THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON ..... President and Publisher
BRODIE S. GRIFFITH ..... General Manager
ROBERT H. LAMPEE ..... Advertising Director
CECIL PRINCE ..... Editor
PERRY MORGAN (on leave) ..... Associate Editor
R. L. YOUNG JR. ..... Managing Editor
JAMES MCDOWELL ..... Circulation Manager

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1958

Massive Resistance Has Done Its Work

OFFICIAL Virginia, whose tactic of "massive resistance" has brought it to the threshhold of a long, dreary winter of educational discontent, now gives signs of turning back.

"Massive resistance" has done its work. It has averted desegregation in the public schools of Virginia, but only at dire cost. The mechanism has closed nine white schools in Norfolk, Charlottesville, and Warren County; and 13,000 schoolchildren are out of school.

Gov. Almond and the editors of the Richmond papers have spent the past four years wandering among the ruins and relics and voicing the shibboleths of 100 years ago. At last, they have raised the white flag of recognition that whatever victory Virginia has won is a pyrrhic victory. It is a victory with casualties so heavy that it is no longer tolerable to fight on the same ground.

Such is the harvest of an earnest, but tragically misguided, scheme to turn away federal courts and their law. Such is the harvest of blind, unyielding adherence to a ragged standard against which time, circumstance, legality and, we suspect, the consciences of many troubled Virginians were working.

North Carolina can ill afford to smile in complacent self-satisfaction at the "surrender" of her great but errant neighbor. Yet once again we find evidence that in her effort to travel the narrow strait between defying the Supreme Court and dashing into new and uncharted social territory, North Carolina has been borne out. Once again, as Virginia officialdom suggests that local option, with possibly limited and tolerable desegregation, may be preferable to locking her schools, North Carolina sees the wisdom of its State Supreme Court, declaring that federal law must be upheld, and of pupil assignment and local option.

That Virginia should now contemplate turning to the course upon which North Carolina has traveled for some time makes strange and bitter balderdash of the words with which, just last week, ex-Gov. Tuck of Virginia lacerated North Carolina and her public officials.

Speaking of North Carolina and Tennessee, who had "succumbed to senseless edicts," Tuck said: "Those states have not been blessed with the type of leadership to wage a fight in opposition to 'these federal encroachments, such as we have here in Virginia in the persons of Harry Byrd and Gov. Almond.'"

A blessing? North Carolinians would say, no doubt, a dubious blessing indeed as it becomes uncomfortably plain that Virginia leaders have ignored the best interests of their state, and as they now draw in the bold horns and eat the bold words by which they designed to defy federal law and squander, in so doing, Virginia's public education. And who, in fact, "succumbed to senseless edicts"? Was it North Carolina, which left the crucial choice between desegregation school-closing to localities? Or Virginia, which forced a statewide orthodoxy on its localities?

Virginia rightly cherishes her fine past, the ideals of her fertile tradition, her great dynasties. But perhaps it is time for her to admit that like Lot's wife she has looked back over her shoulder once too often, that perhaps her vibrant energy would be better expended in the battles of 1958 than of 1858. Perhaps it is time for her to cease mistaking arrogance for pride.

Virginia, we fear, has labored under the South's common illusion — that in the complexities of an industrialized society, where rapid migrations are changing every single old balance, all it takes to keep things the same is human muscle and rhetoric. But, of course, things are not going to remain the same, sweet to behold as old times may be. The many impersonal forces of a turbulent economy and social order can't be battered back, nor does one have to be an economic or other determinist to admit it.

No one likes to acknowledge impersonality, nor enjoys hearing the word "inevitability," least of all a folk for whom conservative, agrarian stability has been a way of life from the beginning. Yet to scoff at, to ignore the impersonal forces at work in the South's changing racial order, to seek always a personal and helpless scapegoat to pillory, is to invite chaos. For unless with responsibility and purposefulness we master those forces for good, they will be riding us bareback for generations.

Golden Age Of Essays: Past & Present

IT is one of the ironies of the age that the disappearance of the essay is still being deplored in U. S. literary circles at a time when a collection of essays called ONLY IN AMERICA is a runaway bestseller in every bookstore in the country.

We can only assume that the myopic academicians who persist in wearing black armbands for this "noblest form" haven't cracked a new book since G. K. Chesterton's ALL THINGS CONSIDERED.

Harry Golden undoubtedly deserves credit for a revival of interest in the essay (there are at least a dozen books of essays coming off the press soon largely because ONLY IN AMERICA made it). But the truth is that this country has always had more first-rate essayists than it deserved.

Edmund Wilson is a master of the form and has been doing quite nicely, thank you, for years. E. B. White, essayist *par excellence*, has produced several bestselling collections. Joseph Wood Krutch is much admired for his penetrating contributions to the craft. As are Jacques Barzun, Lewis Mumford, Van Wyck Brooks. It would be a pity to bar the "Americanized" Aldous Huxley from any select list of U. S. essayists merely because of his British beginnings. And there are the humorists, James Thurber and the late Robert Benchley, who sent a shock of vivifying gaiety into this most ancient of all forms of literary expression. The late H. L. Mencken contributed a shock, too, but it was of a different sort. And Gerald Johnson, another sage of Baltimore, has produced some magnificently biting essays of his own. Nor would any salute to 20th century American essayists be complete without at least a nod in the direction of Christopher Morley, Heywood Broun, John Erskine, William James, Donald Culross Peattie, Frank Moore Colby and the Spanish-born George Santayana.

The essay's grand and glorious heritage is too well-known to require documentation here. We need only mention Addison and Steele, Sir Francis Bacon, Charles Lamb, Montaigne, Samuel Johnson, William Hazlitt, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau and, of course, Mr. Chesterton. These old-timers blazed the trail others were to follow.

That a revival of interest in the essay can be attributed to a writer in Charlotte is not as strange as it might seem. Mr. Golden sees the essay primarily as a vehicle for social and political expression. Thus, he reasons, the stimulation for a revival could not logically come from anywhere but the tempestuous, socially sensitive and politically aroused South. "Nor," he adds, "from anywhere but Charlotte, the churning symbol of both the new South and the new American middle class."

That is true. The material for both kindly and critical social commentary is here. But it still requires the services of a craftsman to render it into that elusive form of artistic reflection known as the essay. Harry Golden is that craftsman. He alone among us is carrying on in the great tradition.

From The Manchester Guardian

FATHER OF THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE

"As an independent nation, our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as government. . . . Great Britain, . . . whose language we speak, should no longer be our standard; for the taste of her writers is already corrupted, and her language on the decline."

NOAH WEBSTER, the American lexicographer, who was born just 200 years ago probably did more than any other American, Franklin included, to establish this emancipation of American from English as an independent but "friendly" language which he demanded in his "Dissertation on the English Language." In England to this day there are still people who find this hard to accept; quavering pedants in Dorset and Dymchurch still write crochety letters to the editor about the assassination of our language by the dastardly colonials. And at the time Webster provoked plenty of opposition from Anglophile New Englanders. Perhaps some of this was due to his own prickly, dogmatic disposition. (H. L. Mencken says he was "a pedantic and rather choleric fellow," and quoted a contemporary who called him "the critic and coxcomb-general of the United States.") But probably more of Webster's critics were moved by irrational instincts similar to those of the English visitor who argued with him in 1828. "If a word becomes universally current in America, where English is spoken, why should it not take its station in the language?" asked Webster reasonably enough. "Because," said the Englishman, "there are words enough already."

But Webster certainly won his case, or most of it, with the American people. His first great work, the GRAMMATICAL INSTITUTE—a spelling book, grammar and reader in three parts—OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, which came out nearly 30 years after Dr. Johnson's dictionary, was selling at the rate of a million copies a year by 1861 and by 1890, 60 million copies of the spelling book had been bought. He was responsible for most of the major spelling reforms in the American language—the English are belatedly catching up with some of them now—though some of the more radical phonetic renderings he suggested have yet to be accepted.

Communists Though Formidable, Aren't Ten Feet Tall

By WALTER LIPPMANN

(Last In A Series)

WASHINGTON

IN SATURDAY'S article I argued that to make an effective reply to the expansion of communism in Asia and Africa, it would be necessary to make a demonstration in a large country—preferably in India—that there is another way to overcome mass poverty and national weakness. Unless this demonstration can be made, there is every prospect that the masses of Asia will rally to communism, either of the Soviet or of the Chinese type.

The old industrial countries of western Europe and of North America do not provide an example which the great, crowded, submerged masses could imitate. They might like to be as rich as we are but they know that this is impossible within any near future, within their own lifetime. Only in Russia and in China do they find a model of how in backward countries great masses of people can raise themselves quickly by their own bootstraps.

But we must not exaggerate. We must not jump to the conclusion that the communist movement is destined to expand until it has conquered the whole world. There are, of course, many on both sides of the iron curtain who think that this will happen. I talked to some communists in Moscow — Mr. K. was not one of them—who said, in effect, that this is one world and that communism is bound to rule it. And there are, as we know, people on our side of the iron curtain who are filled with the deepest anxiety that western Europe will be strangled and will perish if it can no longer command, not merely buy, the oil and other natural products of the old colonial territories.

Both of these views are extreme and each is, I believe, derived from the same very human and common fallacy. It is the fallacy of assuming that this is one world and that the social order to which one belongs must either perish or become the universal order of mankind. But looking at the history of the globe, the truth, as I see it, is that there has never been one world, that there has never been a universal state or a universal religion.

The failure to recognize this truth that there are many worlds, not merely one, is, I believe, the deepest source of confusion between us, and the most stubborn obstacle to that mutual toleration, which is the very best that is conceivable between our two societies.

LENINISTS

The orthodox Leninist, whether he is a true believer or merely a conformist, thinks that he knows the scheme of history. According to this scheme the capitalistic world is bound to fight the communist revolution unless the communist parties capture the western governments. His opposite number on our side is one who thinks also that he knows the true scheme of history. In his philosophy, the line of all human progress is the line that we have taken in the West. The communist revolution is, therefore, a relapse and a diversion from that true line of progress. It follows that the Russians and the Chinese are bound to return to our line in the course of time.

All of this is, I feel sure, a misreading of the reality of things. The communist revolution which began in Russia and has spread to China is not a repetition of the English and the French Revolutions. It is a new historical phenomenon which comes out of a convulsive awakening of the submerged masses demanding a better life for themselves. The dictators who lead this massive uprising rule the people despotically. But he would be a rash man, I think, who would say that such great masses of backward people could be persuaded by democratic methods to accept the discipline and to make the sacrifices which are necessary to the rapid formation of capital in a primitive economy.

REVOLUTION

To a westerner the character of this revolution of the submerged masses is a terrible thing to contemplate. But the more he sees of it, the more he must feel, so it seemed to me, that while the communist system is acceptable in the backward countries, it is not likely to spread to the more advanced countries except insofar as it is imposed by force. The Soviet system does not work, and there is no reason to think that it will work, in eastern Europe. I feel sure that the Soviet domination of East Germany, of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary is precarious and impermanent. Moreover, I think that the rulers of Russia know this and that, if they could think, which they have not, of any safe way to disengage, they would eventually accept some such settlement. They are drawn towards Asia and away from Europe and the general posture of Moscow, as distinct perhaps from Leningrad, is to be turned towards Asia. Moscow is full of delegations of Asian peoples — many from the outlying parts of the Soviet Union itself, a great many from mainland China, many from South Asia and from the Moslem world.

Khrushchev: Will He Rule The World?

This gives to Moscow the air of being the capital of a new order of things among the emerging peoples of Asia.

I conclude with the feeling that, barring a great catastrophe resulting from a war, the communist system has no serious attraction for the highly developed western countries, and that as an experience and an example, it is, in fact, irrelevant to them. Provided we maintain the balance of deterrent power, I feel confident that there is no military threat to the United States nor, unless something very stupid or desperate or reckless is done, to our principal allies in Europe.

The communist revolution will, I think, expand in Asia unless we make an heroic effort of statesmanship to demonstrate that there is an alternative to it. But what we may describe as the communist conquest of eastern Europe — as distinguished from communist expansion in Asia — is not stabilized and is not likely to be conclusive.

If I am right in this summing-up, what the doctor would order for our people is that they relax their fears in order to fortify and clarify their purposes. We have to live on the same globe with the communist powers. But we do not live and we cannot live in the same intellectual and political world. Not now. Not in the foreseeable future. But formidable as the communists are, they are not ten feet tall, and the less we plunge ourselves into hysterics, the more likely we are to take good care of our affairs.

People's Platform — Parents Become Victims Of New 'Philosophy'

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

THIS is a note of appreciation of Vivian Brown's article in your Nov. 5 issue, bearing the headline, "Modern Parents Face Strange Values With Kids." The article describes a teen-ager — 17 years of age! — who condemns her parents who cannot give her as much as they had, after the father lost his job and the mother had to go back to her old job.

The article observes that "the new theory is that the parents' job is to keep their children happy and amused at all cost." Put simply as it is, the statement nonetheless is a profound philosophical analysis of what has become a fundamental law of education in homes and schools. In accordance with this principle of "just keep the child happy," there is no longer the approach to behavior through the principle of "what is right." Similarly, in respect to learning in the schools, there is no longer the approach of inquiring, "What has the child learned?" There has instead proliferated a host of scientific sounding "technics" which are designed to make the child happy. You find out what the child likes, and that's what it does. A parent will say with ill - concealed pride, "My child doesn't do well and doesn't work in this or that subject because he doesn't like it." This is supposed to show a rich individuality and excuses failure. Another stock formula is, "I don't want to force my child." It is this philosophy which underlies the systematic diminution of stress on actual learning, which is the raison d'etre of the schools. The nation only recently has begun to worry about this.

At this point it may appear that I am against making children happy. The fact is, however, that the child in school who is not achieving in learning, is not, in any real sense, happy; no more than is the teen-ager happy who has so long been accustomed to being made "happy" by her parents that, faced with a new difficult situation, she cannot find happiness, as noted in the article, by helping financially, by helping with the household chores, by enjoying the mother's "surprise of seeing the dinner on the table when she comes home from work."

Now, of all this, the point is that it is not that parents are faced with "strange values with kids," but that they themselves have been made victims of the "new" philosophy — in the name of a pseudo-scientific "psychology" — as a basis for rearing children, rather than remembering that behavior is a moral matter. The moral principle of behavior is clean-cut in approach: You analyze a problem that arises—which is a rational, not an emotional, process—and the decision is made as to what is the right thing to do. It is from living in this way that happiness is found. To make the basic approach to problems in terms of being happy, brings not happiness at all, but a constant dissatisfaction coming from the creation of a bottomless desire, or from the lack of opportunity of meeting problems of reality and overcoming them.

Nor is this "happiness" principle a new one. It is none other than the newest expression of the ancient Greek pagan philosophy of hedonism, which is a denial of religion and morality which are the only means of securing happiness, if happiness means anything at all.

— MATTHEW SCHWARZ

Prodigal Father

Court The Tool Of Bar Association

Charlotte

Editors, The News:

I SEE by the papers that the bar association is soliciting suggestions and criticism from the public. This is a long step forward from the time only a few years when I pioneered the current controversy with letters to the editor, and for which the bar then hounded me with some extremely expensive malicious prosecution for which my family and myself will pay the rest of our lives. Too many editors and others are approaching this problem with a superficial knowledge of its significance. I am reminded of the verse from "Mademoiselle from Armentieres":

"The general gave him the croix de guerre
And the son of a gun was never there."

We need to hear more from the guys who were there, like myself. Since the bar is asking for advice, here goes my two cents worth on appointment of judges.

Appointment of judges is not enough — we should not only appoint them, but guarantee their financial security as long as they live. How else can a judge be in a position to administer equal justice under law? Election or no election, judges are chosen by the bar association. In every move the judge makes — everything he says or does — his job is at stake, at the mercy of the very same fellows who are practicing law before him. The judge, knowing this, has to look to the future: his term of office is limited and the tenure shaky. He will be practicing law again some day. Consequently he must play ball on the bench so he can get back in the ball game from the dugout. Consequently, there is no superior court judge in the state with the courage to take notice of the many injustices inflicted in his own court with his knowledge by the members of the bar on whom he must depend to transact the court business, and who hold his job in the palms of their hands.

The court, in order to serve the public, must be an independent institution, and the balance of power should be with the court, not with the bar. Under the present custom, with the bar in control, it is remarkable that any justice at all is administered.

The Bell Committee had this plank — appointment of judges — in its platform. However, some hair-brained editors started a hue and cry that this would be un-American, and the Bell Committee got scared and dropped it like a hot potato. Appointment of judges is the most progressive piece of legislation since the Federal Reserve Bank system. The Bell Committee's unwillingness to back up their own platform indicates that we are sending a couple of Western Union messenger boys out to pick up John Dillinger, or that the committee was only dragging a red herring in the first place.

A weak judiciary is the curse of our present court system. The court is a political tool of the bar association. Appointment for life, with guaranteed financial security, is the only way to insure a strong judiciary and clean court system, with equal justice under law.

—JOHN C. BENNETT

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round — Ike Bagged The Limit In 90 Minutes

WASHINGTON

A LOT of duck-shooters, who have often shivered all day in the blinds waiting to bag a couple of ducks, wondered with jealous envy how the President was able to bag the day's legal limit near Toledo in only 90 minutes.

They suspected that the blinds were baited, which is against the law. Hunters were especially suspicious because they remembered the furor kicked up by Sen. John Bricker of Ohio when some of his friends were arrested in the same area for baiting the blinds. Baiting duck blinds consists of scattering grain on the water outside of a blind in order to attract the ducks, and in 1955 U. S. Judge Ralph V. Freeman gave one of the stiffest duck sentences in history to one of Bricker's friends, Maurice Kocher of Toledo, for baiting blinds. Kocher got a $500 fine, a six months suspended sentence, and two years on probation.

It was largely as a result of Bricker's objection to the migratory game treaty with Canada that he introduced the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would have overridden the President's power to make treaties without the approval of the 48 states. Bricker wanted Ohio to have its own duck treaty with Canada.

So the spot where Ike bagged his legal limit in such a short time is one of the most controversial duck areas in the U.S. Hence the suspicions.

No Bait Used

However, this column has checked into the facts and is convinced that the related no rules or laws that so duck blinds were baited. What the Toledo Cedar Point Club did, however, was to bar all hunters from the best marshes for about a week before the President shot. Thus the ducks got accustomed to feeding there. This was why Ike was able to bag the limit in 90 minutes on Friday, and in two hours and 15 minutes the next Saturday morning.

Battle To Watch

The most dramatic moment of the Chicago 1952 Republican convention which nominated Eisenhower for president was a speech by Sen. Everett Dirksen, the Illinois Republican, blasting Gov. Tom Dewey, two-time GOP nominee for president.

"Do not take us down the trail of destruction again," proclaimed the stentorian senator from Illinois in urging that Republicans not follow Dewey's lead and nominate Eisenhower.

Wheel Swings Around

Six years have passed, and the political wheel of fate has swung around to point the finger once again on hulking Sen. Dirksen and the diminutive Tom Dewey. This time Dirksen seeks to become Republican leader of the Senate, replacing Bill Knowland of California. This time Dewey, retired from public office but still active behind the scenes, may have the power to block him.

Dewey now has four of his own senators in the U. S. Senate. And they are leading the backstage move to defeat Dirksen as Senate GOP leader. The four in the Dewey stable are: Jacob Javits of New York and Ken Keating, the newly elected Republican from New York; Clifford Case of New Jersey and Hugh Scott, newly elected from Philadelphia and onetime campaign manager for Dewey.

Deeper Battle

The battle against Dirksen, however, goes much deeper than any feud with Dewey. It goes to the basic question of whether the Republican Party will, under Rockefeller, be liberal or conservative, cling to the old Taft crowd or with the old Teddy Roosevelt wing.