

School Articles Raise Big Questions

REPORTER Lucien Agniet's articles on this page last week, objective though they were, raised serious questions about the public schools of North Carolina.

From professors at the University of North Carolina, Mr. Agniet learned that graduates of high schools in this state are sadly deficient in such basic subjects as English and math.

He found that the teacher shortage is serious and growing worse despite salary increases since World War II.

He heard sharp criticism of the rigid and authoritarian certification system as one reason why talented young people are turning to other fields.

And he was told that a relatively small group of people "call the tunes" in education in North Carolina, and that they keep a tight control over the philosophy, the systems and the mechanics of education.

From officials of the State Department of Public Education, he received an equally strong defense of the system of producing trained teachers, and of the "sociological function" of modern education.

In sum, he discovered that public

school officials and university authorities are poles apart in their estimate of public education. And in his final article, he listed some of the many points of divergence of opinion.

Public education is the biggest, and the most important function of government in North Carolina. Yet many of its philosophical assumptions, its techniques and its methods have been permitted to develop "in a vacuum of public disinterest," as The Professor put it.

This newspaper doesn't profess to have any answers to the questions raised by Mr. Agniet. It is acutely aware, however, that these and other questions are being asked with greater frequency and with greater persistence by thoughtful persons all over the country.

From time to time, *THE NEWS* will examine, in closer detail, the problems that a fast-growing and fast-changing society has saddled upon the public schools, in the hope that there will be a new awakening of public interest in free and democratic education.

Meanwhile, if there are parents and teachers in this area who have ideas and opinions on the subject, we'd like to hear from them.

Recreation Survey Is The First Step

COUNTY Commissioner John White's proposal for a countywide recreation commission underscores the need for more adequate information on the subject.

On the face of it, the proposal looks good. The rapid urbanization of Mecklenburg County makes it imperative that recreational facilities for the future be planned now, so that they can be supervised. And it would be foolish indeed to create a separate park and recreation commission for the county area alone.

Yet how would the financing be handled if Mr. White's plan were suddenly adopted? What allowance would be made for the county's heavy investment, from bond funds and tax levies, in its extensive, though inadequate, recreation system? And how would the new coliseum and auditorium, which will cost some four million dollars, fit into the scheme?

What kind of facilities would be desirable? And where? What type of program does Mecklenburg really need?

What are the leadership requirements? What administrative setup would function most smoothly? How much training and what kind of training should recreation personnel have? And what about the inter-relationship of the private agencies and public functions?

These are just some of the questions that the people of Charlotte and Mecklenburg would want answered before they could be expected to support the abolition of the city Park & Recreation Commission and the establishment of a countywide program.

And those are precisely the questions that the County Recreation Committee of United Community Services had in mind when it controlled from Moscow, the county governments for \$5,000 each, plus \$2,000 from United Appeal, to pay for an adequate survey done by experts in the field.

At their meeting last week, the county commissioners delayed action on the request. They should act upon it today, and favorably.

Logic -- The Georgia Wool Hat Variety

ONE REASON the state of Georgia is sometimes credited with "wool hat" mentality is, as we've noted before, its official sponsorship of THE GEORGIA FARMER'S MARKET BULLETIN. About a quarter of a million copies are distributed free, weekly. The front-page editorials, written by Commissioner of Agriculture Tom Linde, usually deal with the race question, communism, international affairs. They are frequently inflammatory and often based on untruths.

Now we would not tell the citizens of the sovereign state of Georgia what to do with their official agriculture department publication. But we do have a suggestion, for which no charge is made, as to how THE BULLETIN can serve a useful purpose. The suggestion: Use it in college logic classes.

The Feb. 17 issue would be a logician's delight. It leads off with the banner headline: "A Communist Is An Internationalist—An Internationalist Is A Com-

munist." Why? Because, as the lead says, "Basically, the Communists work for one world, controlled from Moscow. Basically, the internationalists work for one world, controlled from the traitors' headquarters of the United Nations."

That argument, provided you accept the faulty second premise, is like saying a Democrat is a Republican, and a Republican is a Democrat, because Democrats and Republicans are both against communism, or for mother and the home, or what have you.

There's another dilly in the March 10 issue:

"The Jews are opposed to racial prejudice, and the Gentiles are opposed to racial prejudice. The Catholics . . . Protestants . . . blacks . . . and Democrats . . . Republicans are against it. The North is against it and the South is against it."

"Since everyone is against racial prejudice, how can there be any?" Oh, come now, commissioner.

From The Christian Science Monitor

TICKET TO TEACH

WE WOULD NOT condone, of course, the methods by which the New Hampshire University "bogus professor" secured his appointment. And we could do no other than express sympathy for that university, four other colleges, and the American Physical Society, all of whom were "taken in" by his cleverly prepared "credentials." But the whole affair raises a question for American higher education which will be recognized by many sincere educators as disturbing.

Is it not true that Marvin Hewitt, alias "Dr. Kenneth P. Yates," had he not employed subterfuge, would have found no post open to him on the faculty of any respectable college or high school, for that matter—although his associates at New Hampshire and the president of the University of Chicago are quoted as calling him a brilliant physicist?

Why? Reason one, because he could claim no college degrees. Second, as an able economist (who himself owns a well-earned doctorate) once put it, he carries no "union card"—no letters, Ph. D. And third, because he could offer no evidence of "productive scholarship"—to be concrete, he hasn't written a book. Whether he still might be a sound scholar, colleges generally would have no other way of discovering. Whether or not he was a gifted teacher, we regret to observe, few would trouble to ask.

There isn't the slightest doubt that American colleges and universities want on their faculties men and women who at once are sound scholars, productive scholars, and able teachers. And there is no denying that under the mass-production conditions which the American drive for "college" has forced upon the institutions of higher learning some nationally accepted standard for faculty qualifications as well as student "accreditation" has long been essential.

But a system, a formula, once it becomes established, can so easily begin to function as a self-enforcing substitute for selective judgments. Mr. Hewitt, on ethical grounds, should have been dismissed. But it would be well to reflect that on grounds of current academic specifications alone a good many notables from Socrates and Pythagoras down through Franklin and Edison would find it hard to qualify.

If the new GOP tax bill makes as many changes in tax law as the news stories indicate, it ought to be called the FEFTA bill—Full Employment For Tax Authorities.

We're not quite sure Drew Pearson is on solid ground in hinting that Republicans are responsible for the increase in liquor consumption in Washington last year. Maybe the Democrats are still trying to drown their sorrows.

'Anything Definite Yet?'



Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The news reserves the right to condense.

Ritch Will Get His Support

Charlotte
Editors, The News: LIKE THE NEWS, I am happy in that Recorder Sedberry is in the race. Congress to me is a high and honored place and should be handled to no man on a silver platter.

However, the kingmakers who pushed Judge Sedberry into the race at the minute did not reckon on the filing of Marvin Ritch for this office. It is literally infuriated them that he should muddy the congressional waters, and they have almost hanged him in effigy for doing this unpardonable thing.

Mr. Ritch only filed after the kingmakers had descended in vain on a number of likely prospects. I am going to support him. Also supporting him are literally thousands of people who know him as a kind, considerate and helpful person to his fellow workers. Should Mr. Sedberry win the nomination with the powerful support tendered him, I will gladly do all that I can to help him redeem the district.

But, Mr. Editor, in the interest of fair play, if nothing else, please don't degrade one candidate and praise another on the editorial pages of your paper.

—MERCEUR J. BLANKENSHIP

Stories Will Help Handicapped Kids

Charlotte
Editors, The News: ON behalf of the parents of the exceptional children, I would like to express appreciation for the articles in your paper concerning Charlotte's handicapped children and what is being done for them.

We are especially grateful that you see fit to protect their identity. The articles may help the plight of these children. So it is beneficial to publish them. Thanks and keep it up.

—A GRATEFUL PARENT

Critic Has His Day In Court

Monroe
Editors, The News: WHEN your C. A. McNight spoke to the Mooreville Rotary Club on the subject of fraudulent charges, he voiced the opinion that the treatment of controversial topics calls for "sane, well rounded, capable judgment."

The arguments so far have been conducted with dignity and deference. There have been no heated exchanges. But the point has been reached where Ridgway, hero of Korea and former chief of NATO, will either have to yield or resign.

It was to give diplomatic support to Gen. Ridgway that Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave his Senate testimony last

week that the "new look" and push-button warfare will not be the only military answer.

"I believe this nation could be a prisoner of its own military posture," Radford testified. "If it had no capital other than to deliver a massive attack."

Radford, who has argued against too drastic curtailment of his carrier program and doesn't favor putting too many ships in mothballs, personally sympathizes with Ridgway. However, he had a long talk with him last week, after which Ridgway declared: "I will answer only to my own conscience."

First became known when Ridgway opposed Army cuts when he was called upon from attending the National Security Council meeting at which the cuts were finally to be decided. "Previous engagement" was Ridgway's excuse. In the end, Secretary of Defense Wilson ordered him to attend.

At this meeting Ridgway reluctantly agreed to the cuts, and his colleagues on the staff now plead that, since he once agreed, he must go through with the agreement. However, he is sticking to his guns.

Meanwhile the economists in the Eisenhower Cabinet point out that the mid-Pacific hydrogen explosion has proved more confidence than that ground forces are outmoded. A hydrogen bomb that can affect fishermen 75 miles away, they point out, could contaminate the city of New York, plus Newark and Elizabeth, N. J., Bridgeport, Conn., and up the Hudson to Poughkeepsie.

There won't be any such "cooled" secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

"There won't be any such 'cooled' secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

"There won't be any such 'cooled' secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

"There won't be any such 'cooled' secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

"There won't be any such 'cooled' secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

"There won't be any such 'cooled' secretary, then explained sweetly: "This isn't going to be a speech. It's to be a filibuster."

Newsman called Mississippi Sen. Jim Eastland's office the other day for an advance copy of a Senate speech, attacking Hawaiian statehood.

Dulles Charts Own Course Despite GOP Back-Biting

By JOSEPH & STEWART ALSOP

SECRETARY of State John Foster Dulles has now completed some 80,000 miles of air travel in the interests of American foreign policy. Before he takes off for Geneva and what may be the make-or-break point in his career as secretary of state, it may be worth taking a look at his political base at home.

American foreign policy, as Dean Acheson learned to his sorrow, is not made in a political vacuum. No matter how brilliant his diplomacy may be, a secretary of state is doomed to frustration and paralysis if he lacks a secure home base. Dulles realized this from the first, and immediately set out to strengthen his domestic position. He has succeeded, at best, only a partial success.

How complete his success has been is suggested by the rather sad story of Dulles's home-coming from the Berlin conference. Dulles returned from Berlin convinced that he had scored a historic diplomatic success.

Had he not exposed the real nature of Soviet policy to all Europe and the world? Had he not strengthened the Western Alliance? Had he not forced Molotov to agree to the conference on the Far East essentially on American terms? On the plane, Dulles even speculated that the Republicans might make the success of his foreign policy a major claim in the fall political campaign.

He returned to find that the Republican Senate majority leader, William Knowland, had already written and released a speech full of implied criticism of his conduct. When he briefed the Senate leaders on the Berlin meeting, only Sen. Alexander Wiley among the Republicans congratulated him. The others clearly suspected that he intended to recognize Communist China as the city of Geneva.

Dulles was genuinely hurt and dismayed by this reception. "They can't seem to get it out of their heads," he is reported to have remarked, "that I'm really Dean Acheson in disguise." But the fact is that, from the very first, a large and powerful group within his own party has viewed Dulles with acid suspicion.

This group is largely found among the "Taft men" who identify Dulles with the "Dewey make forward" policy. They are friendly with the late Sen. Robert A. Taft. Republican suspicion of Dulles was fed initially by his backing for Charles E. Bohlen, and even more by his failure to put a "Republican team" in the State Department.

This last complaint has been strongly echoed by Republicans. Chairman Levi Bell, last November, shared the view that Dulles should fire all those who ever worked for a Democratic administration, including the professional foreign service officers, and replace them with certified Republicans.

APPEASEMENT FAILED In trying to deal with Republican suspicion and complaint, Dulles has gone through two phases. The first was the appeasement phase, marked, for example, by the appointment of W. Scott McLeod as security chief, and by repeated backdowns before the "peaceful" McCarthy.

As Dulles soon became aware, appeasement, while having an absolutely disastrous effect within the State Department, weakened rather than strengthened his position on Capitol Hill.

The second phase began with Dulles's eloquent reply to McCarthy's "perfunctory" speech. Since then, Dulles has done everything possible to restore confidence within the State Department—he has clipped McLeod's wings, for example, and the odds apparently are heavy that he will also invite the wrath of McCarthy & Company by clearing John Paton Davis.

Dulles has no intention of picking a fight with the right-wing Republicans. But especially since his return from Berlin, he has clearly made up his mind to go his own way and let the chips fall where they may. In this course, he has one main source of political strength.

This is, of course, the backing of President Eisenhower. Acheson, to be sure, had the full backing of President Truman, but Truman actually had nothing like the political power and popularity of Eisenhower.

Moreover, the President is clearly determined to use his power and popularity to shore up the Dulles home base. The President has repeatedly gone out of his way to praise Dulles, and the glowing tribute to Dulles in Vice-President Nixon's recent television speech was reportedly inserted at the President's suggestion.

The fact is that Dulles has learned that it is no use trying to appease certain kinds of Republican. For this kind of Republican, any secretary of state is suspect, since secretaries of state are supposed to be neutral and foreign policy is a bad thing.

Since he learned this lesson, respect for Dulles in Washington—and even in the White House, according to the State Department's private polls—has grown steadily.

Psychology Test For Kids Wouldn't Have Helped Ruzrk

By ROBERT C. RUARK

THEY TELL me there is a new set of psychological tests, which will tip the mill on kids of early age, to indicate whether they'll be juvenile delinquents. A kind of candidate-for-extension rule of thumb. It has been running for nearly two years as a couple of Bronx, N. Y., schools.

The searching idea's sound. The candidates for reform school are spotted in terms of family background. One group is assisted psychiatically. The other is more or less left alone. A few years and a few electrocutions later, we'll probably know how to tell a bad boy from a good boy in terms of whether his old man drinks beer or doesn't.

What the tests are really determining, in background research, is whether parents are fit to have children, and the curative process is to try to reform the children in terms of scrutinizing their folks. If Pop's a bum or Ma's a slattern, the kids get extra counsel. What they probably need is new parents, a new neighborhood, and a new set of inheritance.

CASE HISTORY In a case study, I can't help but wonder what the personality molders might have done with years truly in his formative years.

Just for instance, I remember well, as a gold-star student of Miss Ruth Cunningham kindergarten, in Wilmington, N. C., jumping off the kindergarten roof right smack into the teeth of a Master Meares Harris, who dared me to jump. This caused a tremendous row with young Master Harris' parents, grandparents, and other relatives.

I believe there were fist fights in the classroom later, involving an old man Herman King-gard, what a memory the boy's got—and numerous other juvenile delinquents. There was some cheating on mathematics, which I never understood, and a couple of passionate renderings of young ladies whom I shall not list by name, not being a later-day Jimmy Roosevelt. I led some and stole some, and was altogether what the British call a bad hat.

The point of this confession is just this: if the sociologists had probed around, they would have found that my parents were quite nice folk, despite my ruffianly behavior. Pa was the business manager of a big firm. We belonged to the country club and had a big house and two cars and a couple of servants. (This was well before the depression.)

In terms of personal poverty, I had a hoot and a billy goat and a pony and a fleet of bird dogs and a series of caves and all the room in the world to move around in. I had wonderful grandparents. My mother never beat me; for punishment she put me to bed and deprived me of my reading. I had read all the classics before I was ten. Because the old lady wouldn't let me read trash.

But I was still a young bum. I got caught by the cops exploding gas out of other people's cars. I committed a lot of the sins a kid can commit. That I reformed mildly later has nothing to do with the matter at hand.

All I'm saying is that, if you scrutinize the parents, the grandparents, in terms of family upbringing, you would have smacked right in to a wall.

German Overtures

Alfred Von Krupp, whose huge munitions works supplied arms to Hitler even before he took over Germany, and who was sentenced to prison for his part as a Nazi war criminal, has left Essen, Germany, for Nassau and Mexico City.

The latter country he is slated to confer with President Ruiz-Cortines and Mexican officials about the financing of the new factories, dams, mines or power plants under construction. He is to cut the ground out from under the U.S.A.

These conditions are:

1. A price paid of 20 per cent down, the balance in 10 years, after the completion of the factory, dam or project.

2. Krupp will do this without seeking part-German ownership of the enterprise.

3. He will accept payment in any currency, hard or soft, or is even prepared to accept payment in kind.