans for the improvement of the schools met with less resistance from conservative Congressmen because they were based on the idea of meeting national needs and national goals. Too, the President's recommendations for aid to impacted areas were enthusiastically supported by most Congressmen, including the most conservative. Impacted areas aid was established and became the most important type of aid during Truman's years in office.
CHAPTER III

TRUMAN AND EDUCATION IN THE CAMPAIGN
OF 1948

If President Truman's re-nomination in 1948 had depended upon his previous federal aid to education legislative proposals and their enactment, that nomination probably would not have occurred; however, federal aid to education had not yet become an issue of importance and had little influence on Truman's presidential nomination by the Democratic party in 1948. There were few Democrats who could challenge Truman's bid for his party's nomination. The Democrats re-nominated Truman in spite of his lack of success with much of his first term domestic program, including federal aid to education, and in spite of the President's sharp decline in popularity.

James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, recorded in his diary that in late 1947 Truman looked forward with deep misgivings to another four years in the White House and that if he had not believed it his duty to run again because
of world conditions he would have stepped aside. Yet at this time President Truman was considered to be certain of renomination by his party and a Gallup Poll taken at the end of 1947 showed that he would have then defeated the two leading Republicans, Senator Taft or Governor Dewey, by wide margins. However, due to his stand on civil rights, the Palestine issue, and a series of other complicated events, Truman's popularity went into a tailspin and within four months from a previous poll a new Gallup Poll revealed a reversal in Truman's popularity and showed him far behind leading Republicans.

By the spring of 1948 few persons believed that Truman had the slightest chance of winning the election; one exception was Truman himself. Truman was not only having trouble with the extreme left and the Southern conservatives of the Democratic Party; he was also having difficulty in gaining support from the political center. For the first time since 1930, both houses of the 80th Congress were Republican, and it seemed as though the mood of the American voter was moving toward a Republican president. Fearing Truman's unpopularity many dissident Democrats tried in vain

---


2Ibid., pp. 13-19.
to draft Eisenhower, but Truman remained calm since he knew that former presidents in power, seeking renomination, had traditionally controlled the nominating conventions.

Meanwhile, Truman's decline in popularity caused a surge of optimism within the Republican party. Opening on June 21 in Philadelphia, the Republican convention four days later nominated Governor Dewey on the third ballot over Governor Stassen and Senator Taft.

NEA CONVENTION CONTROVERSY

Shortly after Dewey's nomination and before Truman's re-nomination an important development, specifically involving federal aid to education, occurred at the 27th Annual Convention of the National Education Association. The NEA convention, being held in Cleveland July 5-9,\(^3\) showed special interest in gaining federal support for the nation's schools and therefore called upon President Truman to reconvene the 80th Congress to pass Senate Bill 472 providing for 300 million dollars in federal aid to

\(^3\)After the Convention the Association's Journal published an article entitled "The Notable Cleveland Convention" in which they called their 1948 convention a "great turning point in the history of the NEA" and called the convention their "largest in history." For a discussion of the convention see National Education Association Journal, XXXVII (September 1948), pp. 335-336.
education. This action, not scheduled for the conference agenda, broke unexpectedly after heated discussion by delegate members.

Glenn E. Snow, president of the NEA, disclosed to the convention delegates that he had sent telegrams to both Governor Dewey and President Truman asking them to state their position on federal aid to education. Moreover, NEA leaders announced that they would ask all teachers to canvass state and federal candidates for their stand on federal aid to education. It is understandable that the NEA would ask Dewey for his stand on federal aid since it was far from clear where he stood on this issue, but to request Truman's stand seemed unnecessary since his favorable position on federal aid was well-known to Snow and to other NEA leaders. It appears that the request was designed to force Dewey to publicly state his position on federal aid to education in order that the two positions could be

Further evidence of the importance of the issue of federal aid to education at the NEA Convention was the fact that two of the most important speakers at the Convention were Senator Elbert D. Thomas (Democrat, Utah), and Senator Wayne Morse (Republican, Oregon) who debated federal aid to education. Thomas gave strong support to Truman's effort in this area and Morse defended the Republicans' support of education. For the text of this debate see "Presentation of the Main Issues Facing Voters in the November Presidential Election," National Education Association: Addresses and Proceedings, LXXVI (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948), pp. 39-65.
juxtaposed. If Dewey came out strongly for federal aid to education (which was unlikely), then the NEA would have strong promises from both presidential candidates for support of education. But if Dewey did not support federal aid, it would give the NEA members a legitimate reason to support Truman. Either way the NEA's cause in favor of federal aid to education would benefit.

Perhaps what had stirred the delegates at the NEA convention most was an article in Drew Pearson's nationally syndicated column, "Merry-Go-Round", published on June 21, the same day that the Republican Convention opened. Pearson claimed that Governor Dewey, at the Governor's Conference held earlier in June at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, had tried unsuccessfully to get other governors to support an "anti-teachers publicity campaign." Pearson also said that Dewey denounced the call of the teacher's lobby (NEA) for higher teacher pay and that he called the teachers' propaganda the "biggest lie since Adolph Hitler." Pearson said that the debate in which the other governors rejected Dewey's suggestions was held in an executive session, and


6 Ibid.
the press was barred because of Dewey's insistence. James Haggerty, Dewey's Press Secretary, immediately sent word to the NEA convention denying Pearson's claim. Haggerty's statement was read to the convention delegates but not until after the resolution was passed to get Truman to reconvene Congress.

On July 8 Dewey sent a message to the NEA convention clarifying his position on state aid to education but did not directly reply to the NEA's request for his position on federal aid to education. In sharp contrast on the same day was Truman's message to the convention promising his vigorous support in the association's campaign for federal aid to education.

In response to your inquiry I am very happy to convey to you this renewed assurance of my continued interest in the proper education of our youth. I have consistently advocated federal aid to education....I congratulate the National Education Association upon its continuous efforts to obtain federal aid for education and assure you of my continued and vigorous support in this endeavor.7

Dewey's refusal to commit himself on federal aid to education caused more controversy at the convention. In

an effort to tone down the controversy, the issue was referred to a nine-man committee; nevertheless, a resolution was passed two-to-one by the delegates to mimeograph and distribute Pearson's charges against Dewey—together with a telegram from Pearson asserting that his report was accurate. The resolution commended the other governors for rejecting Dewey's alleged proposal:

We sincerely commend those governors who refused to take part in this proposed deplorable campaign against the members of our profession and against teacher organizations which are endeavoring constantly and consciously to advance the cause of education and the welfare of our children. 8

There was some speculation that Dewey would clarify his position on federal aid to education shortly after the NEA Convention adjourned. On July 13 Dewey and Senator Taft met to discuss the campaign and other political matters, and it was thought that the topic of federal aid to education would arise since Taft was a strong advocate of federal aid. But no public mention was made about the NEA controversy nor did any public statement concerning federal aid to education come from this meeting.

The controversy over Dewey's alleged attack on the "teachers' lobby" was kept alive by the Democrats until the

8 ibid.
closing days of the campaign. In a speech in Springfield, Massachusetts, on October 27, Truman provided information that generally supported Pearson's charge against Dewey.

The Republican candidate has committed himself on this issue of education in words he cannot deny. He's against it, too. I have right here in my hand a couple of telegrams from two great Governors....the Governors of Utah and Maryland.

Both bear witness to the vicious attack which the Republican candidate for President made on this Nation's schoolteachers at the last Governor's Conference in Portsmouth, N.H.

Governor Lane of Maryland says in his telegram that the Republican candidate said, and I quote: "The school lobby," he said, "is the most vicious and dishonest lobby in the country. It is worse than all of the rest of them put together. One of the lies"--now the schoolteachers tell lies--"they tell is that Russia spends more money on public education than we do in this country."

Now, that is the end of the quote, and that's what the present Republican candidate for President said right up here in your neighboring State.

Governor Maw of Utah confirms that fact. Governor Maw says in his telegram that the Republican candidate said that the teacher lobby would destroy the State government of the Nation by supporting only those candidates who would give them what they wanted.

Maybe the Republican candidate is afraid the teachers will support only those candidates who believe that teachers are entitled to good pay and a living wage.

Now the Republican candidate has said that the teachers' lobby is more vicious than the power, or real estate, or oil, or liquor lobbies of this country. Now
I don't think the teachers deserve to be placed in that class. I think the teachers have a right to an organization to present their petitions and to show what they believe to any legislative body in the country, if they so desire....

Now I know only one way to combat that Dewey's totally un-American point of view on the public schools.

That is to maintain a Government at Washington that represents the people, and not the special interests and the privileged groups.

Schoolteachers are people. Schoolchildren are too. It is very distasteful to me to have them lumped in with oil and liquor. 9

Regardless of whether the allegations against Dewey were true or not, these charges, backed with such reputable testimony in such a convincing manner and within a week of the election, surely had considerable impact upon those voters who wanted to vote for Dewey but who could not do so because of his failure to support federal aid to education in the campaign and because of this new "evidence." One way that Dewey could have rid himself of these "anti-teacher" charges, or at least alleviated their effect, would have been to come out strongly in favor of federal aid to education. However, throughout the campaign Dewey's views on federal aid to education were not clearly revealed, and since he had

often strongly criticized increasing centralization of government, it is not difficult to see why advocates of federal aid were skeptical of Dewey's future support for education as president.

SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL SESSION

The Democratic Party nominated President Truman on the first ballot at their convention in Philadelphia on July 14. On the same day Truman made his acceptance speech at Convention Hall in an optimistic and self-assured manner. This was in sharp contrast to the gloom of the leaders of his party. Truman's acceptance speech was his most politically astute of the 1948 campaign for within that speech he called Congress into special session to give the Republican-dominated Congress a chance to enact the moderately progressive legislation they had called for in their platform three weeks earlier.

Now the Republicans came here a few weeks ago, and they wrote a platform. I hope you have all read that platform, and that platform had a lot of promises and statements of what the Republican Party is for, and what they would do if they were in power. They have promised to do in that platform a lot of things I have been asking them to do that they have refused to do when they had the power.... The Republican platform favors educational opportunity and promotion of education. I have been trying to get Congress to do something about that ever since they came there, and that bill
is at rest in the House of Representatives
....There is a long list of promises
in the Republican platform....Everyone
of them is important....My duty as
President requires that I use every
means within my power to get the laws
the people need on matters of such
importance and urgency. I am therefore
calling this Congress back into session
July 26th....I shall ask them to act
upon other vitally needed measures
such as aid to education....10

From the beginning Republican party leaders, partic­
ularly Dewey and Taft, were opposed to the special session
and after it convened on July 27 they worked for its early
August 7 adjournment. The President had the Republicans
in a bind. If the Republican-dominated Congress passed the
extensive new domestic legislation Truman called for in the
special session or even if they failed to pass such legis­
lation, Truman only stood to gain.

Truman's earlier contention that the Republicans
did not mean what they said in their platform received
support by the fact that very little of the promised Re­
publican legislation was enacted. In a news conference
on August 12, 1948 Truman was asked:

10"Address in Philadelphia Upon Accepting the Nom­i­
nation of the Democratic National Convention," July 15,
1948, Public Papers, p. 409. Within this speech Truman
urged Congress to enact 300 million dollars to meet what
he considered an "educational crisis." Ibid.
Newsman. Mr. President have you any observations to make on the record of the special session.

The President: Well, my observations are that it was a kind of poor result that we got. I think more action could very well have been taken. There were instances when committees refused even to meet to hear the administration's views on the subjects on which we asked them to act.

Newsman. Would you say it was a "do-nothing" session, Mr. President?

The President: I would say it was entirely a "do-nothing" session. I think that's a good name for the 80th Congress.11

This rather fruitless special session, which was part of the legislative record of the 80th Congress, gave Truman his most effective political weapon. Now he had the opportunity to condemn the Republican-controlled Congress, a "do-nothing" Congress as he incessantly called it throughout the campaign.

11"The President's News Conference of August 12, 1948, Public Papers, p. 438. Truman had been using this expression since a speaking tour in June.
An important part of Truman's condemnation was based on his concern over the distressful condition of American education and the Republicans' failure to support federal efforts to alleviate the Nation's educational ills. As early in the campaign as the acceptance speech at Philadelphia, Truman contended:

...the schools in this country are crowded, teachers underpaid, and there is a shortage of teachers. One of the greatest national needs is more and better schools. I urged the Congress to provide $300 million to aid the States in the present educational crisis. Congress did nothing about it.12

Truman could not have been more succinct and penetrating in conveying his views on federal aid to education to the American people.

Beginning with an address before the Greater Los Angeles Press Club in June and continuing through October,

12 "Address in Philadelphia Upon Accepting the Nomination of the Democratic National Convention." July 15, 1948, Public Papers, p. 408. There were, of course, other domestic programs that Truman criticized the 80th Congress for not passing such as: a national health program, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, The Brannan Plan for agriculture, and other domestic programs.
Truman made the nation's shortage of teachers, their inadequate pay, and the shortage of classrooms a major issue in at least fourteen of his campaign speeches, and he specifically called for general federal aid to education in many of his other speeches.

Truman's extensive, whirlwind, speaking tour of the nation came to be known as the "whistle-stop" campaign. Campaigning throughout the nation with great vigor, he frequently expressed his favorable views toward federal aid to education, while Dewey conducted a more relaxed, perhaps overly confident campaign and a campaign which fell far short of his opponent's concern for federal aid to education.

In speaking about the plight of the nation's teachers Truman said:

...the teachers of this country are not adequately paid. There are conditions in nearly all the public schools in the country where the teacher has so many pupils under her care that she doesn't even have

---

13 Early in the campaign, Truman faced a very disappointing crowd in Omaha and decided to avoid major speeches in large cities but instead to make his speeches on a train excursion throughout the country. It is estimated that he talked to 15 million voters by traveling 31,700 miles and delivering 356 speeches in 35 days. For Truman's own account of this near-exhaustive whistle-stop campaign see Memoirs by Harry S. Truman: Years of Trial and Hope, II (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1956), pp. 210-211.
time to learn all their names. Something must be done about that.\textsuperscript{14}

The Republican 80th Congress was blamed for these conditions:

There isn't a city or county in the country that isn't short of schoolhouse room and short of teachers. Most of the teachers in the big cities are teaching two and three times as many children as they can possibly do successfully....The Republican Congress didn't do anything about it.\textsuperscript{15}

Truman continued with his gloomy account of American education: "There are teachers who are teaching as many as 55 to 75 pupils when 20 to 30 is about as many as any one teacher can handle; and they are the poorest paid people in the country."\textsuperscript{16}

Truman's criticism of the Republicans in general terms became more severe as the campaign progressed; however, only a few times did he directly and specifically criticize Dewey's position on education. At a news conference early in the campaign Truman referred to the failure of the special session to pass the educational bill S 472,

\textsuperscript{14}\textquotedblleft Address Before the Greater Los Angeles Press Club,	extquotedblright June 14, 1948, \textit{Public Papers}, p. 352.

\textsuperscript{15}\textquotedblleft Address at Lakeside Park, Oakland, California,	extquotedblright September 22, 1948, \textit{Public Papers}, p. 545.

\textsuperscript{16}\textquotedblleft Rear Platform and Other Informal Remarks in Michigan and Ohio,	extquotedblright September 6, 1948, \textit{Public Papers}, p. 469.
but immediately afterward he avoided direct criticism of Dewey.

Reporter: Mr. President, will you hold Governor Dewey responsible for the record of the 80th Congress in the campaign?

The President: I have no comment on that.17

But one such instance was his Springfield speech dealing with Dewey's alleged denunciation of the "teachers' lobby" at the Governors Conference in New Hampshire.

By October, in a speech in Syracuse Truman criticized Dewey's efforts for education in the state of New York:

You know that the present Republican leadership of your great State of New York claims to have done wonders for your New York schools since 1942.... I am afraid that is not quite an accurate statement.... Educational experts have compiled figures which show that this great State of New York is now trailing in 37th place in the adjustment for pupil expenditures to the rising costs between 1940 and 1947. Now, New York State shouldn't do that. If New York State had a forward-looking Governor, it wouldn't do that. New York State aid to schools, in proportion to local support, has actually dropped since 1940.... When you see what has been happening in so prosperous a state as yours, I am sure you can understand why the Democratic Party believes that federal aid to education is vitally necessary.18


VIGOROUS SUPPORT OF TEACHER'S SALARIES

Truman's campaign consistently revealed his support for federal aid to education, particularly his interest in the plight of the teaching profession. He was perceptive of the teachers' poor economic position and revealed an understanding of their frustrations over low pay and poor "working conditions" in the schools.

Expanding employment opportunities in other fields have attracted teachers away from the schools. Many of the teachers who have stayed in the schools because of their interest in their work are underpaid and must have their salaries increased. We cannot expect to hold our present teachers, no matter how strong their devotion, nor attract the additional teachers we need, unless they are properly compensated.19

Perhaps Truman's strongest and most radical support for teachers came in a speech in Indianapolis on October 15:

We don't have nearly enough school teachers and we don't pay them nearly enough. And if the school teachers want to organize for better pay—I am all for them.20


Truman continued his caustic criticism of the Republicans' failure to support federal aid to education and teachers' salaries. "They are not interested in whether teachers have good pay or not. They are not interested in whether the kids get a proper education or not."\textsuperscript{21}

**CALL FOR PARTISAN SUPPORT**

Although Truman condemned the Republican-dominated 80th Congress for not passing educational legislation, he did make an occasional appeal for bi-partisan support for federal aid to education:

> How about a little unity on this federal aid to education issue?  
> ...The Democratic Party will be delighted to work with the Republican Party for federal aid to education  
> ...it is the kind of unity that would benefit the entire nation.\textsuperscript{22}

However, Truman's call for bi-partisan support for federal aid to education was rare, and nearly all his campaign speeches dealing with this issue were strictly partisan. Some examples of partisanship were revealed in a speech in Norman, Oklahoma on September 28:

\textsuperscript{21}"Address at Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis, Missouri," October, 30, 1948, Public Papers, p. 938.

\textsuperscript{22}"Rear Platform and Other Informal Remarks in Texas," September 27, 1948, Public Papers, p. 590.
...these Republicans don't believe in federal aid to education. ...We must make our educational system work. The Democrats are for that. I don't think the Republicans are."23

In a speech at Southern Illinois University on September 30:

We urgently need a national program to aid the states in meeting the present shortage of teachers and schools. The Democratic Party has such a program. But the Republican Party, as usual, can't see the need for this forward step. In spite of the pleading of parents and teachers and school administrators all over the country, this puppet 80th Congress refused to pass the aid to education bill. As a result, millions of American children are failing to get the good education that is their birthright here in the United States. The Republicans want to go backward, instead of forward. That's the Republican way.24

and at a breakfast address in Cincinnati on October 11:

We Democrats urged a Federal program under the direction of the states which would meet that situation nation's educational crisis. The Republicans killed that bill S 472 in the House. They are not interested in that

---


phase of the educational situation. 25

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION COMPARED
TO FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS

In addition to calling for partisan support for
federal aid to education, Truman, in a number of his campaign
speeches, considered the passage of federal aid to education
as legitimate as the federal government's aid to states for
building highways.

Time and time again I urged the
Republican 80th Congress to pass
legislation, to extend Federal
assistance and aid to the States for
the school systems, just like the
Federal Government helps the States
build highways. You'd think
everybody would agree that school-
children are at least as important
as the highways over which the
school buses carry them to school.
The Republicans didn't think so. 26

An even stronger statement was made at Madison Square Garden
on October 28:

I think it's much more important to
see that the children that ride in
the buses over these roads get
the proper kind of schooling and the
proper sort of teachers than it


is to build the roads, myself.27

ANTI-COMMUNISM AND FEDERAL AID

Truman's campaign maneuver to make federal aid to education a partisan issue and his equating the need for such aid to that of the need for federal aid to highways did not seem as surprising a tactic as his efforts to tie the need for federal aid to education to the anti-communism cause. By 1948 Truman's policy of containment was very much in effect and the cold war had become hotter because of the Berlin crisis. Anti-communist feeling was becoming more prevalent among Americans and perhaps because of this both candidates included this theme in their campaign rhetoric.28

27"Address in Madison Square Garden, New York City," October 28, 1948, Public Papers, p. 912. Truman continued this idea in some later speeches. "If we can build roads, why can't we build for the head as well as for the feet and wheels?" "Rear Platform and Other Informal Remarks in Missouri," June 9, 1950, Public Papers, p. 469.

28Although anti-communism is tied to education only in general in the next two quotations, Truman calls for federal aid to education immediately preceding each of these two quoted statements. And Truman continues this theme in speeches of later years. "Education alone is our first line of defense....Through education alone can we combat the tenets of communism." "Address at Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida," March 8, 1949, Public Papers, p. 167. "The challenge of communist imperialism requires the full potential of all our people.... In education." "Budget Message: Fiscal Year 1952," January 15, 1951, Public Papers, p. 94.
Dewey made anti-communism one of his major campaign themes, but he did not relate it to the issue of federal aid to education as his opponent did. By contrast, in a speech at Schenectady, New York on October 8, Truman told his audience that providing ample educational opportunities for all Americans was "the best safeguard there is against communism. When you have an educated people, communism hasn't a chance in the world." On the same day in Rochester, New York, he continued, "You know, the best insurance against communism in this country is education. The communists can't stand education."  

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORMS

Although the Republican and Democratic platforms included anti-communist statements, these statements did not refer in any way to the issue of federal aid to education. However, both parties included federal aid to education in their platforms. The Democratic platform was much clearer and more positive in its support of such aid.


30Ibid., p. 716.
We advocate federal aid for education administered by and under the control of the states. We vigorously support the authorization, which was so shockingly ignored by the Republican 80th Congress, for the appropriation of $300 million as a beginning of federal aid to the states to assist them in meeting the present educational needs. We insist upon the right of every American child to obtain a good education.31

Truman seemed to be proud of the inclusion of a specific request of 300 million dollars for federal aid to education in the Democratic platform and was disdainful of the general statement on federal aid to education included in the Republican platform. In a speech in Syracuse, New York, on October 8 Truman quoted the section on federal aid to education in his party platform and followed it by saying:

Now, now, I want you to listen to this Republican platform and see if you get anything out of it: "We favor equality of educational opportunity, and the improvement of education and educational facilities."

That's all they say. They don't say much, or how to do it or how they will do it, or what they will do. They just make a lot of platitudes just like they have in their campaigns. The Republican Party ducked the issue. I do not see any hope of Federal aid to the state for education if the

Republican Party gets control of the Government. 32

Truman claimed that when "we put things in a Democratic platform, we try to carry them out. We don't just write them down on paper and forget about them."33

THE ELECTION

Truman appealed to the voters to vote out the Republican 80th Congress and replaced it with a Democratic 81st Congress in order that the promises in the Democratic platform could be enacted. In his final message to the American voters, a radio address from Independence, Missouri, on election eve, he stated that he had done his best to discuss the issues and to explain the meaning of the Democratic platform during the campaign and told them, "I intend to carry it out if they give me a Democratic Congress to help."34 The nation's voters settled in their living rooms that evening to await the returns.

32Schnapper, p. 209.
As the lights burned late throughout the night all over the nation it became increasingly evident that the election was not going to be the easy victory for Dewey that the polls had predicted; in fact, to nearly everyone's surprise, the election was unfolding into the greatest political upset in American history.

Dewey conceded defeat shortly before noon the next day after Ohio fell into Truman's column. That day The New York Times was flooded with a record 25,000 telephone calls seeking confirmation of the election results. Groucho Marx quipped, "The only way a Republican will get into the White House is to marry Margaret Truman."^35

When the final results were in, Truman had received 24,105,695 popular and 304 electoral votes to Dewey's 21,969,170 popular and 189 electoral votes. However, these figures were deceptive and the election was closer than the figures suggest. A couple of the bigger states could have "swung" the election to Dewey.^36

It is impossible to identify and isolate any one issue and say that it contributed most to Truman's astonishing victory. Truman, himself, attributed it to labor's support, but most political analysts said the farm vote

---

^35 Abels, p. 270.

^36 Ibid., pp. 289-290.
made the difference. Yet, as in most elections, there were a number of factors that converged to produce the final result. The issue of federal aid to education alone, just as any other one issue—save the issues of agriculture and labor, could not have reversed the election results.

But surely the issue over federal aid to education was important in Truman's victory. American education had reached one of its lowest levels and was a national disgrace. Although most American voters still viewed education as a local affair, many were becoming impatient with local inaction, and many looked to the federal government for help. Their candidate in the 1948 election was clearly Truman.

In an attempt to analyze the reason for Truman's defeat of Dewey, Democratic women at party headquarters in Washington D.C., on the day after the election, said that an important factor in the outcome of the election was Dewey's attack on the teachers' lobby and that Dewey's failure to back federal aid to education caused many mothers and teachers to vote for Truman.37 Considering Truman's victory a "mandate from the people" the director of the legislative and federal relations division of the National Education Association wrote:

President Truman's victory in the election is regarded by many as a strong promise of the enactment of federal aid to education legislation in the 82nd Congress. The President has a clear mandate from the American people to fight for legislative objectives which he clearly defined during the course of the campaign. One of these objectives is federal aid, without federal control, to help equalize educational opportunity for youth throughout the nation. The President is sincere and courageous. No one who knows him believes he will be deflected from the program he charted during his campaign.

There is no way of determining how many voters were influenced to vote for Truman because of his support of federal aid to education or because of Dewey's failure to do so, but with the nation's educational system in such sad condition and with the candidates differing so clearly on this issue, one is led to speculate that large numbers of concerned teachers and parents cast their votes for Truman because of this issue.

Although it may be difficult to determine the extent of voter support that Truman received because of his advocacy of federal aid to education, it is apparent that Truman's endorsement of federal aid to education, as reflected in his public statements and his actions, especially his backing of teachers, far exceeded any previous

presidential concern and support for aid to education.

It is true that the nation's educational problems were probably never before so acute as they were in 1948, excluding perhaps the 1930's, and, therefore, it would be logical for a presidential hopeful to include them in his campaign speeches, but Truman's 1948 campaign was, nevertheless, a milestone in presidential concern for educational problems. His campaign set a precedent for future presidents to speak out on matters of such great importance to our nation's well-being.
CHAPTER IV

TRUMAN'S SUPPORT OF BROAD PROGRAMS
IN EDUCATION

Truman may have been the first presidential candidate to make federal aid to education a major issue in a presidential campaign, but he was not the first president to request federal funds for primary education. In a message to Congress in 1870, President Grant recognized the pressing need for some basic education for the newly freed Negroes and said, "I would therefore call upon Congress to take all the means within their constitutional powers, to promote and encourage popular education throughout the country." 1 Presidents Hayes and Garfield subsequently favored national support for education, but it was Grant's request for federal aid to education in 1870 that initiated Congressional efforts in the Hoar Bill of that same year.

The bill was the first federal government attempt to establish national schools in all states where the state government failed to provide adequate public school instruction. The bill was denounced by educators as unwarranted federal interference in public school education and was withdrawn.²

AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Since the Hoar Bill, numerous other attempts to secure federal aid legislation have been made, but general aid to elementary and secondary schools was never enacted. Truman clearly recognized a need for a radical shift in emphasis regarding aid to education from specific to general federal aid to education.

The Federal Government for many years has given financial aid to special aspects of education, such as vocational education and institutions for special groups, such as Howard University. It has become increasingly evident that federal support of a more general character is needed if satisfactory educational opportunities are to

be made available for all.\textsuperscript{3}

Although there had been other Presidents who had previously requested federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, Truman was the first president to unequivocally and forcefully request large sums of general federal aid for them.

Such requests did not occur in Truman's earlier years as president except for several general statements about the need for aid to elementary and secondary schools. It was not until Truman's budget message of 1948 that general aid for elementary and secondary education was requested. The President's estimates of 1947 and 1948 for education and research jumped sharply from 77 million to 387 million respectively. What caused such a dramatic increase was the proposed 300 million dollars specifically directed to elementary and secondary schools throughout the nation. However, this is not to say that such a large sum of money was first conceived in Truman's 1948 budget message, for this figure first appeared in a bill introduced in Congress in 1936.\textsuperscript{4} Senator Aiken's bill in 1947 called

\begin{footnotes}

\end{footnotes}
for initial appropriations of 400 million which would have increased to 1.2 billion a year, and Senator Taft's bill called for 150 million increasing to 250 million. The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported out a compromise bill (S 472) between the Taft and Aiken proposals; the initial allotment was to be about 300 million. Nevertheless, although numerous Congressmen had called for federal aid to education, this was the first time the nation's president had called for such a large sum for general aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Shortly before Truman requested the 300 million dollars in aid, the National Education Association proposed the exact same figure. After the presidential budget message of 1948, the figure of 300 million was to reappear in most of his requests for federal aid to education legislation; each of Truman's remaining annual budget messages through 1952 were to include this figure; the 1953 budget message did not.

5Ibid.
6"NEA Urges $300 Million Aid Bill," The New York Times, January 4, 1948, p. 34.
7It is customary for outgoing presidents to reduce their proposed budgets in order that the budget may be balanced or at least be nearly balanced. The 300 million dollar proposal was probably eliminated for this purpose.
An interesting development occurred in response to Truman's 1948 budget message in which a 300 million federal aid to education request was made in the same statement with the request for the establishment of a National Science Foundation. Uniting these items in the budget message was apparently the President's way of indicating to the Congress that they were both important and that the need for both programs should not be overlooked in meeting the nation's severe educational needs. But efforts to pass either of the programs was unsuccessful in 1948 and again in 1949.

Truman called for federal aid for elementary and secondary education "to help remedy the deplorable shortages and the maldistribution of school facilities and teachers." Federal aid to education was justified on the basis of the wide disparity of educational expenditures between the wealthy and the poor states and on the premise that the American economy required a higher level of competence among workers. Truman claimed that the greatest urgency in educational problems was in elementary and secondary schools where fundamental preparation was made for later specialized training.

---

With a higher average of competence required by our economy, the most urgent educational problems now center in the elementary and secondary schools. It is here that boys and girls receive their basic training and prepare themselves to absorb more specialized training.⁹

In his 1948 legislative proposals to Congress, Truman made a strong request for 300 million dollars in federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. On April 1 the Senate passed S 472 which would provide for such aid. Passage of S 472 culminated thirty years of effort among Congressman to secure federal aid for schools below the college level. The Senate had debated five bills within that thirty year period; the latest and most closely related to the 1948 bill were in 1943 and 1945, but none of them were successfully guided through the Senate. The basic purpose of all the bills was to provide a minimum of educational opportunity to all children. Senate bill 472, for example, attempted to provide not less than 50 dollars per pupil in average daily attendance per school year.¹⁰

The bill was designed to make possible a minimum educational

⁹Ibid., p. 85.

program for every child regardless of where he lives.

Soon after Senate passage of S 472, it became apparent that the bill was going to have difficulty in the House. Proponents of the bill accused House Speaker Joseph Martin and other House Republican Leaders of thwarting the public will by blocking the bill. Representatives from twenty national organizations urged Martin to help push the measure. He had earlier supported the bill but later stated that foreign aid and national defense bills should be given priority.\(^{11}\) Disagreeing with him, Truman wrote to Martin stating that he was

\[
\text{\textit{convinced that the increases which have become necessary in other Federal expenditures present no valid reason for delaying federal aid to education. On the contrary, I consider that such assistance will be a major contribution to the vitality of American democracy, which is the foundation of all our efforts toward peace and freedom.}}^{12}
\]

Truman asked the Democratic Congressional Leaders to lend their support for S 472. This was not looked upon with much favor by conservative Republicans since the bill was sponsored by a leading Republican Senator Taft. Truman's motives were criticized by some Republicans as being purely

\[^{11}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 148.\]

\[^{12}\text{Ibid.}\]
political. But Truman did not only appeal to Democratic Congressional Leaders; he made a special plea to Republican House Leader Martin by sending him a letter urging his support for the bill and said

I wish to express my earnest hope that the House of Representatives will take favorable action at this session upon legislation providing federal aid for elementary and secondary schools....I included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1949 an estimate of $300 million to cover the cost of such legislation...The cost of providing adequate systems of schools has long been beyond the financial resources of many of our states...Unless the Federal Government comes to the aid of the States in meeting these needs, there is danger of a serious breakdown in our systems of education. We cannot take such a risk. I am convinced that the increases which have become necessary in other federal expenditures present no valid reason for delaying federal aid to education. ...A bill to provide Federal Aid to education has recently been passed in the Senate by a substantial majority of both parties. I hope that legislation for this purpose will soon be passed also by the House of Representatives.13

Despite this and other pleas by many others, including educators and publishers, no further action was taken on this bill.

By mid-June, 1948, when a parliamentary point was raised to block an effort in the House Education and Labor

Committee to send the bill to a special meeting of the House for consideration and when it was obvious to most observers that nothing was going to come of the Taft bill, Truman began to criticize Congress severely for its lack of action on the bill. In an address to the Greater Los Angeles Press Club he displayed his disdain. "No action. No action. It's the most disgraceful thing in this country ..." From that point on, Truman made Congress' failure to pass educational legislation a major issue in the presidential campaign of 1948.

In his opening address to Congress in 1949, Truman made a very strong plea for federal aid, especially to elementary schools because of the worsening crisis in public education.

All these school problems will become much more acute as a result of the tremendous increase in the enrollment in our elementary schools in the next few years. I cannot repeat too strongly my desire for prompt Federal financial aid to the states to help them operate and maintain their school systems.15


15"Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union," January 6, 1949, *Public Papers*, p. 4. On the same day the National Education Association lauded Truman for his support of federal aid to education.
Although Truman continued to request 300 million dollars in federal aid to elementary and secondary schools from 1949 through 1952, the Korean conflict, starting in June of 1950, reduced the president's efforts toward federal aid to elementary and secondary education and for a number of his other domestic programs. This was brought into the open in the State of the Union Message of 1951 when he called for aid to elementary and secondary schools but quickly followed it by saying that "...some of our plans will have to be deferred for the time being." In another call for aid to education Truman said:

> It is clear that we cannot neglect the education...of our people, without the most serious results for a long-run defense effort. Obviously, we will not now have available the resources to build or staff as many schools...in as many places as we hoped to do in normal times.

This statement was an admission that although aid to elementary and secondary education was urgent and the nation needed to do all it could to see that our children were given a good education, funds needed for the War would


take precedence over funds needed for education.

An important shift in the expressed purpose in federal aid to education commenced in 1950. A campaign was begun in Congress to secure federal grants for school construction. However, by 1951 the enthusiasm for aid to education including school construction was declining. Although Truman endorsed aid to education in his 1951 and 1952 messages, he gave only minimal support for it. Even though federal aid to education bills were introduced by some Congressmen, no bills were reported out of either House or Senate Committees. 18

Although Truman strongly supported federal aid to elementary and secondary schools throughout his two terms of office, Congress was not ready to enact it. Controversy over support to private and parochial schools was the main cause of its defeat. Yet Truman had succeeded in establishing with Congress the idea that there was great need for future federal support of the schools. Too, the shift from general federal aid to school construction aid in 1950 provided the basis for the kind of aid to the schools that would be emphasized in the next administration.

18 Munger and Fenno, p. 11.
AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

A very important event in the history of American higher education occurred in 1946 when Truman appointed a Presidential Commission on Higher Education. Appointing the Commission in a little more than a year after coming into office and less than a year after the war ended, Truman showed that he had quickly recognized the urgent need for the study of higher education.

Post World War II higher education was experiencing an unprecedented boom due to the Soldier's Readjustment Act of 1944; millions of returning servicemen were going to college who otherwise would not have been able to go. Provisions for education under this act added considerably to the apparent income of colleges and universities which accepted returning veterans, but such income did not meet all the actual costs of educating so many young men and women. Increased enrollments caused shortages of student housing, classrooms, and instructors. Some institutions faced financial crisis due to rising costs and devalued endowments.

The president warned the nation about the impending increase of enrollment in colleges.

A large proportion of young people who are now crowding the elementary
schools will progress through high school and enter college after 1955. They will replace the veterans who are now in college. Compared with an enrollment of 1.4 million when the war started and a current enrollment of 2.4 million, we should now plan for an enrollment by 1960 of 4 to 5 million students in an expanded and improved system of higher education.¹⁹

He contended that because of the aid for veterans in higher education, the relationship between higher education and the federal government demanded more serious consideration. "The veteran's readjustment program, which compelled a rapid emergency expansion of facilities to meet immediate needs, has focused attention on this fundamental problem."²⁰

Even though Truman gave strong support to the veterans' educational program, he cautioned that the nation must not permit the veterans' educational program to obscure the federal government's larger responsibility for education.


He believed that such responsibility required general federal aid to the states in order to help equalize educational opportunity on all levels of the educational system.  

The president believed that the Presidential Commission on Higher Education was to play an important role in improving colleges and universities. In the letter to those appointed requesting that they accept appointment, he stated that "it seems particularly important that we should now re-examine our system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities, and in the light of the social role it has to play." He asked that the Commission be particularly concerned with ways and means of expanding educational opportunities for all able young people; the adequacy of curricula, particularly in the fields of internal affairs and social understanding; the desirability of establishing a series of intermediate technical institutes; and the financial structure of higher education with particular reference


to the requirements for the rapid expansion of physical facilities.23

The commission had its first meeting in July 1947 and on December 11 released its first report to the President in a report called Establishing the Goals which was the first of six reports in a series entitled, Higher Education for American Democracy.24

A number of major changes in higher education were recommended by the Commission to the president who received them enthusiastically and within a month he began to make general recommendations on the subject to the Congress. Actually, Truman apparently did not find it feasible to follow up on most of the Commission's recommendations and

23Ibid., p. 622. Truman saw these topics as suggestive and not intended to limit the range of the Commission's work.

24The Commission's first report, Establishing the Goals, became the first section of the publication Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948). There were other volumes released later by the White House that were a part of this same series: Volume II, Equalizing and Expanding Educational Opportunity, December 21, 1947; Volume III, Organizing Higher Education, January 12, 1948; Volume IV, Staffing Higher Education, January 25, 1948; Volume V, Financing Higher Education, February 1, 1948; Volume VI, Resource Data, March 21, 1948. All of these reports are sections within the publication Higher Education for American Democracy.
restricted his recorded activity to only two specific recommendations of the Commission. These were the need for establishing two year community colleges and for federal scholarships and fellowships.

Yet, it appears that Truman had considerable confidence in the work of the Higher Education Commission and intended to use their findings as a basis for future legislative requests.

I appointed a commission to make a survey of the educational situation in this country. That commission made a formidable report, and pointed out exactly what the conditions in the schools in this country are today; and I make a recommendation to the Congress that the Federal Government make a contribution to the support of the schools of the nation.25

Although Truman's appointment of the Presidential Commission on Higher Education was a definite indication of the grave concern he had for problems at this level, he did not specifically include aid to higher education until the 1950 budget where one million dollars was proposed.26 These funds were to be used to establish an


administration for federal scholarships and for some scholar-
ships to students.

The president did not request funds from the time of his next budget message in 1948 until 1950 probably because he was emphasizing aid to elementary and secondary schools, and, more importantly, because he probably considered it an unwise political move. But in 1952, only two years after his initial scholarship proposal, Truman inserted 30 million into his budget for a general program of scholarship aid and loans for undergraduate students. This was truly a significant request since it was, in proportion to the amount he requested for elementary and secondary schools, a large figure.

Truman was concerned that because of low family income and because of the high costs involved in getting a college education, more than half of the youth of America who could benefit from a college education would not be able to attend. Therefore, a new idea in federal support for higher education was introduced in Truman's 1950 budget message. The president pointed out that many Americans, both young and old, who wanted to continue their education beyond high school into professional, technical, or vocational training or into general education would be able to do so at low cost only if these opportunities were to be developed in colleges within commuting distance of their
homes. Accordingly, he asked the Federal Security Admin­istrator "to make a comprehensive study of this development in order to determine whether the Federal Government might appropriately take any action to encourage the states and localities to establish and expand community colleges." Although he called for studies of the community colleges, no specific federal aid was requested for them by Truman during his remaining three years in office.

In addition to his requests for federal scholarships for college students, Truman gave his approval to a Korean "G.I. Bill of Rights" for returning veterans. But other than general statements favoring such aid, the president made no major effort to obtain passage of the bill. Truman signed the Veteran's Readjustment Assistance Act in July, 1952, and it became Public Law 550.

Although Truman did not request any significant aid to higher education until his 30 million proposal in 1950, he did begin very early to set up a major study of colleges and universities by appointing a Commission. The president's

\[27\] *Ibid.*, p. 84. Although the President's Commission on Higher Education in 1946 recommended that the number and the activities of community colleges be expanded, it was not until 1950 that Truman began to call for a study of community colleges. For a discussion of community colleges by the President's Commission see *Higher Education for American Democracy*, pp. 67-70.
recommendations stemming from the Commission's report were to provide a basis for later reforms in higher education.

CRISIS AS A BASIS OF AID

From the earliest years of our nation's history the federal government has provided support for certain ongoing educational programs such as, library and museum services, the education of American Indians, land-grant colleges, vocational education, and many others. Truman continued to support these programs, but he did not request any significant increase in funds for them, except a recommendation to expand vocational education. However, Truman's rather calm acceptance of traditional education programs contrasted sharply to his repeated expression of concern about the poor condition of education in the nation's public schools.

In 1946 and 1947 educators and other interested citizens warned that a school crisis was at hand. Teachers were leaving the profession in unprecedented numbers because of low salaries, and yet school enrollments were steadily rising. Truman also recognized that our educational system was facing a financial crisis and thought that it was deplorable that in a nation as rich as ours there were millions of children who did not have adequate schoolhouses or
enough teachers for a good elementary or secondary education. Therefore, he believed that the federal government had the responsibility to provide financial aid to meet the crisis. He was concerned that if the federal government did not come to the aid of the states to help meet their grave educational needs, there would be a serious breakdown in the state educational systems, and he thought this would be too great a risk for the nation to take.28

Time and again Truman asserted in his public statements that many states were incapable of providing a minimum standard of education for their school age children. Truman said, "There are many areas and some whole States where good schools cannot be provided without imposing an undue local tax burden on the citizens."29 Moreover, Truman believed, "If there are educational inadequacies in any State, the whole Nation suffers."30 Accordingly,


Congress was urged to provide federal grants to the states for elementary and secondary education.

Recognition was made by Truman of the fact that many states, even with favorable tax rates, were finding it more difficult to meet the increasing costs of education. If the states were not able to provide needed improvements in their schools, then federal aid was needed.

Many states need new schools and more teachers. The only way our boys and girls can get the kind of education they need is for the Federal Government to help the States improve their school systems.31

Too, the president pointed-out that teachers' salaries had fallen far behind the increased cost of living. The overcrowding of schools was, he said, very detrimental to the health and education of school children. Delay in providing relief for this distressing situation would cause irreparable damage to several million children.32 Accordingly, in many of his requests to Congress for more funds, he included the idea that the schools were in a state of crisis.


Truman predicted that the deplorable condition of education would, if not aided by the federal government, result in serious consequences in the future. They [Republicans] refused to provide aid for education. In several messages I suggested that our educational situation is in the doldrums, that the education of the grades is in a condition that is going to cause us serious trouble in the next generation if we don't do something about it.33

The serious consequences spoken of by Truman were revealed dramatically a decade later when the controversy over the ineffectiveness of our schools was ignited by the launching of Sputnik. Sufficient federal funds to aid schools were not being provided for the schools and as a result the grim prediction of serious trouble for the schools became a reality.

Throughout his two terms of office President Truman urged passage of educational legislation to provide relief from what he considered to be the serious crisis the schools were experiencing. He was instrumental in establishing the National Science Foundation and in preparing the way for the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. His firm belief in providing equal educational

33"Rear Platform and Other Informal Remarks in Michigan, and Ohio," September 6, 1948, Public Papers, p. 469.
opportunity for all children led him to request 300 million for elementary and secondary schools and 30 million for higher education. Although he used the issue of federal aid to education to enhance his own political fortunes, there is little question that he believed such aid to be necessary and appropriate. Even though he was unsuccessful in getting many of his legislative recommendations passed by Congress, he did lay the groundwork for the enactment of major education bills. It remained to be seen what the succeeding presidents would do with the foundation that Truman had laid.
Unlike Truman, Eisenhower was very well-known before becoming president, and his prominent military past made him exceptionally popular with the American voter. Both political parties were cognizant of this fact, and he became one of the most sought after presidential candidates in United States history despite the fact that he had never been elected or appointed to any political office in the past. The Korean War, coming so soon after World War II, and the apprehension over alleged Communists in government resulted in the nation's desire for a return to "normalcy." The time was right for a moderate candidate.

Eisenhower's overwhelming victory in 1952 brought an end to two decades of dynamic executive leadership favoring progressive legislation and a return to a more cautious
leadership favorable to moderately conservative legislation. Nevertheless, much of Eisenhower's domestic legislative program was built on the political foundations that Roosevelt and Truman had laid. He could not suddenly reverse the policies of the New and Fair Deal without causing great disruption throughout the country. It is to Eisenhower's credit that he did not yield to the pressures of some of his more conservative Republican colleagues who favored a sharp move to the political right.

Most of the advocates of federal aid had given their support to the Democratic candidate, and with the election of Eisenhower hope for passage of future federal aid bills was dim indeed. For example, shortly after Eisenhower won his first election an article appeared in a leading educational journal entitled "Unhappy Days for Advocates of More Federal Aid." But although not much action on domestic issues was expected during the Eisenhower Administration, circumstances were to occur which would alter somewhat this negative view.

EISENHOWER'S GENERAL IDEAS ABOUT EDUCATION

Eisenhower often spoke of the value of education in

---

1B.P. Brodinsky, Nation's Schools, LI (January 1953), pp. 104-106.
the broadest sense. In his Inaugural Address at Columbia University on October 12, 1948, he expressed his views on the values and goals of education:

The educational system...can scarcely impose any logical limit upon its functions and responsibilities in preparing students for a life of social usefulness and individual satisfaction. The academic range must involve the entire material, intellectual, and spiritual aspects of life.²

He warned against the dangers of specialization and strongly favored general education;

At all levels of education, we must be constantly watchful that our schools do not become so engrossed in techniques, great varities of fraction­alized courses, highly specialized knowledge, and the size of their physical plant as to forget the principal purpose of education itself—to prepare the student for an effective personal and social life in a free society. From the school at the crossroads to a university as great as Columbia, general education for citizenship must be the common and first purpose of them all.³

Even ten years later as president of the United States, Eisenhower spoke again of the need for a balanced program


³Ibid.
between specialized and general education. "Specialized programs must not be allowed to upset the important balance needed in a well-rounded educational program which must insure progress in all areas of learning."

In a radio broadcast "The Veteran Wants to Know" in July 1948 Eisenhower said that education should not merely be a way of acquiring specialized learning but that which inculcates moral values, builds character, and develops responsible citizens in a democracy. Eisenhower believed that "Unless our schools, above all else, strive to train America's youth for effective citizenship in a free democracy, all their other efforts will, in the end, result in failure."  

In his 1954 budget message Eisenhower stated that education was fundamental to a democracy. "To the extent that the educational system provides our citizens with the opportunities for study and learning, the wiser will their decisions be, and the more they can contribute to our way of life." Furthermore, in a statement to the National

---


5Taylor, p. 113.

Education Association in 1956 he expressed the belief that freedom and free government were dependent upon an educated citizenry. "Public education—and private education as well—serves to strengthen our system of self-government and our freedom as a people." Even before becoming president of Columbia he had held the American educational system in high regard. At a Lafayette College Alumni Dinner in November, 1946 Eisenhower said:

> It is my conviction that there is no agency or no institution of civilization that can do so much for the world today as its educational institutions, specifically its colleges, colleges that take the lead and set the pattern for our educational system....colleges must teach us not only how to be skillful in our own professions, how to make more money than if we had not come to college. They must teach us how to live. The world needs to know how to live—how to live together.

Eisenhower believed that only by education could doubt and fear be resolved.

---


8 Taylor, p. 115.

9 Ibid., p. 118.
Believing that the schools had the responsibility of training an economically competent citizen the president, at a news conference in 1955, said, "Education is really bread-and-butter citizenship. It is just necessary to the developing of citizens that can perform their duties properly."\textsuperscript{10} Too, Eisenhower believed that the "vitality of our democracy and the productivity of our economy depend in large measure on the development of our human resources through an effective educational system."\textsuperscript{11} However, Eisenhower thought that education is not only the means for earning a living, but for "enlarging life--for maintaining and improving liberty of the mind, for exercising both the rights and obligations of freedom, for understanding the world in which we live."\textsuperscript{12} He maintained that "good education" is fundamental to fulfilling the "individual's aspirations in the American way of life." "Good


education" for Eisenhower was "the outgrowth of good homes, good communities, good churches, and good schools." 13

Eisenhower's boundless faith in education was well within the American tradition. 14 He publically expressed an uncritical faith in American education while president of Columbia University and while he was president of the United States even though the American educational system was having serious difficulties.

FEDERAL CONTROL VIGOROUSLY OPPOSED

Although Eisenhower expressed great faith in American education he was very concerned about the possibility of federal control and warned of its dangers to local education in nearly every one of his major statements pertaining to federal aid. He especially expressed opposition to federal control of education while president of Columbia University.

A subcommittee of the House, Education, and Labor Committee was debating the controversies surrounding a general school aid bill (S 246) in 1949. Ralph Gwinn, a conservative Republican Representative from New York and

13 "Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union," January 5, 1956, Public Papers, p. 20. It is interesting to note the order in which Eisenhower describes the outgrowth of a "good education."

14 A criticism of that faith may be found in Jeffrey R. Herold, "The American Faith in the Schools as an Agency of Progress: Promise and Fulfillment." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1969).
a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, wrote
to Eisenhower at Columbia asking him for his advice on the
proposal for federal aid to education. Answering Gwinn's
letter Eisenhower spoke with a diction that anticipated the
McCarthy Era.

Unless we are careful, even the
great and necessary educational
processes in our country will become
yet another vehicle by which the
believers in paternalism, if not
outright socialism, will gain still
additional power for the Federal
Government.15

Continuing in the same letter and in the same spirit
Eisenhower assailed the idea of universal federal aid to
all states for education and bitterly attacked those who
called for greater federal support.

Very frankly, the army of persons who
urge greater and greater centralization
and greater dependence upon the Federal
Treasury are really more dangerous to
our form of government than any external
threat that can possibly be arrayed against
us.16

15 U.S., Congress, House. Extension of remarks of
the Honorable Ralph W. Gwinn of New York in the House of
Representatives on federal aid to education. 81st Congress,
1st session, June 14, 1949, Congressional Record, XCV,
p. A3690.

16 Taylor, p. 35.
Eisenhower considered any granting of federal aid to education to all states tantamount to reckless spending and possible federal control.

I would heartily support federal aid under formulas that would permit no abuse, no direct interference of the Federal authority in educational processes...I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all states in the union for educational purposes. Such policy would create ambition--almost a requirement--to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local expenditures of local revenues.  

It was evident at that time that Eisenhower unquestioningly accepted the way local school districts financed their schools and was concerned that a "mushrooming" of federal funds for schools could occur that would not come under close scrutiny of local officials in spite of the fact that local school districts were not always as careful in the use of school funds as Eisenhower implied.

Even in his last budget message to Congress he considered federal aid to education potentially hazardous to "free education," and he often warned Congress that federal aid should in no way jeopardize the freedom of local schools and claimed that the "strength of our American

17 Ibid.
educational system flows from its freedom and its broad basis of support.\textsuperscript{18}

There was some federal control, however, in Eisenhower's educational proposals despite all his pronouncements against it, and even some of his Congressional supporters admitted a certain amount of control. Representative Samuel McConnell (Republican-Pennsylvania), reacting to the testimony of Samuel Brownell, U.S. Commissioner of Education in support of the Eisenhower administration school construction proposals, said:

\begin{quote}
I think that what we are trying to get at here, and I think what Dr. Brownell is saying is this, and I think he is right, that we as representatives of the people in the federal government have a right to set up certain standards before money is passed out. In other words, we just cannot leave it float according to the word of someone in a different state... There is a certain amount of control or direction in the beginning and there has to be in any federal program.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

The president and others were concerned that if

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
federal aid was to be given without any federal strings attached, states could use these federal funds to relieve local tax burdens without any improvement in the local schools. Neither the proponents or opponents of federal aid to education wanted this to happen. Even Eisenhower, one of the strongest opponents of federal control, was forced to realize that some federal regulations or control was necessary in order to insure that federal funds would be used for their intended purpose.

SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION CONTINUES

The controversy surrounding segregated schools was greater during the Eisenhower years than was the issue of federal control and was, in fact, the greatest obstacle then to gaining federal support for education. Yet Eisenhower infrequently addressed himself to this matter.

In the early twentieth century, controversy over federal aid for vocational education was centered around assuring that proportional amounts of federal aid was expended to the segregated black and white schools. The controversy remained relatively unheated until the 1950's when the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other Civil Rights organizations opposed the misuse of funds to segregated schools. Also, the Supreme Court decision of 1954 on segregation added to the controversy over federal aid to racially segregated schools.
Although the Supreme Court decision led to the belief by some congressmen that no aid should go to segregated schools, Eisenhower seemed opposed to the principle of attaching anti-segregation amendments to major education bills. In a Presidential News Conference on June 8, 1955, the president was asked:

Q. Mr. President, I wonder if you could expand your thinking on this use of the anti-segregation amendments on legislation. As I understand it, the aid-to-the-schools bill is bottled up in a Senate committee because of that same conflict, that there is an attempt to add an amendment that would prevent aid to States which permitted a continuation of segregation. Would that apply the same way you think as on national defense legislation?

The President. My own feeling about legislation is a simple one. If you get an idea of real importance, a substantive subject and you want to get it enacted into law, then I believe the Congress and I believe our people should have a right to decide upon that issue by itself, and not be clouding it with amendments that are extraneous.

20 For example, Senators George H. Bender (Republican-Ohio) and Irving M. Ives (Republican-New York) said federal assistance should not go to any state which refused to follow the Supreme Court ruling against segregated schools.

Again in 1956, Eisenhower, when questioned about an anti-segregation amendment to the school construction bill, replied that although he believed in the equality of opportunity for every citizen of the United States, the Supreme Court had recommended "a gradual implementation" and that the need of the American children for schools is "right now, immediately, today....I simply say, let's get the school bill; that is what I want."22

This same controversy was the main cause of the defeat of the 1956 school construction bill (H.R. 7535). Adam Clayton Powell (Democrat-New York) submitted an amendment to this bill prohibiting federal aid to states which failed to implement decisions of the Supreme Court on desegregation of schools. The amendment caused a curious re-alignment of votes. Some Liberals favorable to Civil Rights causes and federal aid to education voted against the Powell amendment, and ninety-six Republicans who eventually voted against the bill voted for the amendment. Both groups apparently reasoned that if the Powell amendment passed, it would arouse sufficient opposition from Southern Conservatives and Republicans to defeat the bill.

This is precisely what happened.23

There was considerable debate over the principle of the Powell amendment. Northern Liberals opposed to the amendment pleaded with fellow liberals to join them and insisted that the issues of segregation and school aid should be kept separate lest the school aid bill should go down to defeat, thus taking a position very similar to that of Eisenhower.

Just as Eisenhower avoided discussion of the Powell amendment, he avoided referring to the segregation of schools specifically in connection with federal aid to education. Not even during the Little Rock crisis did the President speak out against the injustices of school segregation but justified sending federal troops "solely for the purpose of preventing interference with the orders of the court."24 But in his 1957 "Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union" the President, while calling again for a school construction bill, referred to the Powell Amendment.

23Powell himself claimed that the bill failed because it did not include the equalization formula called for by the president.

This [school construction bill] will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now...I am hopeful that this program can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration. I urge the people in all sections of the country to approach these problems with calm and reason, with mutual understanding and good will, and in the American tradition of deep respect for the orderly processes of law and justice.25

Nevertheless, the president's call for school construction aid was defeated again in 1957, and its defeat was not due mainly to the Powell anti-segregation amendment, as in 1956, but was due primarily to a Congressional economy drive and increased Republican opposition to the principle of aid to education. Moreover, his call for calm and reason over segregation problems was flagrantly ignored when the issue of school segregation "exploded" at Little Rock.

Eisenhower's incessant warning against the danger of federal control contrasted sharply with his deliberate avoidance of the school segregation issue. The latter, was, however, consistent with his uncritical faith in American education.

RESEARCH AND PLANNING IN EDUCATION

In his first year in office Eisenhower did not acknowledge the problem of the nation's segregated schools or the nation's other educational problems; neither did he call for any important studies to be made of education. However, in his first major address to the nation in 1954, he did acknowledge the serious neglect the nation's schools were experiencing and believed that "in order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each state, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem."26

Repeating the call for state conferences and a national conference on education in his Budget Message a few weeks later, Eisenhower indicated optimism over their potential worth:

This conference [White House Conference on Education] will study the facts about the Nation's educational problems and recommend sensible solutions. We can then proceed with confidence on a constructive and effective long-range program.... The proposed

The president then went on to recommend appropriations for the state conferences and the national conference. Moreover, he asked for a small additional appropriation, part of which was for the U.S. Office of Education to help the states conduct educational surveys and part of which was for the establishment of an advisory committee on education in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Congress responded by passing three bills (PL 530, PL 531, and PL 532) one million for the state conferences, 200 thousand for the advisory committee, and whatever sums were necessary for the White House Conference. However, supporters of federal aid to education criticized this legislation as unnecessary and grossly inadequate. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, said: "No conference can keep another million


children from entering our schools each year for the next five...or create additional trained teachers to whom we may entrust their care...or build the classrooms we need to house our children."

Selma M. Borchardt, vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers, said that "no conference...is needed to tell us that we shall need 715,000 new classrooms by 1960." Senator James E. Murray (Democrat-Montana) called them "three puny bills...with which the Administration, who knew the problems of education, had been overruled by the 'budget balancers.'" Representative Eugene J. McCarthy (Democrat-Minnesota) said the Advisory Committee was not needed because the topics proposed for study had been under study "in the graduate schools...and in the departments of education for 20 years or more."

In a Special Message on Education in February 1955, Eisenhower placed considerable confidence in the state conferences and in the White House Conference on Education

---
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32Ibid., p. 208.
to be held in the latter part of that year. He justified providing only emergency federal aid for school construction for that year until the conferences compiled their findings. The President said, "...for the purpose of meeting the emergency only and pending the results of the nation-wide conferences—I propose a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction..."33 In addition to immediate school construction, Eisenhower believed that the nation needed to plan sound long-term financing of the public schools and that it was the task of the State Conferences on Education to help accomplish this. Moreover, Eisenhower believed that the conferences would "arouse the American people to a community effort for schools and a community concern for education unparalleled in our history."34

The President was overly confident in his belief that the conferences would be able to arouse the public's support of an educational system much in need of help. Some improvements were made that year in many local school districts, but in most of the districts financial support remained woefully inadequate.

33"Special Message to the Congress Concerning Federal Assistance in School Construction," February 8, 1955, Public Papers, p. 244.

34Ibid., pp. 248-249.
Shortly after the White House Conference of late 1955, Eisenhower began to lavish praise upon its work and to use its findings as a justification for school construction aid. After stating that the nation's pressing educational problems would be helped only by an active informed public, Eisenhower claimed:

This kind of effort has been spurred by the thousands of conferences held in recent months by half a million citizens and educators in all parts of the country, culminating in the White House Conference on Education.... They concluded that the people of the U.S. must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth. This expression from the people must now be translated into action at all levels of government.35

Accordingly, the president requested considerable federal funds to provide emergency federal aid for public school construction.

Proud of the fact that the White House Conference on Education was the first of its kind in the nation's history, Eisenhower stated in four of his major addresses in 1956 that it had, after intensified appraisal of the Nation's educational system, reawakened broad public interest

in the schools and helped to erase the idea that schools were other peoples' problems. For him, the conference represented a firm foundation for action and a potent force by the people. Therefore, the President believed that the final report of the White House Conference, the culmination of all the conferences, should receive serious consideration. For Eisenhower, the Committee's Report confirmed the critical classroom shortage that necessitated federal aid, and because of this the President was willing to make this "one of the major goals of this administration."36

Moreover, Eisenhower said the the Report "recognizes the crucial importance of good teaching and the need for higher salaries and greater community prestige to attract more teachers."37 But Eisenhower's federal aid to education proposals for 1956 included no provision for aid to teachers.

In Eisenhower's 1958 Special Message on Education, he recommended that the Office of Education be given authority to provide grants to state educational agencies to improve the collection of educational data. For this


37 Ibid., pp. 488-489.
purpose Congress provided 60 million in the National Defense Education Act to be used over a four year period. In this same Message the president requested support of much-needed educational research of a progressive and comprehensive nature:

Basic to all endeavors in improving education is a vigorous and far-sighted program of educational research. This has been a sorely neglected field.... educational research can...point the way to advances in making life more meaningful to more people....

To increase the effectiveness of education, national leadership could well be directed to research in such areas as: ways of educating more people to their fullest capacity; staffing and housing the Nation's schools and colleges; educating the retarded child to help him lead a more normal life, and educating the child of special abilities so that he may utilize these abilities more fully; the relationship of schools to juvenile delinquency; educational effects of population mobility; educational needs of low income families.38

Enacted by Congress, Public Law 635 provided a major increase in funds for these studies to be conducted through the Office of Education in cooperation with the nation's colleges, universities, and state departments of education.

In his last budget message to Congress, Eisenhower

again requested funds for the refinement of data on education in order to justify federal aid for school construction:

The precise requirements for federal aid to local school districts are difficult to determine because of the inadequacy of available information on the classroom needs of districts in various parts of the country and on their financial capacity to meet these needs. Accordingly, funds are included in the budget for improvement of education statistics, including data on local school construction requirements and the actions local communities and States are taking to meet them.39

Although Eisenhower had requested significant funds for educational research in previous years, it seemed that he was unsure of the requirements necessary to justify federal aid to the schools. It appears that even though he was very generous in his support of funds for conducting studies of the schools, his main concern was to justify in his own mind the legitimacy of providing federal aid for certain programs.

NATIONAL NEEDS AND GOALS AS A BASIS FOR AID

During his first three years in office Eisenhower

waited for the results of the State Conferences and the White House Conference to recommend major federal aid programs, and what he did recommend was on an emergency basis only. National needs as a basis for aid did not figure significantly in his requests until in late 1956, when, as if anticipating the forthcoming Soviet technological achievement, he did refer to higher education as "a special problem resulting from the increasing impact of scientific development on our lives and the international competition in this development both for peaceful profit and for warlike potential."**40 Also, in a Special Message to Congress on education in the following year, Eisenhower said, "Advances in science and technology, the urgency and difficulty of our quest for stable world peace, the increasing complexity of social problems—all these factors compound our educational needs."**41 In a news conference in July of the same year, the President said that "the education of our children is of national concern, and if they are not educated properly, it is a national calamity."**42

**40"Letter to a College Student Concerning the Administration's Views on Education," October 29, 1956, Public Papers, p. 1037.

**41"Special Message to the Congress on Federal Aid to Education," January 28, 1957, Public Papers, p. 90.

It was not until after the launching of Sputnik that Eisenhower began to specifically tie the need for federal aid to education to the nation's interests. Prefacing his special education message to Congress with one of his numerous descriptions of education as strictly a local function, Eisenhower, nevertheless, recognized the national concern by saying:

Because of the national security interest in the years immediately ahead...the Federal government must also undertake to play an emergency role. The Administration is therefore recommending certain emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern. These recommendations place principal emphasis on our national security requirements.

Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our armed forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our further progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special—but by no means exclusive—attention to education in science and engineering.43

The President called for massive outlays of federal funds to the National Science Foundation and the Department

of Health, Education and Welfare for federal support of education because of national interests. Justifying federal aid to the National Science Foundation, Eisenhower said:

The Administration has recommended a five-fold increase in appropriations for the scientific education activities of the National Science Foundation. These increased appropriations will enable the Foundation, through its various programs, to assist in laying a firmer base for the education of our future scientists and engineers vitally needed by the country at this time.\(^4^4\)

Even the President's request for federal aid to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was based on the idea that "National security requires that prompt action be taken to improve and expand the teaching of science and mathematics. Federal matching funds can help to stimulate the organization of programs to advance the teaching of these subjects in the public schools."\(^4^5\) Indicating his concern for improving foreign language teaching, Eisenhower added, "Knowledge of foreign languages is particularly important today....And yet the American people generally are deficient in foreign languages...It is important to

\(^{4^4}\)Ibid., p. 128.

\(^{4^5}\)Ibid., p. 130.
our national security that such deficiencies be promptly overcome." In the national interest loans, grants, scholarships and fellowships were specifically requested to support students preparing in these fields.

In a final statement to his entire, massive National Defense Education Act requests, Eisenhower concluded that "this emergency program stems from national need, and its fruits will bear directly on national security....The Administration urges prompt enactment of these recommendations in the essential interest of national security." 

After rejecting Eisenhower's request of federal aid for school construction for three straight years, Congress did an about-face and enthusiastically supported the one billion program geared basically to the sciences, mathematics and foreign languages. In a policy declaration in the new law Congress explained why it changed its stand on federal aid to education:

The Congress hereby finds and declares the security of the nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities

46 Ibid., p. 131.
47 Ibid., p. 132.
be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques and new knowledge.  

This same statement specifically called for programs to assure all students with ability an opportunity for higher education and for the rapid correction of "the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and trained in technology." In conclusion the statement declared Congress' reaffirmation of the principle of state and local control and primary responsibility for public education, but it also stated:

The national interest requires... that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of Government. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals and to states and their subdivisions in order to insure trained manpower of

---


49 Ibid.
sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.\textsuperscript{50}

Upon signing this Act, Eisenhower agreed in principle with the Congressional policy declaration:

This Act, which is an emergency undertaking, to be terminated after four years, will in that time do much to strengthen our American system of education so that it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security.\textsuperscript{51}

In a Republican-sponsored panel discussion before the 1958 Congressional election, the President was asked if America could not offer its children an equally good scientific education as Russian children received and if this could not be done without federal aid to education. In answering, Eisenhower described American education as a free system and the Russian as a "regimented and dictated" education. Eisenhower acknowledged that the Soviets were emphasizing more difficult subjects, but said that gifted American students were making progress. In relation to federal aid, the President said that

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{51}"Statement by the President Upon Signing the National Defense Education Act," September 2, 1958, Public Papers, p. 671.
whether or not we can do without this federal aid, we have, as you know, given some inducements to get more scientific subjects taught in our secondary and college levels.... and I believe this; we probably will develop a little tougher schedules for our children through secondary schools and in college indeed."

The president ended by contrasting the purpose of Soviet education as strengthening the Soviet Union militarily and industrially with the American educational system as a defender of freedom. Such a simplistic contrast of the two systems was consistent with the general American belief about them, in which Eisenhower so strongly shared.

Nevertheless, Eisenhower's support of educational research through the Office of Education and the efforts of the White House Conference on Education was an indication of his interest in improving the quality of American education. Most of his recommendations to Congress for federal aid to education were based on the idea that such aid was needed to meet national needs and to achieve national goals.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION EXPANDED

Eisenhower's awareness of national needs and goals was perhaps best reflected in the emerging importance of

52"Radio and Newsreel Panel Discussion Sponsored by the National Republican Committee in Chicago," October 22, 1958, Public Papers, pp. 784-785.
the National Science Foundation during his administration. In his first year of office, the law establishing the National Science Foundation (PL 81-507) was amended by Congress to remove its ceiling appropriation enabling it to increase basic research for the Federal Government. The president requested a further increase of six million dollars for fiscal 1955; one half was to go for certain research programs to be transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Science Foundation, and the other half was for expanding basic research by the Foundation. Eisenhower justified these funds for research in part because he believed that basic research projects provided university graduates with training. Moreover, he warned that "the number of trained scientists graduating each year falls short of the needs of our growing economy and is still declining. Enlargement of the research program and the related fellowship program will help counteract this trend."53

Nevertheless, Eisenhower did not again specifically request significant federal support for the expansion of research in the National Science Foundation until his legislative requests were made in 1958 in response to the

launching of Sputnik. The shock from this Soviet technological achievement stimulated the President to propose in his fiscal 1959 budget 140 million in appropriations for the Foundation, which was three times the amount provided in the fiscal 1958 budget. A supplemental appropriation of ten million was also made for 1958. Eisenhower said that "these recommendations will enable the National Science Foundation to proceed vigorously in expanding support for basic research. . . . Most of the expenditures will be for research projects carried on by university scientists and, as a byproduct, will contribute importantly to the education of graduate students."54

Of the 1959 appropriation, 58 million, was provided for research grants, for research facilities and equipment, and for related activities; the sum was twice the 1958 amount. The appropriation alloted for the second major part of the National Science Foundation's program was to extend and to improve science education. This item was 82 million, or about five times the amount for the same purpose in 1958. Eisenhower asserted:

Most of this is for expansion of programs which have proved their worth in improving high school

and college science education. These programs include (1) action to interest able students in science careers, (2) measures to improve the methods of teaching and the content of courses in mathematics and science and to give supplementary training to college and high-school teachers, and (3) provision for fellowships to highly qualified college graduates and scientists for advanced study in science and mathematics....

These recommendations for the National Science Foundation... are designed to meet our most urgent needs for support of science, to aid in the identification and encouragement of talent and to strengthen our teaching staffs.55

The president added that several important considerations were taken into account in planning these programs. (1) Private employers needed to make the most effective utilization of available scientists and engineers. (2) The basic responsibility for science education, training and research depends primarily on non-federal support, and, therefore, federal support should be limited to four years. (3) Training of scientists is a long term project and therefore planning must be made for non-federal support after the federal emergency stimulation is ended. (4) The needs of society go beyond science and technology and require the development of a strong general educational system.

55 Ibid.
(5) Specialized programs must not upset the balance needed in a well-rounded educational program.56

The programs of the National Science Foundation, designed to improve science education, were developed in cooperation with the scientific community under the direction of the National Science Board. Eisenhower had recommended increased federal funds for the improvement of the following National Science Foundation programs: (1) Expansion of science institutes providing supplementary training for high school and college science and mathematics teachers for improvement of subject matter knowledge. (2) Stimulation of the content of science courses at all levels of the Nation's educational system. (3) The encouragement of science as a career. (4) Graduate fellowships in science.57 Funds were also recommended to enable the Foundation to start several new programs to provide fellowships for secondary school science teachers during the summer months, for graduate teaching assistants, and those seeking additional education to become high school science and mathematics teachers.

56 Ibid.

Eisenhower's budget requests in the years 1959-1962 were less than in 1958 while his budget requests for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare steadily increased after 1958. This was an indication that the president was interested in shifting specialized science education programs from the National Science Foundation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The shift in emphasis from the NSF to HEW was clearly visible. Eisenhower probably would not have increased the amount of aid for these two federal agencies if Sputnik had not been launched. The fact remains, however, that funds were substantially increased during the Eisenhower administration.

IMPACTED AREAS AID CONTINUED

Eisenhower's strong support of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was not matched by his requests for aid to federally impacted areas although the needs were just as real there. In fact, federal support of education in impacted areas had lapsed in fiscal 1953 because of President Truman's veto and because of Congress' failure to act upon this
legislation in 1952; however, there had been adequate funds from previous years to continue the impacted areas school construction program through June 30, 1953. Sensing the urgent need of Federal support for impacted areas at this time, Eisenhower said:

One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.58

Congress, with some modifications of PL 815 and PL 874, extended federal aid to impacted areas for school construction (PL 815) until June 30, 1954, and for school maintenance until June 30, 1956.

Senate and House hearings were being held in 1954 and 1955 to extend the impacted areas aid by as much as four years, but Eisenhower remained silent over this issue during these years. Nevertheless, the Commissioner of

Education, Samuel M. Brownell, testified before the Senate in 1954 in favor of extending this type of legislation for only one year, or two years at the most, and his testimony was a sign of Eisenhower's reluctance to give support to impacted areas legislation.59 In 1954 Congress extended aid for school construction in impacted areas through June 30, 1956, and in 1955 it was again extended until June 30, 1957. Not until his State of the Union Message of 1956 did Eisenhower again make significant reference to impacted areas legislation. Nevertheless, Congress extended aid to these areas for both school construction and maintenance through June 30, 1958. When aid for impacted areas was again extended in 1957 through June 30, 1959, Eisenhower publicly revealed his reluctance to support this legislation and his growing opposition to it:

I have approved HR 8679 to provide a one-year extension of the programs of financial assistance in the construction

59An interesting development took place earlier in the year of the extension. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson ordered in January that no new schools on military installations were to be opened on a segregated basis and that schools already segregated were to desegregate no later than September 1, 1955. Southern Congressmen, many of whom were strong supporters of aid to federally impacted areas, objected to this form of federal control, but this order, given impetus by the Supreme Court desegregation decision, was eventually implemented.
of schools in areas affected by Federal activities....In taking this action, I wish to make it clear that I have done so only because I have been assured that without this extension, school facilities which will be needed for children by September 1959 would not be available.60

Reassured by a House Committee report that in the next session it was going to undertake a thorough study of the entire legislative program for federally impacted areas, Eisenhower predicted that the House Committee's report, in conjunction with a study of the impacted areas legislation underway that year by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would provide a basis for much needed improvements in this type of legislation.

In his Budget Message of 1958, Eisenhower, although recognizing the Federal Government's responsibility for helping school districts in financial trouble caused by federal activities, reflected a further tightening of his view:

Experience with these programs, however, suggests that they should be modified: many of the communities for which grants have been made no longer have problems as acute as those suddenly generated by the migration of workers and families to them during the Korean crisis.

In view of the continued maintenance of a substantial defense establishment with existing locations, authority for grants for construction and operation of schools should be extended, but the assistance should be restricted to instances where the Federal personnel both live and work on Federal property. However, grants for operation of schools on behalf of people living on taxable property should be gradually reduced during an adjustment period, and then terminated.

Another reflection of the President's desire for revision of this aid was given in testimony in the House Labor and General Education Subcommittee hearings by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who said that grants under this program should be limited to "situations where there is a clear and direct Federal responsibility" because now this program in effect, "favored treatment for very hundreds of communities as compared with others of equal or greater need." 62

Federal aid for both construction and maintenance in improved areas was extended through June 30, 1961. Aid to support the education of children whose parents both work and live on Federal property was made permanent. Upon


signing HR 11378, Eisenhower said that he was doing so despite serious reservations, in order to avoid burdening some 3,300 school districts with a sudden and serious hardship.

In other messages of 1959 and 1960, Eisenhower continued to call for comprehensive impacted area legislation and reiterated his belief that some of the responsibility should be assumed by local districts.

In his 1960 Budget Message, the president made what appeared to be a startling announcement that could have set the tone for an attempt to change the federal government's support for impacted areas in a new direction. "The pressing need is particularly evident in those districts on the verge of economic depression, where general aid to help localities maintain the standards of public schools."6

However, he was not calling for a general federal aid

---


to the schools but simply was referring to specifically school construction aid. Eisenhower recommended that "in the case of construction grants, where general aid for needy districts is again proposed, no separate provision is included for continuing the special program for federally affected districts. It is recommended, furthermore, that the Congress defer consideration of any extension legislation until after it has considered and enacted the broad program of Federal aid for school construction which is being recommended."65

In spite of Johnson's appeals in 1959 and 1960 for a cut-back and an eventual termination of aid to districts where parents did not both live and work on federal property, Congress appropriated more money than the President had asked for: $170 million dollars in 1959 and $171 in 1960; Congress enacted $225 million dollars in 1959 and $255 in 1960. Aid is needed to education in impacted areas just as much, if not more, with the Congress than with the President.

These facts are not so much providing aid to federal impacted areas the President to his opposition to

federal control and his avoidance of the issue of segregation in that they were matters of principle with him. Even his strong support of research and the National Science Foundation was based upon what he considered the national needs to be and what he thought the national goals in education should be. Although the president's requests to Congress were based on principle, there was a general shift in his position from an earlier opposition to federal aid to a later reluctant realization of the need for such aid.
EISENHOWER AND EDUCATION IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS OF 1952 AND 1956

THE 1952 CAMPAIGN

One of the earliest public figures calling for Eisenhower to run for the presidency was, strangely enough, his predecessor, Truman. As they were riding in a car to the Potsdam Conference in July of 1945, Truman made an unusual proposition to Eisenhower: "General," he said, "there is nothing that you may want that I won't try to help you get. That definitely and specifically includes the Presidency in 1952." The General replied, "Mr. President, I don't need any help in your campaign for the Presidency, but I will accept." From that year on, Eisenhower’s name was mentioned both as a possible Democrat


2...
and as a Republican presidential candidate, in spite of his continued denial of interest in the office.

During his long career in the military, Eisenhower deliberately refrained from making political statements, and, thus, when he was talked about as a possible candidate, it was unclear whether he was a Republican or a Democrat. Moreover, an Elmo Roper public opinion poll in June of 1948 indicated that Eisenhower was the choice of voters in both parties. It is no wonder, then, that the interest in a draft-Eisenhower movement was high by both parties as the presidential conventions of 1948 neared. Not until Eisenhower made an unequivocal public statement saying that he would not run for the presidency did many influential Democrats at their convention cease to seek him as their candidate.

Shortly before the 1948 conventions, Eisenhower took over as President of Columbia University, a position for which he had little previous qualification. Eisenhower's biographer, Marquis Childs, claimed that during his two years at Columbia, Eisenhower never was really accepted as

2Marquis Childs, Eisenhower: Captive Hero (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1958), p. 112. Also, a Gallup Poll in 1951 revealed: Not only did all Democrats polled favor Eisenhower as their presidential choice as compared to 20% for Truman. See Pusey, p. 7.
a college president; his "years at Columbia were not satisfying years. The man who read little more than military history and Westerns was not at ease in the abode of learning." Thus, it was no surprise when in late 1950 Eisenhower accepted Truman's appointment of him as Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe.

Predictably, the Republicans, reeling from an unexpected defeat in 1948, regained their interest in Eisenhower as their candidate and made an increasing effort to get him to run for the nomination in 1952. However, the Old Guard of the Republican party opposed his nomination. After the debacle of the 1948 election, the Republican party was sharply split between the Dewey and Taft wings of the party. The defeat of Dewey intensified the conservatives' desire to see their candidate, Taft, nominated in 1952.

As the Republican primaries grew nearer, increased pressure was placed upon Eisenhower to accept the Republican nomination. After a good showing in several state primaries in which he did not campaign, he said he was forced to re-examine his position on running. Eisenhower asked to be and was relieved of his duties as NATO

\[4\text{Ibid., pp. 108,110.}\]
commander by President Truman effective June 1, 1952.5

Eisenhower officially opened his active campaign for the Republican nomination on June 4th when he made his first political speech in his home town of Abilene, Texas, and on the following day Eisenhower held a press conference there which was more revealing of the General's political views than the previous day's speech. Domestic and foreign policy issues were discussed rather openly, and Eisenhower's views on many issues were made public for the first time. When asked about his position on federal aid to education, he commented at great length although his answer was not always directly related to this issue. One rather clear exchange was this:

Reporter. Mr. Eisenhower, as a college president recently, would you care to talk on the subject of federal aid to education.

Eisenhower. I believe...education is one of those local functions that we should keep locally because I found this—in every totalitarian state that I know anything about, one of the earliest efforts is to get charge of the education process.6

5Truman tried to dissuade the General from running for the presidency in 1952 but only after he was convinced that Eisenhower was to run as a Republican and not as a Democrat. See Furry, p. 17.

He continued by making a reference to Hitler's takeover of the control of the German educational system upon coming into power and believed that without a certain adequate level of educational opportunities, Americans endanger their political freedom. Returning to the reporter's question about federal aid to education, Eisenhower said that if any particular section of the country did not have the adequate means to educate its children he would be in favor of providing help. Eisenhower stated:

On the other hand, the thing which I fought when I was at Columbia was this, that each state would put in some money in this educational fund, and then even the rich states, the ones who put in, would get something back.

To my mind, it's just a process of supporting another bureaucrat or a bureaucracy in Washington and cutting off something before you send it back to the very state that's providing the money. I think they can do it better themselves, locally, with local responsibilities than you can by this centralized help which will finally, it seems to me, lead again toward control and dictation. But where they can't support it, I believe in it.\(^7\)

These moderately conservative, "off the cuff" comments which appeared to be a call for a minimum of federal aid to education clearly placed Eisenhower closer to the Republican Old Guard position of opposition to federal aid to education.

\(^7\)Ibid.
education than to advocates of federal aid legislation. His support of federal aid only to "needy" states and opposition to federal support for all states was strikingly similar to Senator Taft's position.

Several weeks after Eisenhower's Abeline press conference, Taft made the charge that Eisenhower was shifting his position closer to his. In a prepared speech in New York, Taft said he would continue to support federal aid to education where the need was clearly shown but was opposed to extending aid to those states able to pay their own way. Taft stated that he believed that the federal government had an interest in seeing that all American children had equality of opportunity regardless of their station in life. However, Taft insisted that definite need was to be shown and that federal controls were to be avoided.8

In his only other public statement dealing with federal aid to education before his nomination in July, Eisenhower treated the issue only indirectly. In a press conference on June 8, 1952, Eisenhower was asked by a reporter to state his position on the costly practices, to all levels of government, of segregating schools in the South. Answering in a surprised, cautious and somewhat

naive manner. Eisenhower said, "You brought up a feature of this thing that I have not even thought about. I did not know there was an additional cost involved. Frankly, I will have to look at that particular point before I would add anything to it." Eisenhower concluded this response with a platitudinous statement that reflected a greater concern for economy in government than for the correction of the human injustice of school segregation. "It is necessary for all of us to use our resources frugally. We shouldn't forget the good old American thrift that has also helped to bring the U.S. where we are today. Therefore, needless expense and duplication should be condemned." On July 11 the sometimes bitter contest between Taft and Eisenhower for the Republican presidential nomination was ended by a first ballot victory for Eisenhower.

Party Platforms and Early Maneuvering

The party platforms which developed in the Republican
and Democratic convention of 1952 differed on a number of issues, and on the issue of federal aid to education the differences were especially clear-cut. The latter platform gave strong endorsement to federal aid to education. It called for every educational opportunity to develop the potentialities of every American child. Federal, state, and local governments, the platform stated, had a shared responsibility in providing for the needs of the nation's educational system. Federal support to state and local educational systems that met basic minimum standards was advocated, and this was to be done without the federal government dictating or controlling educational policy. The platform became more specific when it pledged "... immediate consideration for those systems which need further legislation to provide federal aid for new school construction, teachers' salaries and school maintenance and repair."\footnote{Kirk H. Porter, and Donald Bruce Johnson, compilers, \textit{National Party Platforms: 1860-1964}, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1966), p. 500.} The platform called for the support of vocational education and also urged "the adoption by appropriate legislative action of the proposals advocated by the President's
Commission on Higher Education, including Federal scholarships.\textsuperscript{12}

The Republican platform completely refrained from any support of federal aid to education, and in a terse statement placed all the responsibility for education upon the local districts and the states. "The responsibility for sustaining this system of popular education has always rested with local communities and the states. We subscribe fully to this principle."\textsuperscript{13}

In the campaign Eisenhower did not specifically refer to the negative position of his party's platform on federal aid to education but had already indicated his general agreement with the principle of state and local responsibility for education. On the other hand, Stevenson criticized the Republican platform position on federal aid to education and referred to his party's positive stand on this issue. In speaking about the nation's educational problems, Stevenson said, "The Democratic platform spells out a program of action to meet our needs. We mean what it says. And again the Republican platform is entirely negative, offering no program at all for better education.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 493.
And they mean that, too."14

The brief and negative statement on federal aid to education in the Republican platform undoubtedly met with the approval of most conservative Republicans, excluding Taft. Yet, the drafting of the platform and the nomination battle between Eisenhower and Taft resulted in political wounds within the Republican party. Immediately following his nomination, Eisenhower sought to heal these party wounds and especially to gain the support of Senator Taft. His efforts culminated in a successful meeting between these two men at Columbia University on September 22, which resulted in Taft issuing a statement promising to support Eisenhower "throughout the country to the extent of my ability."15 This breakfast meeting between these two leading Republicans was made a campaign issue by the Democrats who labeled the meeting as Eisenhower's "surrender at Morningside Heights" to Taft's conservative political views.

Yet it cannot be said that Taft had been negative in his previous public statements and political efforts in

---


15 Tucky, p. 27.
regard to federal aid to education but had, to the contrary, contributed much to the cause of federal support of education. However, no specific public mention of federal aid to education came from the breakfast meeting, and it could not have been assumed that the hopes for future federal support of the nation's schools was furthered by this meeting.

One of the few Eisenhower campaign speeches that treated federal aid to education as an issue was delivered less than a month after the Taft-Eisenhower meeting of September 12. Supporting federal aid to education in his Los Angeles speech of October 9, Eisenhower spoke of the tasks facing America and described one of them as the school's responsibility for the "conservation of our greatest asset: our nation's children." Eisenhower continued by stating his usual praise of American education; he considered it "a living testimonial to the devotion, the intelligence, the deep concern and sacrifice for America's future on the part of tens of thousands of school teachers and school officials. Also laymen and women in thousands of communities have served and are serving the cause of

education. But he made no recommendations for specific action, not even any aid for the teachers whose devotion he praised.

In spite of the generality of his tribute to American education and to those responsible for its accomplishments, Eisenhower did show concern for the nation's serious classroom shortages:

But here again, we must honestly face the fact that in too many places we are not adequately meeting the school needs of America's children. More than 60% of all our public school classrooms are now seriously over-crowded. By 1958 it is estimated that our school system will have a shortage of 600,000 classrooms. This year 1,700,000 American boys and girls were without adequate school facilities. We must do better than that.

Critical of Truman's administration and justifying his own position on federal aid to education, Eisenhower calls for federal assistance to needy states to build schools but without federal controls.

Here, again, the answer of the present administration is more Federal bureaucracy and increased federal controls. This is not the American answer. The American answer is to do--in this field--what we have been doing for a long time, in other fields.

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
We have helped the states build highways and local farm-to-market roads. We have provided Federal funds to help the states build hospitals and mental institutions.

In this critical problem of adequate education we must now undertake to help needy states build schools. Such help should be extended only where a state is doing its utmost but, because of inadequate resources or special burdens, is unable to do the job on its own.  

Eisenhower concluded his recommendations for federal aid to needy states by making it clear that he was requesting aid only for the building of classrooms and not for the administration of schools or for teaching salaries; this limitation was justified in the interest of preventing federal control. Eisenhower claimed that "In such a program, the costs of maintenance of administration and of the actual business of teaching should be borne by the localities and the states themselves. That is their responsibility. That is the American answer to Federal compulsion. It is the American defense against thought control."  

Throughout all of Eisenhower's campaign his ideas about federal aid were sometimes clear and other times they were not. But toward the end of the campaign it was evident that he was willing to moderately endorse aid to the schools.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.
Democratic Response

The Democratic presidential nominee in 1952, Adlai E. Stevenson, was not nearly as concerned as Eisenhower that federal aid be based on need nor was he as concerned about federal control. Like Eisenhower, he did not make federal aid to education a major domestic issue in his campaign and made it an important topic in only a few of his major addresses. In a speech on "Social Gains and the Public Welfare" in Columbus, Ohio on October 3, Stevenson talked about his efforts to improve education while Governor of the state of Illinois as one of his most satisfying experiences. Yet he acknowledged that much more needed to be accomplished for education in Illinois and in the nation.21

Speaking of national educational problems Stevenson lamented:

We pursue our folly of paying the lowest salaries in many communities to those who handle, not our goods, or even our garbage, but our children's education. We have far too few school rooms for the vast increase in school children that is ahead of us. Too many areas, especially in the South, lag behind in education, because they produce more than their relative share of the nation's children and get less than their share of the nation's income.22

Stevenson claimed that the Democratic Party was more willing

21Stevenson, pp. 202-203.

22Ibid., p. 203.
to deal with these problems than the Republican Party and used as evidence the favorable and negative statements on federal aid to education in the respective Democratic and Republican platforms. Four days later at Michigan State Normal University in Ypsilanti, Stevenson declared even more ominously that the nation's future educational problems would become "more acute and not easier."23

Speaking at St. Louis on October 9, the same day his opponent spoke in Los Angeles Stevenson pointedly referred to the economic plight of the nation's teachers:

Today not everyone in this country is sharing fairly in our national prosperity. School teachers, pensioners, old people living on the proceeds of life insurance—these people often cannot make ends meet today because prices have outrun their incomes.24

President Truman was much more direct in his criticism of Eisenhower's position. Two days after Eisenhower spoke in Los Angeles Truman, speaking in New York, challenged Eisenhower's support of social legislation as "me-tooism," and went on to deride his partial endorsement of federal aid.

23Ibid., p. 209.

He [Eisenhower] has been against federal aid to education....But in a speech in Los Angeles the other day he said he was...for extending social security, a little bit; he said he is for federal aid to education, just a little bit. He said he is for aid for medical care, just a little bit.

Eisenhower doesn't need fear special interest lobbies—they're afraid their candidate is going to lose so they'll let him say anything.25

Eisenhower was politically astute and refused to respond to Truman's criticism. Except for Eisenhower's speech in New York on November 1, which only indirectly related to the issue of federal aid, very little else was said by both candidates about aid to the schools in the last weeks of the campaign.

As is well known Eisenhower was elected overwhelmingly and he carried with him a narrow Republican majority in both the House and the Senate. There had been a number of issues that were important throughout the campaign but one issue that could have become important in the campaign but did not was federal aid to education. The condition of American education had not grown better since 1948 and, in fact, had perhaps become worse in a number of ways. Both candidates, but especially Eisenhower, gave little attention to the further deterioration of it in their campaign oratory.

It seemed as though both the candidates and the voters were consumed with other "more important" issues of the day, and thus, federal aid to education had little or no effect upon the outcome of the election.

THE 1956 CAMPAIGN

Before the 1956 campaign, even as before the 1952 campaign, there was doubt as to whether Eisenhower would run for the presidency. A serious heart attack in 1955 gave him a perfectly valid reason for choosing not to run, but doubts about his intentions were laid aside when he announced his candidacy on February 29, 1956 after being assured of complete recovery by several of his physicians. Neither did a second illness and an emergency operation in June keep him from seeking a second term. Running unopposed, Eisenhower and Nixon won re-nomination easily. A repetition of the campaign issues and campaign oratory of 1952 was made almost inevitable by the renomination of Stevenson as the Democratic candidate.

Republican and Democratic Party Platforms

Reflecting Eisenhower's more favorable attitude toward federal aid to education, the 1956 Republican platform, unlike the platform of 1952, supported federal aid to
education in rather general terms but listed with pride some specific accomplishments of President Eisenhower's administration. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the first new federal department in forty years, was described as a Republican creation. The Republican-initiated White House Conference on Education was considered "the most comprehensive community-state-Federal attempt ever made to solve the pressing problems of primary and secondary education."26

The study by over four thousand communities of their educational needs was given credit in the platform for having encouraged "the Republican administration to urge a five year program of Federal assistance in building schools to relieve a critical classroom shortage" but one that was to be based on need and "designed to encourage increased state and local efforts to build more classrooms."27 The platform also pointed out that the Eisenhower administration had proposed "for the first time in history, a thorough nation-wide analysis of rapidly growing problems in education

26Porter and Johnson, p. 550.

27Ibid.
beyond the high schools," and asserted that the President's party was "determined to press all such actions that will help insure that every child has the educational opportunity to advance to his greatest capacity."\textsuperscript{28}

On the other hand, the Democratic platform, as in 1952, was more specific than the Republican platform in its support of federal aid to education. After favoring "every educational opportunity" for every American child, the Democratic platform described the nation's shortages of educational facilities as a threat to "national security, economic prosperity and human well-being."\textsuperscript{29} Federal aid to education would be provided best under state and local control, and the Democratic party was pledged to the following:

(1) Legislation providing federal financing to assist states and local communities to build schools, and to provide essential health and safety service for all school children.
(2) Better educational, health and welfare opportunities for children of migratory workers.
(3) Assistance to programs for training teachers of exceptional children.
(4) Programs providing for the training of teachers to meet the critical shortage in technical and scientific fields.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., p. 535.
(5) Expansion of the program of student, teacher and cultural exchange with other nations. 30

The platform also commended the 84th Congress "for voting the maximum authorized funds for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes Act for the first time in the history of the Act" and also pledged "continuing and increased support of vocational training for youth and adults, including aid to the States and localities for area technical-vocational schools." 31

Issues Concerning Federal Aid to Education

When Stevenson was nominated on the first ballot at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, the Republican and Democratic Platforms differed less significantly on federal aid to education than they had in 1952, but changing events had altered other issues both domestic and foreign. The nation's schools were still very much in need of improvement, and the severe classroom and teacher shortages that existed had required that President Eisenhower propose legislation during his first term to alleviate these conditions.

Although Eisenhower began the presidency opposed to

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
federal aid to education, he was driven in 1955 and again in 1956 because of the drastic classroom shortages, to recommend to Congress more than one billion dollars for school construction aid to be spread over a four year period. The Democrats introduced their own bill, the Kelley Bill (HR 7335), which would have allotted 1.6 billion dollars over four years. Neither the Republican nor the Democratic sponsored bills passed, and each party blamed the other for their defeat. The Republicans claimed that a bill for school construction would have passed if the Democrats had not sponsored a substitute bill. The Democrats, in turn, charged the Republicans with "killing" the chances of a school aid bill by supporting an anti-segregation amendment. Regardless of who was at fault the fact remained that neither of the bills was passed and the schools remained in greater need of additional funds.

While Eisenhower made his requests for school construction aid, Stevenson did not remain silent on this issue but urged passage of the Kelley Bill. Stevenson cautioned, however, that although passage of the bill would be a step in the right direction, it would by no means meet the nation's entire construction needs. Moreover, Stevenson said that the need for federal aid to education, which had become necessary in the mid 1950's, would become increasingly acute
in the following few years. During the four years between
the campaigns of 1952 and 1956, both candidates reiterated
their opposition to federal control. While calling for
school construction aid in a Special Message to Congress
in 1956, Eisenhower expressed confidence that there need
not be federal control accompanying federal aid. "I am
confident the federal government with this program [School
Construction Bill] can help construct schools without in
any way weakening the American tradition that control of
education must be kept close to the local communities. Any
legislation enacted should embody this principle." Similarly, Stevenson believed that federal aid had not
and did not need to result in federal control. "Two centuries
of American history and experience testify that this need
for federal financial assistance can be met without the
slightest degree of domination by the central government."34


34 "Bipartisan Support," p. 75.
Just as Eisenhower and Stevenson opposed federal control of the schools, they praised the efforts of the nation's teachers. In his 1956 Special Message to Congress, Eisenhower spoke of the important role of the teachers. Lavishing praise upon them, he said that good teachers did not just happen but were "the product of the highest personal motivation, encouraged and helped in their work by adequate salaries and the respect, support, and goodwill of their neighbors," and continued with the dubious statement that the "quality of American teaching has never been better." However, he did believe "the rewards for too many teachers are not commensurate with their work and their role in American life." Yet he was not willing to request federal aid for teachers' salaries and was content to leave this responsibility with state and local governments. Speaking to a National Education Association meeting in 1955, Stevenson also praised the nation's teachers without, at that time, requesting federal aid for teachers' salaries.

The real heart of good education remains, as always, good teaching. We must, if we want to improve the quality of education attract into teaching and hold there a far larger number of our ablest young people. Compensation must be geared to ability and performance, and opportunity afforded for advancement to a high level based on merit, as in other professions.
The teacher, I say, is not a second-class citizen, and we must help that profession to regain its erstwhile order among us.35

In the closing months of the 1956 campaign, unlike in 1952, both candidates made rather significant campaign promises to support federal aid.

In a major speech on September 29, 1956 in Milwaukee Stevenson, by devoting a lengthy section of his speech to the nation's educational problems, provoked an open conflict of ideas with his opponent. He urged federal funds for constructing schools, financing teachers' salaries, and providing national scholarships in order to end the crisis in the nation's schools. For Stevenson the nation faced "a crisis in our schools that presents in my judgement a very great danger to our country....to meet this crisis there is no choice except to use federal funds to bolster up our educational program."36 Stevenson claimed there was a grave classroom shortage affecting five million children; the nation was short hundreds of thousands of trained teachers, and the teachers' average earnings were ten percent below the average factory workers'. Stevenson


charged President Eisenhower with failure of national leadership to take the necessary action to avert the great danger caused by the school crisis. Criticizing Eisenhower's efforts for education during his first term in office, Stevenson said, "We have had during these four years fine words, conferences and lofty, high-sounding proposals about education. We have had no action and no results." 37

Apparently reacting to Stevenson's Milwaukee speech, Eisenhower, on October 1 in a nationwide radio and television speech delivered at the University of Kentucky, charged that the Democrats in Congress had been solely responsible for killing his school construction bill in 1956. The president admitted that the problems of the nation's schools were urgent but, recalling his own efforts, said that the serious school shortage had actually been somewhat reduced with the building of more classrooms in the past four years than in the preceding twelve. He conceded that local and state action had not been enough and that it was necessary to ask Congress for two billion dollars in federal aid for school construction over a five year period. Too, he insisted that school construction aid be based on need with matching state funds. "As for the

37Ibid.
opposition," Eisenhower charged,

not one of its proposals met these
simple, vital requirements. Now,
within the last week, we see the strange
spectacle of an apparently confused
candidate of the opposition supporting
the principles of the bills that we
proposed, and that his party defeated....
In the House, the opposition voted
against it by 215-9 while three-fourths
of the Republicans voted for it.38

On the same day of Eisenhower's Lexington speech
additional reaction to Stevenson's Milwaukee Speech came
from Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, who claimed that "President
Eisenhower had given more vigorous leadership to education
than any other President....For the first time a president
has personally led the way in a great national reawakening
of concern and support for better schools."39 Folsom

38"Texts of the Addresses by President Eisenhower in
Cleveland and Lexington, Ky.," The New York Times, October 2,
1956, p. 18. Actually Eisenhower referred to a motion, before
the final vote on HR 7535, to recommit the school aid bill
and substitute the administration's school aid proposals.
That motion was defeated by a 158-262 (Democrats 9-215;
Republicans 149-47). roll-call vote. But on the question
of passage of HR 7535, the final vote was 194-224 (Democrats
119-105; Republicans 75-119). See "Aid to Schools," Congress-
ional Quarterly Almanac, XII, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional

39"President Hailed on Education Aid," The New York
maintained that Stevenson made uninformed charges about the nation's education problems and that the shortage of teachers and classrooms was being reduced rather than increased as Stevenson claimed.40

Democratic National Committee Chairman, Paul M. Butler, on October 3 distributed a two page memorandum entitled, "Republican Votes Killed the School Bill" which was in response to Eisenhower's criticism of the Democrats on the school bill issue. Butler asserted, "no amount of presidential oratory will keep American voters from recognizing that 119 Republicans voted to have no school bill at all....and that the President made no effort to win Republican support."

On the same day a joint statement was released by Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey, ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and Representative Samuel K. McConnell Jr. from Pennsylvania,

40Ibid. The determination of whether there were classroom or teacher shortages often depended on the source of information. For example many local school districts consistently reported shortages, but the United States Chamber of Commerce claimed there were few if any shortages.

a Republican member on the House Committee on Education and Labor, charging that the Democrats had stalled on the school bill and that the Democratic record in Congress for the last two years was one of "delay and obstruction" while President Eisenhower "week by week urged effective action." It called Stevenson's program "wishy-washy" and the Eisenhower program "sound and effective." 42

A few days after Stevenson's Milwaukee speech he revealed a specific program of federal aid to education in a second policy document entitled "The New America--A Program for Education." In it Stevenson urged a vast rise in federal help and suggested that the national education expenditures be increased by one-half to one billion dollars each year for ten years. He specified that the nation needed 100-thousand new classrooms a year and fifty-thousand new teachers a year until the shortages were ended. Stevenson made five proposals:

(1) Establishment of a national policy of federal aid to education.
(2) Federal aid for classrooms and teachers' salaries
(3) Federal scholarships for needy college students
(4) Expansion of the student foreign exchange program
(5) Aid to vocational and adult

42 Ibid.
education.\textsuperscript{43}

The charges and counter-charges that both presidential candidates resorted to in the closing days of the campaign did very little to improve the chances for the future enactment of federal aid to the schools. Perhaps Martha A. Shull, president of the National Education Association, came closest to being accurate when she claimed that both parties were to blame for killing the school aid bill. Looking positively to the future, she asked for bi-partisan effort and said, "what is important is a positive school support program in the next session."\textsuperscript{44}

Candidates' Statements Juxtaposed

Perhaps the clearest contrast of both candidates' views on federal aid to education was published in the \textit{National Education Association Journal} one month before the election. Special statements on federal aid to education were prepared by Eisenhower and Stevenson and were printed side-by-side in the October issue of this leading


\textsuperscript{44}Ibid.
Eisenhower's statements in the National Education Association Journal were much more general than those of Stevenson's. For Eisenhower the basic goal of education was to provide every person with educational opportunity in order that he may develop to his highest capacity. The role of the federal government was to encourage and help facilitate the process of education, but it was never to control education. The federal government was to meet specific needs with concrete action as it had done throughout its history. He praised the White House Conference on Education, the expanded services of the United States Office of Education, and his administration's support of research into hard-core problems of education and classroom construction. The president ended by saying that the nation's educational system could never be any better than its teachers; although they were described as better today than ever before, he warned that more of them were needed and

---

45 "Special Statements Prepared for the National Education Association Journal by the Republican and Democratic Presidential Candidates," National Education Association Journal, October 1952, pp. 710-711. There is no question that the National Education Association intended to influence voters. Inserted between the candidates' statements was a block listing the states alphabetically with the deadline dates for registration to vote. Under the caption "Register and Vote" was a statement urging members to do so, calling the reader's attention to the late registration dates in many states.
that they needed to be compensated adequately.\textsuperscript{46}

Stevenson claimed that the nation's strength, wealth, and welfare depended on what transpires in the schools. The commendable efforts of local communities were considered tragically short of the nation's educational needs; almost 500 thousand classrooms short and 137 thousand fewer qualified teachers recruited in 1955 than needed. Poor salaries and teaching conditions threatened a serious decline in the quality of teaching. These difficulties were attributed to state and local inability to raise enough money. Therefore, Stevenson believed the federal government needed to help but without controls. He recommended federal funds for school construction; for the general operation of schools, especially for improving teachers' salaries; for teacher education; and for scholarships in higher education. He also called for the investigation of the possibility of establishing a separate, cabinet-level Department of Education.\textsuperscript{47}

The campaign ended after a rather lively exchange of views between the candidates on many issues, including federal aid to the schools. Predictions of the election

\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 410.

\textsuperscript{47}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 411.
were not as cautious as in 1952, and it appeared that Eisenhower would be re-elected easily.

As in 1952 Eisenhower won an overwhelming victory but unlike in 1952, when the Republicans won control of the House and Senate, the Democrats won both houses of Congress. It was the first time in over a century that a president was re-elected but failed to carry with him the House and Senate.

The issue of federal aid to education was debated between the candidates much more in 1956 than in 1952. Stevenson and Eisenhower were much more vocal about the need for federal assistance to the schools, and each was favorable to some kind of federal aid; nevertheless, Eisenhower took a less positive and specific stand than his opponent.

Although the plight of the nation's schools remained at a crisis level in 1956, and although federal aid to education was a fairly important domestic issue in the presidential campaign, it was greatly overshadowed in the outcome of the election by Eisenhower's popularity, the international crisis, and the voters' faith in the President's ability to maintain his campaign promise of "peace and prosperity." The stand taken on federal aid to education by the presidential candidates did not reflect the "lopsided"
victory by the Republican candidate.

The presidential campaigns of 1952 and 1956 occurred in years during which the nation's educational system was in dire need of financial assistance from the federal government. But neither presidential candidate made federal aid to education a major issue in the campaigns. The spark that was to start a massive outlay of federal funds for the schools was to come not from presidential aspirants but from a jolting Soviet space achievement.
EISENHOWER'S SUPPORT OF BROAD PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

When Eisenhower became President in 1953, he inherited the problems of the nation's woefully inadequate elementary and secondary schools which had grave classroom and teacher shortages. His predecessor had been unsuccessful in his attempts to provide federal aid to help alleviate the poor condition of these schools.

AID FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY CLASSROOM SHORTAGES

Since the end of World War II the cost of the construction of school buildings had been rising steadily, and the states and school districts were unable to keep up with the demand for elementary and secondary classrooms created by increasing enrollments. When Eisenhower took office there were hundreds of communities where children were operating on half-day, double shifts, and the shortage of teachers was about as serious a problem as was the
classroom shortage. However, the new President's proposals for 1953 did not include any legislation to relieve the distressful condition of the schools.

But by his second year in office Eisenhower had begun to refer to the need for federal aid to the states for the construction of schools. He said that the nation was not "building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population....the Federal Government should stand ready to assist states which demonstrably can not provide sufficient school buildings." Nevertheless, Eisenhower did not propose any substantial aid for school construction during his second year in office. In fact, he refused to give support to a number of school construction bills introduced in Congress that year, in spite of the fact that members of his own party had introduced such legislation. The president was questioned on this matter by a reporter.

Q. Mr. President, up on Capital Hill Senator Cooper [Republican-Kentucky] and Congressman Frelinghuysen [Republican - New Jersey] have introduced compatible bills on

emergency school construction. Thus far they feel they have a certain amount of backing, but there is a general uncertainty on the Hill as to how much administration support this emergency school building program for $250 million has. Now, sir, are you for such legislation?

The President. As a matter of fact, I do not know the details of that particular legislation. There are particular kinds of school construction that I have supported all along and recommended. With respect to this one, I don't know its details, I'd suggest you go to Secretary Hobby to find out where we stand.2

Yet the bill (S 2601) was opposed by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who sent a letter to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee requesting that federal school aid legislation await the outcome of the 1955 White House Conference and also stated that Senate Bill 2601 was not in agreement with the President's efforts to balance the budget or with his attempt to continue state and local control of the nation's schools. Mrs. Hobby's views in the letter were consistent with Eisenhower's previous views on federal aid to education.

2"The President's News Conference of August 4, 1954," Public Papers, p. 684. Eisenhower was referring to his support of Impacted areas legislation, a special on-going federally supported program that affected a very small percentage of the total funds provided for the nation's elementary and secondary schools.
Eisenhower was either unaware of Mrs. Hobby's position and of the provisions of the school aid bill, or he was deliberately avoiding the issue. The latter seems to be the case, yet it seems incredible that a bill of this importance, proposed by members of his own party but opposed by his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, received so little attention from the President at a time when classroom shortages were so critical. Secretary Hobby's letter to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in opposition to Senate Bill 2601 must have been interpreted by Congress as the President's position on the school aid bill for there was a lack of Senate floor action on the bill.

Finally in 1955, and for two subsequent years, Eisenhower sponsored bills to provide federal aid to the states for school construction. In a special message to Congress in 1955, the president claimed that there was a deficit of more than 300 thousand classrooms. Eisenhower said that the nation must build at least 50 thousand new elementary and high school classrooms yearly to keep up with increased enrollments. But he said that during the fiscal year 1955-56, 60 thousand classrooms were being built, and, therefore, the president claimed the rate of construction more than kept pace with the increasing enrollments. It was the total classroom deficit that needed to be reduced,
and thus federal aid to education was needed for this purpose.3

The classroom shortage was set at an exact figure by Eisenhower in a new conference the day following his special message to Congress.

Last year we constructed 60,000 classrooms and at that rate we are never going to reach the objective of getting rid of the shortage of 340,000 classrooms as of today.

The shortage has not just sprung up overnight. You find a steady growth in it reaching clear back to 1940. It was already, in 1940, something over 160,000 and the estimates show a gradual increase until today 340,000.4

But without any other classroom construction than the estimated average for 1950, Eisenhower, without further explanation, just ten months later, drastically reduced the estimated number of the nation's classroom shortage.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare...discussed a series of proposals....for assuring the construction of additional classrooms, to clear up the backlog of a 200,000-

---

3"Special Message to the Congress Concerning Federal Assistance in School Construction," February 8, 1955, Public Papers, pp. 243-244.

room deficiency in the nation.\textsuperscript{5}

There was a reason for the President's decreased figures even though he did not think it necessary to make a public explanation of this. The 340 thousand figure used by Eisenhower in February 1955 came from information obtained from state conferences on education submitted by the States to the Office of Education. He revealed this in his Special Message to Congress in February. "The latest information submitted by the states to the Office of Education indicates that there is a deficit of more than 300 thousand classrooms...\textsuperscript{6} The 200 thousand figure made in a statement on December 12, 1955 was derived from information from the White House Conference on Education held November 28 through December 1, 1955. In a full report to the President on their findings, the Committee for the Conference stated, "Responsible estimates place the nation's school building need at from less than 200 thousand to nearly a half-million

---


\textsuperscript{6}"Special Message," \textit{Public Papers}, p. 244.
additional classrooms by 1960." The president probably chose the smallest figure the Committee used because he was interested in keeping down the amount of federal funds that would be necessary for classroom construction.

In 1956 Eisenhower spoke of emergency school construction aid as "one of the major goals of this administration," and in 1957 he made strong and unequivocal statements pointing out the urgent need for school construction aid. He said, "high priority should be given the school construction bill," and that "no proposal for enlarging our national resources is more important than that for Federal assistance in overcoming the critical shortage of schoolrooms." Eisenhower claimed that "of all the problems in education, one [classroom shortages]...

---


In a news conference in July, 1957, after the School Construction Aid Bill had been defeated for the third straight year, Eisenhower was asked why he had not urged Republicans to vote for it. He replied in a general way, stressing the item of need, "something to help the needy States and needy districts where building is impossible.... unless the Federal Government does help," and emphasized that this bill was deficient in failing to stress need properly. He said that the Republicans did not want a plan we would call another giveaway or another dipping of State hands and elbows into the Federal Treasury.... If you try to make every State believe that they are getting something for nothing out of such a bill, then I would doubt your ability to terminate the operation of the bill at the end of the five year period. I can't be too enthusiastic about something that I think is likely to fasten a sort of albatross...around the neck of the Federal Government."

Eisenhower also said that the question of need should be looked at honestly and met—today. "And I tell you this:

I will have another bill ready for the session of Congress."12

In 1958 Eisenhower did not request school construction legislation, but emphasis was dramatically shifted to the promotion of science. In 1959 and 1960, unlike 1955, 1956, and 1957, Eisenhower delivered no special messages to Congress on education requesting grants to states for school construction aid.

Eisenhower's recommendations for elementary and secondary schools were mainly for school construction aid but these requests were flatly rejected by Congress. This seemed to be the kind of aid that the president believed in most but it was the type of aid that was the most difficult for him to have enacted.

FINANCING FEDERAL AID

In 1955 when Eisenhower first proposed a school construction program he recommended a rather complicated federal aid program that involved three alternative types of federal assistance: (1) The federal government's purchase of local school bonds (2) federal backing for the bonds of state school building authorities, and (3) as a last resort, federal matching grants based on need.

To facilitate bond purchases by the federal government Eisenhower in his 1955 school construction proposal recommended that legislation be enacted authorizing the Federal Government, cooperating with the several States, to purchase school bonds, issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate. To carry out this proposal, I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of 750 million dollars for use over the next three years.

The president was concerned that many school districts could not borrow enough money to build needed schools because their debt limits were restricted, and he believed some other form of financing was needed. He pointed out that several states had developed special state-wide school building agencies which gave them borrowing advantages since they represented the collective credit of many communities throughout a state. Under this plan a local community could lease a new school from the state agency without borrowing. Eisenhower wanted to expand this plan to include the federal government:

I now propose the wider adoption of this tested method of accelerating school construction. Under this proposal, the Federal Government would share with the states in establishing and maintaining for State school building

agencies an initial reserve fund equal to one year's payment on principal and interest....I recommend that the Congress authorize the necessary Federal participation to put this plan into effect so that State building agencies may be in a position to issue bonds in the next three years which will build six billion dollars of new schools.14

In his 1955 proposals Eisenhower also called for federal matching grants to the states but only if every other procedure failed to provide local school districts with money to build needed schools. He stated that federal grants should be forthcoming only when one of the following conditions was met:

(A) The school district, if it has not reached its legal bonding limit, can not sell its bonds to the Federal Government....because it cannot pay interest and principal charges on the total construction costs.

(B) The school district, if it has reached its legal bonding limit, is unable to pay the rent needed to obtain a school from a State agency on a lease purchase basis....

The State would certify the school district's inability to finance the total construction cost through borrowing or a rental arrangement. It would also certify that the new school is needed to relieve extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or hazardous or unhealthful conditions.15

14Ibid., pp. 246-247.

15Ibid., p. 248.
Moreover, in his 1955 proposals Eisenhower recommended 200 million dollars in matching grants for a three year program. He also called for a three year, twenty million dollar federal grant to be matched by the states for the administrative costs involved in implementing the recommendations of the state conferences on education. Neither of these programs were enacted.

The President's school construction proposal to Congress for 1956 was similar to his 1955 school construction proposal except that grants were raised from 200 million dollars annually for a three year program in his 1955 proposal to 250 million dollars annually for five years in his 1956 proposal. In the latter proposal Eisenhower listed several principles he considered essential before federal grants should be made.

The first broad principle is that Federal grants must not reduce the incentive for State and local efforts.... I propose, therefore, that Federal grants be matched by State appropriations.... Furthermore, I propose a formula to reduce the proportion of Federal funds for those States which are noticeably lagging, behind their ability, to support their public schools.16

Another fundamental principle that Eisenhower stressed was:

Federal funds should be distributed according to relative need. Federal appropriations will most quickly accomplish the most good if a relatively larger share of Federal funds is distributed where local and state resources are least adequate to meet classroom needs.

I propose this principle be fulfilled in three ways. First, larger amounts per school-age child should be allotted to States with lower income per child. Second, States with lower income should not be required to put up as large a proportion of funds as higher income States. Third, highest priority should be given to school districts with the least economic ability to meet their needs. 17

Eisenhower's proposals to Congress for school construction in 1957 were similar to his 1956 proposals, but the amount requested was condensed into four years, which increased the annual amount requested. The basic principals governing legislation for federal grants were about the same in 1957 as in 1956. However, the idea of providing

17Ibid. Eisenhower was proposing an "equalization grant." There are several kinds of federal grants. Two of the most common types are: (1) "flat grants," in which a flat sum is distributed among the states in proportion to the number of school age children or a fixed per capita is paid for every school age child in each state, and (2) "equalization grants," in which a significantly higher percentage of the funds go to poorer states. There are basically two ways in which federal grants are allocated. (1) "matching grants," in which states are required to match a percentage of the amount provided by the federal government, and (2) "outright grants," in which no matching requirement is made upon the states.
more equality of educational opportunity between the states was not stressed as much in the 1957 requests as it had been in 1956. The equalization factor had raised some controversy during the 1956 Congressional discussions over federal aid to education, and Eisenhower apparently wished to put less emphasis upon it in 1957.18

In a press conference of July 1957 a discussion about the defeat of the 1957 bill arose, and Eisenhower was asked by a reporter why he had not given more support for that year's bill. He replied in part, "a year ago we made a further concession to the theory of grant. This year we made still a further concession, and I thought I had compromised the principles for which I stood, as far as I could."19

In 1958 Eisenhower did not request the purchase of bonds for school construction, but he did request federal

18 Such a divergent group as James Reston of The New York Times, David Lawrence of The United States News and World Report, and Adam Clayton Powell (Democrat, New York) claimed the 1956 bill was defeated because its sponsors did not include the equalization formula asked for by the President resulting in loss of votes among Republicans. See National Politics and Federal Aid to Education. Frank J. Munger, Richard F. Fenno, Jr. (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962), p. 44.

funds for student loans, fellowships, and matching grants for specialized programs of testing, counseling, and guidance services; for the expansion of graduate schools; for the collection and the improvement of statistical data about the status and progress of education; and for the improvement and expansion of the teaching of science and mathematics, and foreign languages. These requests far exceeded, both in variety and in funds, any legislative requests for matching grants for education in both Eisenhower administrations. Most of the requested grant programs were approved and included in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

In 1959 Eisenhower turned away from any kind of outright grant and substituted instead a long-term program of debt service aid designed to help needy school districts pay off school construction bonds. The plan called for federal payments stretched over a period of thirty to thirty-five years to help local school districts pay off the interest and principal costs of three billion dollars in long-term school construction bonds. The proposal failed to pass Congress and was attacked by Northern Democrats as a "bankers' bill" designed to cost the president's budget little. Eisenhower restated this request in 1960, and it again failed to get Congressional approval.

With the exception of his NDEA proposals in 1958,
Eisenhower's recommendations to Congress for school aid clearly favored the purchasing of bonds from local school districts to enable them to build more schools. There seemed to be little question that in his two terms in office the president came to recognize the pressing need for school construction aid because of the nation's severe classroom shortages, but it appeared that his choice of having the federal government provide aid by purchasing school bonds was his way of keeping the public cost of such aid to a minimum.

TEACHER SHORTAGES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The president early recognized the states' inability to provide enough teachers for too few classrooms. In his 1954 State of the Union Message he warned:

Youth--our greatest resource--is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population.20

However, several weeks later in his Budget Message he expressed serious reservations about federal aid to the states:

I do not underestimate the difficulties facing the States and communities in attempting to solve the problems created by the great

increase in the number of children of
school age, the shortage of qualified
teachers and the overcrowding of class-
rooms. The effort to overcome these
difficulties strains the taxable
resources of many communities. At
the same time, I do not accept the
simple remedy of Federal intervention.21

In his Special Message to Congress on Education in
1955, Eisenhower again recognized the nation's lack of
adequately trained teachers as well as a grave classroom
shortage. But his description of the teacher reflected
a traditional and rather romanticized American view of the
teacher:

Good teaching and good teachers made
even the one-room crossroads schools of
the nineteenth century a rich source of
the knowledge and enthusiasm and
patriotism, joined with spiritual
wisdom, that mark a vigorously dynamic
people.22

Nevertheless, the President's praise of the nation's teachers
was quickly followed with a more realistic and accurate
assessment of the profession:

Today, the professional quality of
American teaching is better than ever.
But too many teachers are underpaid and
overworked and, in consequence, too few

21"Text of President Eisenhower's Budget Message:

22"Special Message to the Congress Concerning Federal
Assistance in School Construction," February 8, 1955, Public
Papers, p. 249.
young men and women join their ranks. Here is a shortage, less obvious but ultimately more dangerous, than the classroom shortages. 23

The president repeated his praise of American teachers in his 1956 Special Education Message to Congress, but it was mixed with a concern for their well-being. After commending the quality of teaching in the nation's schools, he warned that "the rewards for too many teachers are not commensurate with their work and their role in American life." 24

Toward the end of 1956 and just prior to the presidential election, Eisenhower described the status of the nation's teachers much more favorably. In a letter to a college student he asserted:

Today, more Americans are receiving more and better education, in better schools and colleges, from more and better teachers than ever before.... the teacher shortage has reached a turning point. The number of students entering colleges for teacher training increased 24.5 percent from 1953 to 1955. The current shortage of qualified elementary and high school teachers is estimated at 120,000, a reduction of 20,000 compared with the shortage of last fall.

The position of teachers, the life-blood of good education, is steadily being improved. Teachers' salaries have been increased in many communities,

23 Ibid.

a reflection of improved support and esteem for the role of teachers in our community and national life."25

This optimistic view was repeated in his 1957 special message, when the president claimed that the States had already accomplished much toward reducing the teacher shortage. Yet he had to acknowledge that "thousands of emergency teachers with substandard certificates had to be employed. Far more needs to be done in our various communities to enhance the status of the teacher—in salary, in community esteem and support and thereby attract more people to the profession and, equally important, retain those who bear so well the trust of instructing our youth."26

For all of Eisenhower's praise of the nation's teachers and their importance in our society, his public statements did not include specific requests for federal aid to support teachers' salaries. His statements revealed an increasing contentment with what he considered to be their improved status.

This contentment, however, was shattered with the launching of Sputnik. In his Special Message to Education in 1958, Eisenhower abruptly shifted from his pre-Sputnik

25 "Letter to a College Student Concerning the Administration's Views on Education," October 29, 1956, Public Papers, pp. 1035-1036.

position of no federal aid for teachers' salaries to requesting support for them. With the intention of improving the subject matter knowledge of science, mathematics, and foreign language teachers, the president recommended federal funds for teacher training institutes. He recommended that Congress authorize federal grants to the states, on a matching basis, for this purpose. These funds would be used according to the "discretion of the States and the local school systems, either to employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers, to help purchase laboratory equipment and other materials, to supplement salaries of qualified science and mathematics teachers, or other related programs." By stating that federal funds for support of teachers was to be used at the "discretion of State and local school systems," the president was able to preserve the integrity of his previous statements demanding local control, but the idea of supporting teachers with federal funds was contrary to Eisenhower's previous position.

President Eisenhower's 1958 call for federal support of teachers was a significant shift in position, even though it may be argued that that support was indirect. His 1959

State of the Union Message contained statements that were even more of a change from his former stand on federal aid. In a discussion on the need for a committee to study the ways to establish national goals, Eisenhower used the local and state control of schools as an example of why national goals were needed.

In their capacity and in their quality they conform to no recognizable standards. In some places facilities are ample, in others meager. Pay of teachers ranges between wide limits from the adequate to the shameful. As would be expected, quality of teaching varies just as widely. But to our teachers we commit the most valuable possession of the nation and of the family—our children.

We must have teachers of competence. To obtain and hold them we need standards. We need a National Goal. Once established I am certain that public opinion would compel steady progress toward its accomplishment.²⁸

The idea of having a "national goal" for teacher standards was strangely inconsistent with the President's previous near-obsession with strict local control and autonomy of the public schools.

In his final year in office Eisenhower returned to his earlier opposition to federal support of teachers' salaries. When the President was asked about federal funds to support teachers' salaries he replied casuistically:

I do not believe the Federal Government ought to be in the business of paying a local official. If we're going to that, we'll have to find out every councilman and every teacher and every other person that's a public official of any kind....and try to figure out what his right salary is....I can't imagine anything worse for the Federal Government to be into.29

Eisenhower did not believe in federal aid for teachers' salaries. His refusal to recommend it prior to the launching of Sputnik reflected his real attitude about such aid. Even the aid he did recommend in his NDEA proposals of 1958 in support of teachers probably would not have occurred if he had not been gravely concerned about the dangers to American security caused by Sputnik.

SPECIALIZED AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

It may be said that Eisenhower's support of aid to teachers in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a form of general federal aid for the nation's schools except that aid for teachers under this Act was limited to specific programs and was limited to the specific subject areas of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The Congressional Quarterly, when referring to passage of this Act, said that "Congress ....for the first time endorsed

the principle of a Federal contribution toward general 
education. Even Eisenhower justified the need for his 
educational programs in the National Defense Education Act 
on the basis of strengthening general education. But the 
NDEA cannot be referred to as general federal aid, for 
most of the provisions of this Act contained provisions for 
specialized programs, and particularly its provisions for 
elementary and secondary schools.

The specialized programs requested by Eisenhower 
were a direct outgrowth of his concern for the many young-
sters who were dropping out of high school before graduation 
and for those many graduates who were not going on to 
higher education. According to the President:

Much of this waste could be avoided 
if the aptitudes of these young people 
were identified and they were encouraged 
toward the fullest development of their 
abilities.

The administration proposes, therefore, 
that the Congress authorize: (a) Matching 
grants to the States to encourage improved 
State and local testing programs to 
identify the potential abilities of 
students at an early stage in their 
development. (b) Matching grants to 
the States to encourage the strengthening 
of local counseling and guidance services, 
so that more able students will be 
encouraged to stay in high school, to

---

30 "Federal Education Aid Approved," Congressional 
Quarterly Almanac, XIV (Washington, D.C.: Congressional 
put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education.\footnote{\textit{Special Message to the Congress on Education}, January 27, 1958. \textit{Public Papers}, p. 130.}

In response to the President's requests, Congress appropriated 60 million dollars in grants for four years to state educational agencies to help them establish and maintain programs of testing and of counseling and guidance. However, Eisenhower had asked for matching grants by the states, but the state matching requirement was not included in the bill.

Congress was more than generous toward the President's educational requests of 1958. The National Defense Education Act even included two other additional provisions not requested by the President. Grants and loans up to 18 million dollars were provided for research on educational television, radio, motion pictures and audio-visual aids, and 60 million dollars in grants was made to the states for vocational programs for students not going to college.

Although Eisenhower's proposals in the National Defense Education Act for elementary and secondary education were not sufficient considering the nation's pressing educational needs, they did represent a significant increase in funds for the schools. Too, there was an important shift from school construction aid to specific federal aid.
to elementary and secondary schools for specialized programs. But this change was short lived because the President's 1959 and 1960 Messages to Congress contained little in the way of specific aid for specialized programs for elementary and secondary schools. Nevertheless, Congress continued funding such programs.

Eisenhower was more willing to recommend federal aid for specialized programs in elementary and secondary schools in his NDEA proposals than he was for teachers' salaries and for general federal aid. Congress was even more willing to enact such aid. Although the aid provided by the government for specialized programs was designed to improve America's position in the space race, the large amount of money made available to the schools did, in fact, benefit the schools in areas other than in the specialized programs.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The nation's colleges and universities, as well as the nation's elementary and secondary schools, were in great need of federal help when Eisenhower became President. It was reasonable to expect the nation's chief executive to have been very concerned about the problems and well-being of American higher education and, especially, since he was the past president of a large, renowned university.
But seldom in his earlier years in office did he propose significant federal aid for higher education; one major exception was during the "Sputnik crisis."

Eisenhower rarely spoke about higher education during his first three years in office. Even the highly reputed and influential White House Conference on Education of 1955, which the President placed so much confidence in, did not concern itself with the problems of higher education. In the introduction to the Conference's final and complete report submitted to the President in April 1956, the following justification was given for this exclusion.

The White House Conference restricted itself to discussion of problems affecting the elementary and secondary schools, public and non-public. This decision, made by the Committee, was due to the press of time and the fact that these two areas of American education affect the greatest number of persons.32

However, in a Special Message to Congress on Education in 1956, Eisenhower began to speak publicly of problems that existed in higher education, and he began to speak of ways to deal with future problems in higher education. Shortages continued to exist in many areas of higher education, and a sharp increase in enrollment was

expected to further compound those shortages. To attack these and other problems in higher education, Eisenhower decided to

appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the nation, in the years ahead.33

Accordingly, in 1956 Eisenhower appointed a committee which became known as the Committee on Education Beyond the High School, composed of distinguished educational leaders and lay personnel whose task it was to study and make recommendations in the field of higher education. The committee issued an interim report to the president on November, 1956 pointing out issues in higher education that needed careful scrutiny. In his January, 1957 Special Message on Education, Eisenhower referred to an important issue in the interim report. "It [Committee's Report] pointed out that much more planning is needed at the State level to meet current and future needs in education beyond the high school."34


In 1956 Congress had passed Public Law 813 authorizing federal aid for states so they could establish state committees on education beyond the high school. However, Congress failed to appropriate the necessary funds. Disappointed over this, the President recommended that "the Congress now [1957] appropriate the full amount authorized under this legislation....I recommend that the Congress amend Public Law 813 so as to authorize grants to the States of 2.5 million dollars a year for three years for these purposes."\textsuperscript{35} Even this meager request met with unfavorable Congressional action.

Until 1958 the Eisenhower administration had provided very little support for America's colleges and universities, but Eisenhower's virtual silence in support of federal aid to higher education was altered significantly in 1958. In his Special Message to Congress on Education, the President called for federal aid somewhat different from what he had previously requested. He recommended an increase in the Foundation's National Science Foundation graduate fellowship program and a program of federal Scholarships for able high school graduates who lack adequate financial means to go to college. The administration recommends approximately 10,000 new scholarships annually, reaching

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.
a total of $40,000 in the fourth year....

Scholarships were to be allotted between the States on an equitable basis and awarded by State agencies on the basis of ability and need. Preference was to be given to students who were well prepared or had a high aptitude in science or mathematics. Moreover, Eisenhower was concerned with increasing the supply of trained college teachers.

To help assure a more adequate supply of trained college teachers, so crucial in the development of tomorrow's leaders, the Administration recommends that the Congress authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide:

(a) Graduate fellowships to encourage more students to prepare for college teaching careers. Fellows should be nominated by higher educational institutions.

(b) Federal grants, on a matching basis, to institutions of higher education to assist in expanding their graduate school capacity. Funds would be used, in the discretion of the institution itself, whether for salaries or teaching materials.

In this same address Eisenhower called for "support of special centers in colleges and universities to provide instruction in foreign languages which are important today


37Ibid.
but which are not now commonly taught in the United States," and for "support of institutes for those who are already teaching foreign languages in our schools and colleges."\textsuperscript{38} In conjunction with support for elementary and secondary school counseling and guidance, Eisenhower called for a program which "would provide for grants of funds to colleges and universities to permit them to establish training institutes to improve the qualifications of counseling and guidance personnel."\textsuperscript{39} These requests were granted, with some modifications, within the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Law 864.

One important exception, however, was the request for Federal scholarships which aroused considerable controversy. The House Education and Labor Committee approved a bill that included 23 thousand scholarships a year. The House debated an amendment by Carroll D. Kearns (Representative-Pennsylvania) to reduce the scholarships back to the President's original ten thousand request but finally approved an amendment by Walter H. Judd (Representative-Minnesota) to eliminate the scholarships altogether. The 120 million dollars to be used for the scholarships was

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid.
placed in a loan fund. It is ironical that Congress re­
jected Eisenhower's Federal scholarship proposal and placed
funds for it into a loan program since the President's
previous public statements on federal aid to education would
suggest his desire for Federal loans rather than scholar­
ships anyway. Commenting on the defeat of the scholarships
Eisenhower said, "While the Congress did not see fit to
provide a limited number of National Defense scholarships
which I recommended as an incentive to our most promising
youth, I consider this Act to be a sound and constructive
piece of legislation."40  The President did not seem to be
too disappointed with Congress' rejection of his scholar­
ship program and, in fact, it may have been a relief to
him that federal scholarships were not made available to
college and university students.

Eisenhower's recommendations to Congress for aid to
higher education were similar to his requests for aid to
elementary and secondary schools. It was Sputnik again
that motivated the president to request such aid. His
NDEA requests were important in the improvement of the
nation's colleges and universities. The president's effort
for higher education, as commendable as it may have been,

40 "Statement by the President Upon Signing the National
Defense Education Act." September 2, 1958, Public Papers,
p. 671.
was not, however, adequate for the vast number of problems that existed in these institutions. Nevertheless, without the vast sums provided by the NDEA, the nation's colleges and universities would not have been able to make some of the advances they made in the 1960's.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY AID

Requests for federal aid to higher education were justified by Eisenhower mainly on the basis that this was an emergency program stemming from national needs that had a direct bearing upon national security. But most of his proposals for federal aid to education were for school construction aid and for support of science, mathematics, and foreign language education in the elementary and secondary schools. These latter kinds of aid were to be provided also on a temporary basis and only because an emergency situation existed.

In his 1955 proposal for school construction legislation, Eisenhower had claimed that "the present shortage requires immediate and effective action that will produce more rapid results. Unless the Federal Government steps forward to join with the States and communities, this
emergency situation will continue.\textsuperscript{41} Eisenhower went on to call for a broad effort by the federal government to help finance school construction "for the purpose of meeting the emergency only."\textsuperscript{42} But in a news conference on the following day, the president hinted that perhaps a permanent plan for school construction could evolve. "...this is an emergency plan so far as construction is concerned although it does point out certain ways that could be permanently applied to this problem."\textsuperscript{43} The emergency construction plan, which Eisenhower wanted to start "instantly," was to provide federal aid for school construction until recommendations for long-range plans were made by the White House Conference on Education.

However, in his first major address after the conclusion of the White House Conference, Eisenhower suggested that school construction aid be limited. "...I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit

\textsuperscript{41}"Special Message to the Congress Concerning Federal Assistance in School Construction," February 8, 1955, Public Papers, p. 245.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43}"The President's News Conference of February 9, 1955," Public Papers, pp. 253-254.
of school classrooms. Such a program should be limited to a five-year period ...."44 Less than a week later in a Special Message to Congress on Education the President eliminated the doubt that existed from his State of the Union Message as to whether he believed federal support of school construction aid should be temporary or permanent.

If speedily and fully utilized, this Federal program—added to the increased basic efforts of States and communities—should overcome the nation's critical classroom shortage within five years. Once this shortage is overcome, the Federal grant program can and must terminate. The States and localities should then go forward without Federal funds, to meet their current and future needs. Present construction levels indicate their ability to do this.45

The president's concern over eventually ending federal aid for school construction was in vain since this type of aid did not pass Congress.46 Furthermore, his optimism

46Lamenting the defeat of his school construction bill of 1956, Eisenhower said, "The only ones who will suffer because of this failure are those who count most but cannot vote, our children." "Letter to a College Student Concerning the Administration's View on Education," October 29, 1956, Public Papers, p. 1037.
over the ability of States and localities to meet their own classroom needs was premature. The deficit of classrooms was too great to be overcome by local school districts and states unless they were willing to make major sacrifices of other state programs and divert funds to building schools or unless large scale federal aid was forthcoming. Neither occurred, and the shortages continued. The United States Office of Education reported in December of 1959 that at the beginning of the 1959-60 school year the nation was short 132,400 public elementary and secondary school classrooms and "despite state construction of 63 thousand to 72 thousand new classrooms annually since the 1955-56 school year, the over-all classroom shortage declined only slightly."47

As was recounted earlier, in 1957 Eisenhower specifically urged Congress to enact a program which would help meet the backlog of classroom shortages within four years. Eisenhower reasoned that the time period needed to be reduced from five to four years because of the defeat of the school construction bill in 1956.48 After four years of federal support, the president believed that full


48A similar shortening of the time to meet the backlog of needs in classroom shortages was not made in the president's public statements of 1956 even though his school construction legislative requests in 1955 failed.
responsibility for school construction needed to revert to the State and local governments.

The president justified his call for federal aid because "the lack of physical facilities is a temporary emergency situation in which Federal assistance is appropriate." In rather extemporaneous comments during a press conference, Eisenhower said he believed the Federal Government did not have

any proper role in the operation and in the general maintenance of our public school system....But....through a series of circumstances, many of which the local people could not help at all, we got way behind in schools, in schoolrooms. And I have come to the conclusion that because some of those difficulties were brought about by national emergencies, [Depression of the 1930's, World War II, and the Korean War] the National Government ought to help, and I say help only—that is, beyond the power of the State to get those buildings built, and then turn the whole thing back to the States, and have nothing more to do with it.

The closing words of this statement seem to indicate Eisenhower's discomfort with the idea of federal support of local and state education. There was a finality ringing

---


in the words, "and have nothing more to do with it," and they reveal his desire that federal aid be provided only on a temporary and as an emergency basis.

TEMPORARY AID FOR SCIENCE

After three successive years of defeat of his school construction proposals, Eisenhower shifted to proposing federal aid for the support of science education. However, this shift did not change Eisenhower's previous emphasis on the need for keeping federal aid temporary and the need to consider it as emergency aid. In his 1958 budget message he suggested:

The basic responsibility for science education and training...depends primarily on non-Federal support, and requires a thorough understanding of the problem by all our citizens and their wholehearted support. Therefore, I strongly recommend that this Federal participation in the nation's educational process be limited to four years (allowing additionally for the completion of scholarships granted within these four years), and be considered as an emergency stimulant to encourage the states and local communities to bring their educational systems up to date in the light of our modern scientific age.51

The president limited federal aid to science education to four years without specifically stating the reason why

he believed this was the exact number of years needed to bring local schools "up-to-date" in this area. Specific figures were used to justify four years of federal aid for school construction aid. There was no way of measuring how many years it would take to get local schools current in science, and apparently Eisenhower used the four-year limitation simply because it had been used in school construction requests. Eisenhower related the need for federal aid for science education to national security but only on an emergency basis. After his usual praise of local efforts, Eisenhower conceded that federal aid was necessary "because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead;" therefore, "the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role." 52 For Eisenhower, federal aid for science education was "a temporary program and should not be considered as a permanent federal responsibility." 53 Upon signing the National Defense Education Act, Eisenhower reinforced his concern that this type of aid be temporary. This act, which is an emergency undertaking to be terminated after four years, will in that time do much to strengthen

---


53 Ibid., p. 128.
our American system of education so that it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security.  

However, the President's prediction of the termination of aid under the National Defense Education Act proved to be inaccurate. Many of the provisions for federal aid to the nation's schools under the NDEA were to continue for Eisenhower's few remaining years in office and were expanded upon in later administrations.

Eisenhower came to the presidency clearly opposed to federal aid to education, but during his two terms of office he became a somewhat reluctant supporter of such aid. Without the threat of Soviet space superiority it is doubtful that the president would have given as much support to federal aid as he did, and it is even more doubtful that Congress would have approved of his legislative recommendations. Nevertheless, even with moderate support from the president, federal funds to the schools increased much more rapidly during the Eisenhower administration than in any previous presidential administration in the history of our nation.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters have examined the public statements of presidents Truman and Eisenhower on federal aid to education; their numerous concerns have been dealt with as separate categories, but at the same time an attempt was made to treat these categories as a continuous, unified issue. This chapter will summarize each category separately, compare and contrast the two presidents' views, and then conclusions will be drawn. In addition, an over-all view will be taken of these categories and some general conclusions will be made about the two presidents' involvement in the question of federal aid to the schools.

SOME GENERAL CONTROVERSIES

Truman's statement on education reflected considerable concern for the vast inequality of educational opportunity that existed between the various states during the late
1940's. He displayed an impatience with this and other inequalities that existed throughout American society. "We cannot be satisfied until all our people have equal opportunities for jobs, for homes, for education, for health, and for political expression, and until all our people have equal protection under the law."¹

He placed much of the blame for the inequality of educational opportunity upon the States and local districts and attributed it to the great disparity of wealth that existed between the states. The federal government should provide aid to the states he believed, in order to reduce the inequality and in order to best serve the best interests of a democracy.

Eisenhower spoke of the necessity for improved education so that all could become better citizens, and he talked about "the best possible education for all our young people,"² but he did not refer to the injustice of the vast

¹ This statement comes from his February 2, 1948 message to Congress transmitting his recommendations for a civil rights program. See "Truman on Education," School Life, Vol.XXXXI, January 1949, p. 8.

inequality of educational opportunities between the states and between local districts. Nevertheless, he did consistently demand in most of his recommendations that aid be based on need and that "the greatest help go to the States and localities with the least financial resources."^3

In spite of Truman's direct and specific statements about inequality and Eisenhower's rather indirect and general statements about it, Eisenhower's legislative proposals were more insistent than Truman's that federal monies be used to help the poorest states. However, unlike Truman, Eisenhower was not so much concerned that the neediest states receive funds to reduce the inequality in education as he was concerned that "the firm conditions of federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income."^4

Truman and Eisenhower both favored equal educational opportunity and opposed federal control of the nation's schools; however, they differed in their conceptualization of federal control. Truman, taking a broad view of the idea of federal control, wanted the federal government to

---


provide the necessary financial aid to the states and then let the states decide what to do with the money. He did not specify how the $50 million dollars that he repeatedly requested was to be spent except that the funds were to go to elementary and secondary schools for their particular needs. On the other hand, Eisenhower seemed genuinely fearful that federal aid, especially federal aid for all states, meant federal control and seemed obsessed with preventing federal control from occurring. Yet there was an element of federal control in many of Eisenhower's legislative proposals. For example, his 1955, 1956, and 1957 proposals all stipulated that the federal aid requested must be spent for the construction of school buildings, and his 1958 NDEA proposals placed strict federal requirements upon local schools to spend federal monies on improving mathematics, science, and foreign language education. Furthermore, the equalization formula contained within many of Eisenhower's education proposals was also a form of control.

It is ironical, therefore, that Eisenhower who was incessant in his pronouncements against federal control actually included more federal regulations within his legislative proposals than Truman who neither included warnings against federal control in any of his legislative
proposals nor called for federal restrictions upon local school districts that were to receive federal aid.

Whereas only Eisenhower included warnings against federal control in his aid to education proposals to Congress, both presidents excluded the issue of segregation in the schools in their recommendations. However, on occasion Eisenhower was reluctantly drawn into the latter controversy.

During Truman's years in office, this issue had begun to receive national attention because the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights organizations began to exert pressure upon state governments, Congress and the president to integrate the schools. Truman was not unsympathetic to the civil rights of the black man. On July 26, 1948 he issued Executive Order 9980, requiring an end to discrimination in governmental hiring practices, and Executive Order 9981, which prepared the way for the eventual and long overdue desegregation of the armed forces. But Truman's effort in these two areas was not extended to the nation's schools, and most of them remained solidly segregated during his two terms in office. On the other hand, an awareness of

---

5 It took years for these two orders to be implemented. For a discussion of the problems arising out of the implementation of these executive orders see Lee Nichols, Breakthrough on the Color Front (New York: Random House Inc., 1954).
segregation in the nation's schools was forced upon Eisenhower, because of the mounting criticism against this common practice, especially after the Supreme Court school desegregation decision of 1954. Nevertheless, he avoided it whenever possible.

The reason for Truman and Eisenhower's avoidance of the issue of segregation in their federal aid to education proposals should be apparent since their speaking out on this issue would only further antagonize interested parties. But it was a sad commentary on the moral leadership qualities of both Presidents that neither spoke out loudly and clearly against the injustices of segregation in the nation's schools when they presented their educational proposals.

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

Although Truman and Eisenhower avoided the issue of segregation in their public statements, they spoke frequently about the need for research and planning for the nation's schools, and both provided for studies of the schools in their legislative proposals to Congress. Planning was provided in both administrations; Truman appointed the Presidential Commission on Higher Education in 1946, and requested a three-year survey of the nation's school building needs in 1950. Eisenhower set up the White House Conference on Education in 1955 and appointed the Committee on Education
Beyond the High School in 1956.

There seems little question that the various surveys of the schools conducted during both presidents' terms of office had significant influence upon their legislative proposals. Surveys that revealed severe classroom and teacher shortages were largely responsible for Truman's repeated 300 million dollar requests for elementary and secondary schools, and the studies conducted by the President's Commission on Higher Education resulted in his calling for more aid to higher education in the form of scholarships. Similarly, Eisenhower's school construction proposals were a direct result of the reports by the state conferences and the White House Conference on Education in 1955. Thus, the surveys conducted during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations served as a basis for discovering what the schools' needs were, as a basis for justifying both presidents' requests for federal aid to education, and as a basis for educational research and planning.

It was quite evident that Truman and Eisenhower were motivated to propose educational legislation because they believed it would strengthen the nation economically and militarily. Truman clearly tied the need for better schools to the nation's defense effort. The Korean War intensified his belief that a sound and fundamental education for all of America's youth needed to be provided in
the interest of national security. He was aware of the high illiteracy rate among World War I and World War II draftees and believed that the education of the nation's youth had a direct bearing upon the nation's military effort.

The launching of Sputnik profoundly increased Eisenhower's support of federal aid to education. Furthermore, it was the main cause of his dramatic shift of emphasis from federal aid for school construction to federal aid for mathematics, science, and foreign language education. Congress' support of President Eisenhower's NDEA requests was unquestionably a reflection of their desire to improve the nation's position in the space race between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Education was to become the vehicle to close the gap between the two nations caused by the Soviet's breakthrough in space exploration.

With national needs and goals in mind, Truman favored the creation of both a National Science Foundation and a

---

6 Frank J. Munger, and Richard F. Fenno, Jr. in National Politics and Federal Aid to Education (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962) point out that close to 25 per cent of the World War I draftees were illiterate (p. 3) and claimed that "more than any other single cause, the rate of selective service rejections produced the demands for federal aid in 1917.... the repetition of the same events in the World War II draft produced the 1943 Senate debate on federal aid." (p. 16)
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When a bill passed Congress in 1947, he disagreed sharply with the proposed administrative structure of the National Science Foundation and consequently vetoed it; otherwise, the Foundation probably would have come into existence three years earlier. Truman's two main objectives in his efforts to create the Foundation were to improve national research and to strengthen national security. Eisenhower expanded Truman's efforts in behalf of the National Science Foundation. However, he did not specifically call for any major increase in aid to the NSF until his Special Message to Congress on Education in 1958. Passage of the National Defense Education Act provided a sharp increase in funds for the Foundation.

Truman helped lay the groundwork for the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare although he devoted less time and effort toward its creation than he did for the National Science Foundation. Eisenhower created HEW in a reorganization plan in 1953, but spoke very little about it probably because its creation was pretty much a foregone conclusion when he came into office.7

7The earliest attempt to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare began with President Harding's
Basic to Truman and Eisenhower's statements in support of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health, education, and welfare was the idea that both of these governmental bodies would improve the nation's well-being. It seemed that the support of both presidents for the creation and the expansion of NSF and HEW was more in the national interest than in the interest of education.

Impacted Areas Aid legislation was passed in 1950, the same year that the National Science Foundation was established. Truman gave strong support to impacted areas aid throughout his administration and, in fact, was instrumental in getting this type of aid changed from emergency, stopgap aid in the immediate post World War II years to a more permanent type of aid in 1950. Moreover, Truman called for and was successful in getting the administration of

- proposed Department of Education and Welfare in 1923. A similar Department was suggested in 1924, and in 1932 President Hoover recommended the concentration of health, education, and recreational activities into a single executive department. A President's Commission in 1937 recommended putting health, education and social security functions in a Department of Social Welfare. This was partially implemented in 1939 when these three functions were grouped into the Federal Security Agency. A new department might have been created if the Re-organization Act of 1939 had not prohibited the creation of additional executive departments. A committee of the Executive Branch proposed the creation of a department for education and social security. The Reorganization Act of 1949 led directly to the Reorganization Plan I and the creation of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953.
impacted areas aid consolidated under the Office of Education.

President Truman's vigorous support of impacted areas aid was, however, tempered by his warning that such aid should not be considered a substitute for general federal aid to education—a warning that many enthusiastic Congressional supporters of impacted areas aid did not want to hear. It was not infrequent for a Congressman to give full support to impacted areas aid which benefited his district, but this same Congressman would flatly oppose general federal aid legislation.

Eisenhower differed considerably from Truman in his support of federal aid to impacted areas. Although Eisenhower began his first term of office by requesting a continuation and an expansion of such aid, he soon became reluctant in that support and eventually he suggested that it be significantly reduced so that aid would be provided only where federal personnel both lived and worked on federal property. He took such a stance because he believed it was unfair for the federal government to give aid to school districts that were benefiting in tax support from increased federal activities in their districts. To give federal subsidies to a district that was already benefiting from increased federal activity was, according to Eisenhower, preferential treatment for those districts.
Eisenhower's contention that this practice was unfair was essentially accurate. However, it appeared that his reluctance to support aid to impacted areas went beyond his concern for the inequity of this type of aid to a concern that impacted aid was becoming permanent and very costly.

He became quite concerned about the growing amount of aid for impacted areas and evidently felt compelled to reduce, or at least slow-down, the increase of funds. A reduction in federal expenditures for such aid was consistent with Eisenhower's conservative fiscal policies. Since impacted aid had been such a politically popular form of aid with most Congressmen and with most of the American public, it appeared that Eisenhower was making a politically courageous move when he sought to curb such aid. But what seemed to be an attempt by him to provide a more equitable

---

The distribution of funds to poorer states for education was really an attempt by him to reduce total federal spending on education then and to prevent future expansion of such spending.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

The presidential campaign of 1948 was the first in which federal aid to education was made an important issue by an aspiring presidential candidate. Truman crisscrossed the nation in a whistle-stop campaign speaking out frequently on what he considered to be a national crisis in American education. He made the 1948 campaign a defense of the New Deal policies and accused the Republicans of attempting to repeal Roosevelt's domestic programs. Richard O. Davies, writing on Truman's social welfare policies, claimed that Truman had a simple but ingenious plan in the campaign of 1948:

Truman merely sought to maintain intact the Roosevelt coalition that had worked so effectively in 1940 and 1944....he shaped...his entire campaign around social welfare policies.... Scarcely a week passed in 1948 that he did not dispatch a special message to Congress on some reform program. Special messages on civil rights, housing, rent controls, medical care, price controls, social security, and education descended upon the Republican Congress, and he made frequent references to these reforms.
during his press conferences. 9

Truman was particularly diligent at flailing the Republican-dominated 80th Congress for its lack of legislative action to alleviate the severe classroom and teacher shortages. His branding of the 80th Congress as the "do-nothing-Congress" and his recalling this Congress for a special session were perhaps two of the most astute political moves that he made in 1948 that helped him to victory that fall. The 1948 Republican platform endorsed essentially the same social welfare policies as the Democratic platform; one notable exception was federal aid to education. The president put the Republicans "on the spot" by calling them into special session to give them a chance to enact their platform promises. Regardless of whether the programs he requested in the special session were enacted or whether they were rejected by the Republican-dominated Congress, Truman could only gain politically. His strategy proved to be very successful; the Republicans bickered among themselves and adjourned without passing

any significant legislation. Truman devoted nearly all of his campaign speeches to social welfare policies and centered his criticism of the failure to enact social welfare legislation not on his opponent but upon the "do-nothing-Congress" and especially the Republican congressional leadership. A significant part of that criticism was devoted to Congress' failure to enact educational legislation.

In his campaign, Truman spoke frequently about the low pay, the poor "working conditions" of the nation's teachers, and the grave national shortage of classrooms and called for federal aid to alleviate the crisis in American education; this contrasted sharply with Dewey's virtual silence on such aid. The fact that there was such a

---


11 Dewey did, however, refer to the raises in teachers' salaries in the state of New York under his governorship, but this was during the Republican presidential primary. Referring to the legislative program Dewey said, "Minimum teachers' salaries have been raised from $900 to $2,000 rising with annual increments to the permanent levels of $4,400 to $5,300 a year. State aid for education has gone up from 100 million dollars to 100 million dollars a year." See Public Papers of Governor Thomas E. Dewey: Fifty-first Governor of the State of New York, 1943-1954, vol. V of 12 volumes, (Albany, N.Y.: William Press, 1948), p. 593.
clear-cut difference between the candidates on this issue and the fact that Truman won an unexpected but a relatively close victory was an indication that federal aid to education was an important issue in determining the outcome of the 1948 election. However, a more detailed and extensive analysis of this election is needed to show more precisely to what extent the issue of federal aid to education contributed to Truman's victory.

Whereas Truman had entered the 1948 campaign in favor of federal aid to education, Eisenhower entered the 1952 campaign with a negative view about the need for federal aid to education. While President of Columbia University he spoke of the "centralizing" effect of federal aid to education and continually warned against federal control. Furthermore, his early reluctance to support federal aid to education was largely a result of his opposition to what he considered "reckless federal spending." Yet, in the campaign he recognized the grave national classroom and teacher shortages and called for some federal support to relieve these conditions. Throughout the campaign he seemed to be torn between providing federal aid to relieve the critical condition of the nation's neediest schools and his conservative opposition to federal spending. The support he did give was tempered by his cautious concern about excessive federal spending. Neither Eisenhower nor
Stevenson devoted much of their campaign rhetoric to the issue of federal aid and this issue was of little if any consequence in the election of 1952.

Eisenhower's views on federal aid to education changed from the time when he accepted the Republican nomination in 1952 to when he accepted the nomination in 1956; by then he was less reluctant to support federal aid to education. Too, the Republican platform of 1956 favored federal aid to education and contrasted sharply with their platform of 1952. Throughout the campaign of 1956 Eisenhower generally spoke in favor of federal aid to education. Moreover, he spoke less about the dangers of federal control and reckless federal spending. The President campaigned mainly on his support of federal aid to school construction in 1955 and 1956 and attacked his opponent's party for the failure of his school construction program. Stevenson had not remained silent on the issue of federal aid to education during Eisenhower's first term in office and, in fact, had become increasingly concerned about the poor condition of the nation's schools.

Although both presidential candidates, and especially Stevenson, gave more support to federal aid to education in their campaign speeches in 1956 than in 1952 and although the issue of federal aid was a relatively more important issue in the campaign of 1956, it was overshadowed by other
factors in the election and, consequently, had little effect upon the outcome.

**BROAD PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION**

From his first budget message of 1946 and continuing in a number of his speeches throughout his two terms of office, Truman recognized and supported the need for federal aid to elementary and secondary schools to help alleviate their distressing condition. His earlier proposals were for 300 million dollars in general federal aid, but by 1950 he called for specific grants to states so that they could survey their school construction needs. Congress authorized the funds and perhaps because the states' survey reports showed severe classroom shortages, school construction aid was the most frequent type of aid requested in Congress during the 1950's. Nevertheless, Truman continued to favor general federal aid and recommended such aid in his 1951 and 1952 budget messages.

Although Eisenhower made a few very brief statements about the nation's shortage of classrooms during his first two years in office, it was not until 1955 that he made major recommendations for school construction. Eisenhower continued his support for school construction in 1956 and 1957 but shifted to his NDEA proposals in 1958. In 1959 and 1960 he returned to requesting school construction aid, but on a long-term loan basis.
Both presidents differed in their requests for school construction aid in that Eisenhower made it a major and almost an exclusive type of aid in many of his messages to Congress whereas Truman included his requests for school construction as a part of general federal aid proposals. Eisenhower often considered aid for the construction of new school buildings as the kind of aid generally sufficient to improve the nation's educational ills; Truman did not.

It was perhaps on the issue of federal aid for teachers' salaries that Truman and Eisenhower's position differed the most. The shortage of teachers, their inadequate pay, and their poor working conditions was a common theme in Truman's rhetoric, particularly in the 1948 campaign. He saw the teachers as overworked and underpaid and called for federal aid to the states so that the states could improve teachers' salaries and working conditions. Truman did not, however, specifically request direct federal aid to teachers; the money was to go to the states, and the states were to decide if any funds were to be used for teachers' salaries; Truman left this decision strictly up to the states.

Eisenhower was also concerned about the shortages and the poor status of the teachers, but he often commented on what he considered to be their steadily improving condition. This blurring of the teachers' status could only
serve to confuse the public and mitigate any positive view they may have had toward providing federal aid for teachers' salaries.

Until his 1958 proposals, Eisenhower was unalterably opposed, and one might say even hostile, to the idea of federal aid to teachers' salaries. It seemed to take the threat of Soviet space superiority to convince him to change his position. However, his recommendations for aid were confined to science, mathematics, and foreign language teachers. Sputnik even caused Eisenhower to talk about "national goals" and "national standards" for teachers, strange talk indeed for one who had previously displayed an obsession over retaining local control and avoiding federal control of the schools.

Truman's support of federal aid to teachers' salaries differed from Eisenhower's support in that the former saw this kind of aid as an integral part of the total need for federal aid to education, and the latter did not. Although Truman saw the improvement of the teaching profession as a means to improving the nation's well-being and position in the Cold War, he did not justify such aid on the basis of national interest as often as Eisenhower did.

Truman requested far more aid for elementary and secondary schools than he did for higher education. Nevertheless, he appointed a Presidential Commission on Higher
Education in 1946 to deal with the rapid expansion caused by the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 and with other problems arising out of the rapid changes taking place in post World War II higher education. In his "Letter Appointing 30 members to the National Commission on Higher Education" Truman said,

As veterans return to college by the hundreds of thousands, the institutions of higher education face a period of trial which is taxing their resources and their resourcefulness to the utmost. The Federal Government is taking all practicable steps to assist the institutions to meet this challenge and to assure that all qualified veterans desirous of continuing their education have the opportunity to do so. I am confident that the combined efforts of the educational institutions, the States, and the Federal Government will succeed, in solving these immediate problems.\[12\]

The Commission advised Truman to recommend federal scholarships, fellowships, and general aid, and Truman acknowledged their recommendations in his requests to Congress.

Truman's belief that the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 was a success, coupled with its obvious political advantages for him, undoubtedly led him to support the

\[12\] July 13, 1946, Public Papers, p. 344.
Veteran's Readjustment Act of 1952 (P.L. 550) for returning Korean veterans. However, it is ironical that even though Truman did not conceive of either of the "G.I. Bills" as the main type of federal aid needed to help solve the nation's problems in higher education, he did, in fact, rely heavily upon this type of federal aid for higher education during his years in office. Excluding veteran's aid and scholarship aid, Truman's requests for federal aid were not adequate to meet the nation's higher educational needs.

Seldom in his early years as President did Eisenhower speak about the problems of higher education. However, these problems mounted, and in 1956 Eisenhower decided to appoint the Committee on Education Beyond the High School to study and make recommendations to him about problems in higher education. However, Congress refused to provide the very modest funds necessary to implement the basic recommendations of this committee.

With the launching of Sputnik, both Congress and President Eisenhower became much more willing to support federal aid to higher education. The President requested federal aid for scholarships, fellowships, and grants to improve the physical sciences, in particular. Congress, quickly approved the National Defense Act of 1958. It was difficult to determine whether Congress or the President
was the most eager to provide aid to higher education to help meet the new Soviet technological challenge, but it was clearly evident that both were moved to action to provide such aid because of the Soviet threat to national security.

Although both presidents sought federal aid for higher education to enhance national interests, Truman was more interested in the long-term effect federal aid would have upon higher education. His statements indicated his interest in providing equality of educational opportunity for all citizens and in broadening the base of higher education. On the other hand, Eisenhower's support of higher education was generally based on his concern with improving higher education in accordance with the nation's immediate needs. His proposals were designed primarily to provide short-term emergency relief for the nation's scientific needs that could only be provided by higher education.

FINANCING FEDERAL AID

Truman did not often state in his proposals to Congress how he would provide federal funds for education. When he did he was more favorable to "equalization grants" than
he was to "flat grants." However, Truman avoided using the term equalization grants specifically in his proposals to Congress probably because he wanted to avoid the controversy it would arouse between the flat grant and equalization grant advocates.

Even before becoming President of the United States, Eisenhower opposed flat grants as a form of federal aid to education. He distinctly preferred the purchasing of local school district bonds rather than federal grants. With the exception of the National Defense Education Act, federal grants were the kind of federal aid least acceptable to him.

13There are several kinds of federal grants. Two of the most common types are: (1) flat grants, in which a flat sum is distributed among the states in proportion to the number of school age children or a fixed per capita is paid for every school age child in each state, and (2) equalization grants, in which a significantly higher percentage of the funds go to poorer states. There are basically two ways in which federal grants are allocated. (1) matching grants, in which states are required to match a percentage of the amount provided by the federal government, and (2) outright grants, in which no matching requirement is made upon the states.

14The preference for flat or equalization grants reflects the relative wealth or poverty of the state represented; wealthy states favor flat grants, but poor states are for equalization grants because poor states get a much higher percentage of federal aid under the equalization formulas. The Senate and the President usually support equalization grants, and the House usually supports flat grants.
His requests to Congress for aid were usually a combination of federal bond purchases and federal grants.

In 1958 Eisenhower abruptly shifted his requests from the purchase of bonds from local school districts to a request for federal grants. This was due mainly to the fact that his emphasis on federal aid to education was shifted from school construction aid to aid for rather specialized programs; purchasing school bonds was more appropriate for school construction, and federal grants were better suited for specialized programs. But perhaps what allowed him to make this shift was the fact that he conceived of the NDEA program, like school construction aid, as a temporary kind of federal aid designed only to meet the "Sputnik crisis." In his 1959 and 1960 federal aid requests, Eisenhower did in fact return to a form of his earlier school construction aid, except that these requests were based on a long-term plan of 30 or 35 years.

Truman and Eisenhower's public statements on federal aid to education revealed the kind of federal aid to education each president wanted; Truman relied heavily upon general federal aid to the states in federal grants with an equalizing formula implied, whereas Eisenhower favored federal bond purchases and federal loans to the states for school construction. Eisenhower insisted on an equalization formula whenever grants were to be made to the states and also insisted that these grants be matched by the states. Truman
did not specifically often require an equalization formula in his requests for federal aid nor did he always insist that the federal grants be matched by the states. Eisenhower's proposals ran into more difficulty with Congress than Truman's did because of the former's requirements. In fact some critics have claimed that Eisenhower opposed flat grants not so much because federal aid goes to all states but because flat grants were the only politically feasible way to get educational legislation passed.

It can be argued that the main reason why Eisenhower insisted upon the matching and equalization requirements for federal grants was not because of the fairness of these requirements but because they were a means whereby the total cost of federal aid to education could be reduced. It was consistent with Eisenhower's fiscal conservatism and his "lukewarm" support of federal aid to education. Truman did not have similar motives in his educational recommendations.

Of great concern to opponents of federal aid to education has been their belief that such aid would become a permanent and costly federal program. There was no reference to this concern within Truman's public statements in support of federal aid to education. It may have appeared that his requests for aid to relieve the crisis which American education was experiencing in the late 1940's were
directed toward the temporary relief of such conditions, but no statement was made by Truman to indicate that he viewed this as a temporary condition, and, in fact, he predicted that the crisis would become worse in the future without substantial federal aid to education.

Conversely, Eisenhower's statements on federal aid to education revealed a concern about the permanence of such aid. The very fact that he chose to emphasize school construction aid was an indication of this concern. Eisenhower was probably aware that if any form of federal aid to education was likely to remain a temporary form of federal aid, it would be school construction aid.

In most of Eisenhower's proposals to Congress, especially his NDEA proposals, he referred to the need for "temporary" and for "emergency" federal aid. The specialized kinds of programs that were to be provided under this Act, especially federal aid for teachers, must have caused great concern for Eisenhower, for he introduced his NDEA requests in 1958 with heavy emphasis upon "local responsibility for education" and insisted that his NDEA proposals were "a temporary program and should not be considered as a permanent federal responsibility."  

Thus, it may be concluded that one of the basic differences between Presidents Truman and Eisenhower's statements in support of federal aid to education was their position on the cost and the duration of such aid. Eisenhower was opposed to permanent, costly federal aid to education and went to great lengths in his statements to prevent such from occurring. Truman's statements on federal aid to education did not reveal such concern.

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS

An examination of the public statements of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower on federal aid to education revealed that Eisenhower spoke considerably more than Truman about federal aid to education, yet Truman’s terse statements on the subject were often much clearer, more concise, and more positive. Also, Truman was more consistent in his statements, whereas Eisenhower occasionally contradicted his earlier position. While reading their numerous statements on federal aid to education, one had the feeling that Truman had conviction and resolution in his statements but Eisenhower was often reserved and seemed to be vacillating between his realization of the need for such aid and his basic fiscal conservatism.

Both Presidents reacted to the demands of their times: Truman to the crisis in American education in the
late 1940's and to the Korean War; Eisenhower to the continuing poor condition of American education in the 1950's and to the crisis caused by Sputnik. Both supported federal aid to education because they believed that such aid was in the national interest and knew that Congress was more easily convinced to support it on this basis. However, it can be said that their requests for federal aid to education were more a result of the events of their time than they were a result of their own convictions.

Both Presidents purposely avoided the usual controversy that accompanies federal aid to education legislation, but both were occasionally drawn into it. Although Truman showed more skill at avoiding controversy, his legislative proposals seemed to be hindered more by controversy than Eisenhower's were. The controversies surrounding federal aid to education legislation usually occurred in spite of the presidents' attempts to avoid them. Whether these controversies adversely affected educational legislation was usually beyond the control of the presidents.

Both presidents differed in their use of federal aid to education in the political arena. It was very obvious throughout Truman's statements on federal aid to education that he was using this issue as a means to enhance his own political status. By contrast, Eisenhower did not
openly use this issue to advance his own political well-being; in fact he seldom spoke of federal aid to education in a way that was directed at his political betterment.

Another important difference between the two presidents was the type of federal aid each proposed. That Truman wanted general federal aid to education was shown by the fact that his repeated 300 million dollar requests to Congress, although they suggested aid to elementary and secondary schools for teacher and classroom shortages, left the states to decide how the money would be used, as long as it was spent in some general way to improve the schools. Conversely, Eisenhower's requests placed rather strict requirements upon the states to spend the money in specific ways. It seems likely that Truman's support of general federal aid proposals, if passed, would have ultimately been a more permanent and a more costly type of aid than Eisenhower's specific federal aid proposals.

Neither president was an overly enthusiastic supporter of federal aid to education, particularly Eisenhower; nevertheless, their numerous public statements on such aid revealed a vastly increased concern about federal aid to education over that shown by any previous president. They set a precedent for speaking out on such an important issue that has, so far, been continued and greatly expanded by presidents in the 1960's. There is every reason to believe
that future presidents will be required to deal with federal aid to education, at least as much as Presidents Truman and Eisenhower did, and probably considerably more.
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