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When I was asked to meet with you, I was advised that at the conclusion of my remarks on education and foreign relations, you would divide into panels. I understand that in these panels you will be considering problems of family relations, class-room relations and community relations.

If the procedure were reversed, that is, if you met on these problems first and listened to me afterwards, my task would be easier. In that case, I would simply take the conclusions of your group discussions, compound them in complexity several times and add a few ingredients unique to the international scene. The result would be an exposition of the nation's problems of foreign relations and the part education can play in solving them.

This is not as facetious as it may sound. In many ways, foreign relations are a magnification of the human relations which we know on a smaller and more personal scale. In many ways, they are an extension of the problems of these more limited and intimate relations into the vast and impersonal arena of the globe where nations meet, get along together, compete with one another and sometimes, unfortunately, clash.

Whether your conference begins or ends on the theme of foreign relations,
I am glad nevertheless that you have seen fit to make a place for this subject on your program. It is one which is highly important to you as teachers even as it is to me as a Senator. In this matter as in many others, there is a close association of function between educators and legislators. Your principal job is to help Americans to develop their potentialities within the framework of a civilized society. A principal function of a Senator is to help to preserve and enlarge the framework of the civilized society in which Americans develop their potentialities. The more successful you are at your job the more practicable mine becomes. Conversely, the better I handle mine, the more yours should be facilitated. Educators and legislators, in short, go together. They have a mutual concern both in the calibre of tomorrow's citizens and in the kind of nation and world in which they live.

I need hardly tell you ladies and gentlemen that the responsibilities of educators in this connection have grown at a rapid rate particularly in the last half century. Education has become increasingly complex in the past fifty years because human society has become increasingly complex.

The same thing has happened in the Congress of the United States. Fifty years ago, a Senator's concern was confined largely to state problems and the national issues of great importance which from time to time affected the interests of the state. Rarely, however, did international questions impinge directly on these interests.

In those days, the scope of a Senator's concern did not as a rule extend beyond the nation's borders. In a similar fashion, the responsibilities of
American educators were largely confined within the same area. Education prepared people for life in an environment that consisted almost exclusively of the locality and the state and to some extent the nation. Other than a relative handful of businessmen and intrepid missionaries and travelers, few of our citizens went abroad. Those that did, went largely to Europe. Few Americans were aware of developments across the oceans and few were seriously influenced or affected by these developments.

These circumstances have changed and changed drastically. All of us in this country are now touched by what happens abroad, whether we realize it or not, whether we want to or not. Sometimes we feel the impact directly and promptly as when a market overseas is closed to our products or when a particular line of business is adversely affected by imports, as is the case now in the or when we cannot get essential products fields of lead and zinc and soon, perhaps, in copper as well, from abroad. Sometimes the effect is indirect but nonetheless real, as when tax rates are high in order to provide for defense in the event of a partial or complete breakdown in international relations. Finally, since 1945 all of us have lived under the shadow of possible nuclear war. There is not a person, a nation, or any part of the globe that is safe from this threat to civilization itself. This is the overriding shadow of our time.

What has happened, in short, is that a new complexity has been added to the framework of the life of the citizens of the United States. To do their job competently and fully, legislators must now give a substantial part of their time
to the problems and possibilities which arise out of this new complexity, out of the vast increase in foreign contact. Local, state and national matters cannot be neglected but neither can those by which the nation is related to the rest of the world.

You will see immediately, I am sure, the parallel between the position of the educator and the legislator in this connection. If we in Congress must be prepared to deal continuously and in depth with this new dimension of civilized life, educators carry a similar responsibility. It is no longer sufficient for you to help human beings to develop their capacities for life in the society of 50 years ago or even 20 years ago. If Americans are to meet the challenge of survival and development, they must be prepared to meet it in the environment in which they live today. It is an environment in which the rest of the world plays no small part, an environment in which other countries exert a real and substantial, if not always perceptible, impact on every man, woman and child in the United States.

It is an environment in which, for purposes of government, business, education, religion and pleasure we are being brought into ever-increasing contact with the peoples of other lands. Last year, for example, about a million and a half Americans went abroad, exclusive of military personnel. This year foreign travel is likely to rise to a new peak. We are, in this world in which we live, neighbors, one with another.

One effect on education of the new dimension in contemporary life is readily apparent. We need and we need promptly, an increase in the technical
skills that are essential to carry on international relations. We need linguists, not only in the traditional French, Spanish and German but in a host of other languages - the languages of the Middle East, Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa. We need men and women trained in the intricacies of international business. We need social scientists who are especially skilled in international problems. We need, men and women who, regardless of their specializations - whether they be in medicine, agriculture, mining, electronics or some other - are prepared to live and work in foreign lands.

Specialists are essential if the nation is to survive, grow and prosper in the world of the 20th Century. They will help to steer us through the complexities of the new dimension of modern life. They will facilitate the conduct of the international relations. Alone, however, they are not enough.

The responsibilities of educators, therefore, do not end with the training of technicians. We need something more. We need something more if we are to maintain, in this new complex environment, the human freedom and the human decency which are at once the heritage and the inspiration of this nation. Educators must supply to a whole people an awareness of the kind of world in which we live. They must make clear to an entire nation the limitations as well as the potentialities of that world, its great dangers as well as its infinite promise. They must help the people of the United States in the difficult task of relating their interests and the nation's interests to the international environment in which we now find ourselves.

Democracy can provide the machinery for safeguarding the nation in free-
The machinery will run effectively, however, only if those who operate it - the government - and those who control it - the people of the United States - understand the changed setting in which it must function.

The principal changes which confront this generation arise from three sources. The first is the technological revolution which has brought all nations into instantaneous communication and intimate contact with one another. We cannot close our ears to the sound of jet planes and rockets overhead; we cannot close our eyes to the mushroom cloud of nuclear explosions. These changes are there and they will not go away. They must be faced, both for their potential good and their potential evil.

The recent announcement by the Soviet Union - and the proof - that it has developed the earth satellite, or the sputnik, should give the United States especially and the free world in general - the opportunity to take sober stock of its position. The satellite plus the ICBM should prove to the American people that the Soviet Union has not only kept up with the United States in these and related scientific fields but has, in fact, exceeded us in some. We can no longer brush off the Soviet announcements as figments of its imagination but instead we must face up to the facts of life. We must recognize as a fact, and this should be of great interest to you teachers of science attending this Convention, that the Soviet Union two years ago graduated 50,000 scientists and engineers and 50,000 sub-scientists and sub-engineers, whereas, in our own country the total graduate output in scientists and engineers was 28,000. Furthermore, the curve for the Soviet Union in the years ahead is up; for the United States, it is down.

While the Soviet development of the ICBM and earth satellite is only a
segment of the vast area of science and technology, it compels us to revamp our political sights and above all, to come alive to future relations between government and education in the sciences. It may be well that the mirage of the lack of scientific knowledge and technical know-how in the Soviet Union -- the universal assumption on our part that in all things scientific we are superior to the Soviet Union - it may be well that these myths have now been dissipated.

This is not the time to become panicky or hysterical on the one hand nor is it the time for the President to state, as he did in a recent press conference, that "there was not one more iota for reason of concern over national security" as a result of the latest Soviet developments. This is not the time to state for political or other reasons that we could have launched a satellite, that we could have developed a missile, or that we could have done this, that or the other thing. In recognizing that there is cause for grave concern, it would be imprudent not to assess the present weakness - and disastrous were we not to project a course for the future.

As for the immediate problem, even if the U.S. satellite program is going according to plan, it is evident that in this program as well as the IRBM and ICBM programs we are lagging behind the Soviet Union. It is evident that there has been some mismanagement. The question is whether the missile program should go ahead under a centralized organization or, as is still the case, under each separate service. There are arguments on both sides but I think the idea of unification and centralization is by far the better choice. Because of -- or in spite of -- the past interservice rivalry there have been some accomplishments, but in my opinion it would appear there has been a great deal more.
waste.

While there has been too much complacency on the part of the American people, the Congress, and the Administration, the primary responsibility lies with the Administration. It seems to have been more careful in screening the budget than in screening our security needs. While a balanced budget is highly desirable; it is more desirable that the security of this nation be maintained. We must begin to do away with the overlapping, the duplication, the inefficiency, and the waste inherent in the intense interservice rivalry in the missile field.

It is time to consolidate these different attempts into one centralized agency to which would be attached the best scientists from the services and civilian life. The consolidation thus achieved would allow for a very respectable budget of 1.651 billion dollars within the $38 billion limitation consistently laid down by the Administration. It is time, in my opinion, to take the Werner VonBraun team of Redstone Arsenal and put it up where it belongs in the rocket field. At the present time it and the Army are at the bottom of the missile totem pole despite the fact that the only real advance in the missile field - the Redstone - was developed by them.

But whatever the short term needs, the long-term hope lies first in restoring freedom in the field of science and secondly, in creating certain government instrumentalities to support educators in developing scientists.

In this connection I would most respectfully suggest the following:

1) That a Secretary for Research and Development be named with full cabinet status to assume direct control in all fields of outer space.
2) That the Administration draw up plans and procedures for a subsidization by the Government of students beginning in the Sophomore year of High School, who show an aptitude in the fields of science and engineering so that it will be possible for them to finish their education through college and, if especially qualified, into the graduate field. In return such persons on graduation would work for the government for from 5 to 7 years in the armed services or in fields connected with our national security. As I indicated earlier, the latest figures I have going back 2 years indicate that the Soviet Union in one year graduated 50,000 scientists and engineers; 50,000 sub-scientists and sub-engineers, while the United States in that same year graduated only 28,000 scientists and engineers. Furthermore, on the basis of all possible conclusions the rate of increase in the Soviet Union is accelerating while in the United States it is declining. I know that there are some people who will call such a proposal socialism. I call it survival.

3) That the National Science Foundation should be expanded and given sufficient funds so that it would be possible for it to aid more scientists and engineers and thereby overcome, to a degree, our deficiency in those fields.

4) That joint action in research and development be undertaken by U.S. and Euratom scientists in the fields of thermonuclear energy and outer space. We have no monopoly on scientific brains. Together, we and the scientists of Western Europe can accomplish much more, in our common interests, rather than in a continuation of the hit and miss, uncoordinated activities of the past or the present.

If we consolidate and centralize the divergent elements working in the missile field, if we will give proper recognition through the creation of a Cabinet Secretary in the field of science, if we will enlarge and expand the National Science Foundation, if we will engage in joint action with Euratom's scientists, and if we will undertake a sound program in the subsidization of specially qualified students beginning in the Sophomore year of High School, then I think we will be on the road to accomplishing in the near future what we might have accomplished in the immediate past had such suggestions as the above been carried out.
The need is not for a special session of Congress nor is it for an investigation of the missile program. The need is to conduct with deliberate speed Committee hearings which, I hope, will soon be underway. Such hearings, insofar as would be consistent with our security, should be open to the public. This is not the time to draw a curtain around the American people - this is the time to tell them the truth. The American people are old enough, mature enough, and intelligent enough to recognize facts for what they are; and they are ready, able and willing to pay the price and make the sacrifices these facts may entail.

We have come a long way on easy street but it is now time to start traversing the hard road of reality. This first great change confronting our generation -- the technological revolution -- poses challenges which American educators, the Congress, the Administration and indeed, the entire American people must meet -- whether viewed in terms of survival or in terms of positive leadership.
The second great source of change arises in the revolutions or evolutions in the former colonial areas of Asia and Africa. In these regions new countries have come into being in recent years, and more are destined to achieve independence in the future. I have visited many of these countries. In them, new ideas are being grafted on old civilizations. No one can say with certainty what these grafts will yield in the years ahead. One thing is clear, however, they have already produced a new force in international life. It is a force that is likely to grow in the decades ahead. It is certain to have a significant impact on the political, economic and social nature of the world in which we live.

The third source of change is the direct conflict between totalitarianism and freedom for the ideological adherence of mankind. This conflict has existed in one form or another for a long time. The technology of our times, however, has given it an unprecedented intensity. As the most powerful of the nations
dedicated to freedom we cannot evade the conflict. We are the natural and primary focus of totalitarian enmity. At the same time, we are a principal source of the strength of freedom in the world.

What are the implications of these great changes for the United States? It seems to me that they add up to this: We can no longer take freedom for granted. We cannot even take survival for granted.

These implications suggest the tasks that lie ahead for the government, for all the citizens of the United States. We must seek to bring under control the destructive potentialities of modern technology while we give every encouragement to its constructive aspects. We must work out a whole series of new relationships with the nations of Asia and Africa which will encourage them to move forward with us and other free nations to new heights of human achievement, rather than to slide back into totalitarianism or colonialism under new labels. We must, finally, as each generation must, pledge ourselves anew to freedom and rededicate ourselves to its survival and growth.

I believe you will readily see your role in meeting these new national needs. As educators you will seek out youth with special aptitudes for the technical tasks of international relations and develop these aptitudes into the skills which the nation must have in the decades ahead. It is your responsibility, moreover, to transmit an understanding of the world - not as it was in the past or as we might like it to be - but as it is. It is your responsibility to delineate accurately the position of the United States in that world. It is your responsibility to provide an understanding of the problems as well as the potentialities of inter-
national relations. Only with that kind of an understanding can people of the United States exercise the controls of democracy over their government in these questions.

Having been a teacher, I believe I can say that teachers are not superhuman even though they are frequently called upon to perform superhuman feats. In providing education in foreign relations, your capacity to do so will be governed in major part by your own training and experience. You already have more of both in these matters than most citizens. However, is it enough? It seems to me that a great need will exist in the years to come to open far greater opportunities than now exist to permit teachers to improve their knowledge of foreign relations, and their direct contact with its many ramifications. It is essential, for example, that you know by direct contact as much as possible of the world about which you are expected to teach. You, like your students, should always ask questions; you, like your students must always try to find answers.

The Fulbright, the Smith-Mundt and other exchange programs have helped to provide opportunities for teachers to enlarge their knowledge in this respect. They have made a great contribution even though the emphasis in the administration of these programs has been somewhat one-sided. We have brought many educators and other leaders to the United States to see this country as it is and to study our methods. We have not sent nearly as many American teachers and leaders abroad. Yet, there is as much need for our educators to see the world and study its peoples as for the converse. Programs of this
nature are, in my opinion, one of the best methods to understand people and, in understanding people, you will be more able to understand nations.

The service which the Fulbright and other exchange programs have performed is one which will grow in importance in the years ahead. As it grows, moreover, it is one which can be made to serve more fully the needs of education in this country.

I do not need to urge, in conclusion, that you keep in mind this broad question of foreign relations as you consider the other types of relationships with which you are concerned at this conference. I believe you are aware of the influence which education can exercise over the manner in which a free government conducts these relations. I want to say only this to you. You hold a responsibility in foreign relations second to none. It involves the entire future of the nation. It involves the freedom, the civilized survival of the generations which will inherit the land. Exercise that responsibility fully and well because on you and your influence with your students may well rest the future of our country and the free world. I know as one of you, that our state and our nation is in good and dependable hands.