



Charlotte College: Crisis In Education

"IT IS VERY apparent that something is wrong with higher education in North Carolina."

Members of North Carolina's General Assembly will find these unsettling words in the 1955 report of the Commission on Higher Education.

The commission, headed by Victor Bryant of Durham, painted a dreary picture of how the state is "plowing under" much of its college-age population which could profit from higher education.

Some serious questions were raised. Yesterday, Charlotte had an answer to one.

It is wrapped up in the proposal to establish a state-supported college in Piedmont Carolina—raising the possibility of making expanded educational facilities available in a strategic part of the state with reference to college-age population.

The proposed legislation has been endorsed by the City School Board. The endorsement includes an offer to transfer to the state college the assets and organization of Charlotte College—if the institution is located in Mecklenburg.

"The need for a state-supported college in this rapidly expanding metropolitan area is great. It is getting greater every day."

Charlotte College (enrollment: 381) is a start. But its financial support is limited, its growth restricted. It could grow tremendously in importance and service to the community if it could become a full-fledged state institution.

For too long a political straitjacket has prevented any territorial expansion of higher education facilities in North Carolina. It is time for that straitjacket to be removed. If it is not done soon, the state may tumble even farther down the educational ladder.

In 1950, North Carolina ranked 47th in the nation according to the propor-

tion of its population in college. Actually, only 15.3 per cent of the state's college-age citizens were in college. The national average is 20.4 per cent. According to the U. S. Office of Education, only South Carolina was lower.

The 1950 census indicated that 6 per cent of the nation's population 25 years of age and older had completed four years or more of college. For North Carolina, it was only 5 per cent.

For the nation as a whole, 72 had had one to three years of college education. For North Carolina, it was only 6 per cent.

It has become customary for some Tar Heels to view such statistics with no great alarm "because the Negroes pull us down."

There are several answers to this bit of racial snobbery but the most significant one, we think, is contained in these statistics of the State Commission on Higher Education:

North Carolina was tied for last place in 1951-52 among 14 southern states in the percentage of its white college-age population enrolled in college. By contrast, only two of the 14 states ranked higher than North Carolina in the percentage of Negro college-age population enrolled in college.

It is the whites then who are being "pulled under." Certainly North Carolina is spending a great deal of money on higher education. The question is whether there may be more suitable ways to divide the available funds.

It would seem that higher education in North Carolina would be better served if some of the cash in the state's higher education budget could be diverted to institutions like Charlotte College—institutions right on the doorstep of North Carolina's biggest centers of college-age population.

Ideas Under Fire

Role Of The Intellectuals

By LEWIS M. HACKER

(Editors' Note: Mr. Hacker is dean of Columbia University's School of General Studies, an historian of note and a frequent commentator on the American scene.)

NORMALLY, I am not an alarmist, for I believe that sense of urgency should not prompt political decisions in a democracy, but I have a feeling that a dramatic crisis is developing in America that will shake the foundations of our republic and have the widest repercussions abroad and on our foreign relations.

The crisis has nothing to do with our amazingly dynamic—and, therefore, unstable—economy. With high productivity, high employment and high income, we are in better shape than ever before. The crisis has to do with the growing suspicion of the intellectual's role in our national life.

The dissenters I am not one of those who hold that America itself, because of its belief in equality, is anti-intellectual. Intellectuals are sometimes eccentric, frequently they are non-conformists. We have always had a place for such in America: Witness Benjamin Franklin, Henry Thoreau, Bronson Alcott, Walt Whitman. The fact is, because most of the immigrants who came to America were Europe's rejected—in religion, politics, opportunities to make a living—we supported a people have been tolerant of dissenters. Never has there been a country where more social experiments have been attempted or more sound—and unsound—ideas tested.

Or take the case of education. Alone in the world, we are extending our commitment to universal education to the university level. Correcting for population, we are training 10 times as many super- or talents as Britain and perhaps 20 times as many as are France and Italy. From personal experience I know—for I lecture widely all over the United States—that the close hearing given and the respect accorded to the thoughtful person who wishes to talk of ideas are very high.

"SENSITIVE AREA" Yet here is a paradox: Education has become a "sensitive" area, with intellectuals and ideas suspect. Teachers are being asked to take loyalty oaths; they are being hounded as "Fifth Amendment Communists" because of youthful indiscretions; their relations with their fellows abroad are being watched and restricted. Our devotion to knowledge will serve no purpose unless we are prepared to recognize, simply and flatly, that knowledge thrives on cross fertilization. Despite our great power, we can learn as much from Europeans and Asians as they can learn from us.

Our people are not hostile to learning; but our political leaders—in the Congress and the state legislatures—and our functionaries

in the State and Justice Departments (with the approval of Washington) are. The best proofs are to be found in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, and their administration by the State and Justice Departments.

HUMILIATION The first law makes it difficult and frequently impossible for foreign scholars to enter America unless they are prepared to submit to the most humiliating examination of past political beliefs. Many intellectuals in Europe and Asia, fighting in the Resistance movements against Germany and Japan, joined forces—frequently unwittingly—with Communists.

Such people, even only as visitors—to lecture, attend learned conferences, do research—find it impossible to come to America. We lose both ways: By destroying touch with foreign learning and by strengthening the hands of neutralists everywhere. And the neutralists are growing—in Britain, as well as in France and Italy; in Japan, as well as in India.

LOSS OF CONFIDENCE The law of 1938, as enforced by the Department of Justice, virtually places a ban on the importation of Russian newspapers and many other Iron Curtain periodicals into the United States. How can we learn what is taking place in such lands unless our scholars can read the press?

What I worry about most is that our intellectuals will lose confidence in our political leaders. When intellectual and political leaders part company—when mutual hostility and intolerance feed on each other—then a society's essential stabilities are in danger and political compromise is no longer effective.

The despair and then the deterioration of the intellectuals in France in the second half of the 18th century spelled the doom of the "ancien régime." The American intellectuals of the 1770s parted company with the whole idea of imperial authority. The ineptness of the British government in the

1800's and 1830's in resolving its domestic perplexities drove most of the intellectuals into the Labor Party.

Unless Washington learns from these experiences and cultivates not only our more able and heartily devoted, but also those of European and Asia—who by opening our doors to scholars and ideas—neutralism at home and abroad will grow. We will fall not as a result of subversion—for never was there a people more wide awake and devoted to a common purpose than are Americans today—but because of indifference. And that is what neutralism really is.

The despair and then the deterioration of the intellectuals in France in the second half of the 18th century spelled the doom of the "ancien régime." The American intellectuals of the 1770s parted company with the whole idea of imperial authority. The ineptness of the British government in the

1800's and 1830's in resolving its domestic perplexities drove most of the intellectuals into the Labor Party.

Unless Washington learns from these experiences and cultivates not only our more able and heartily devoted, but also those of European and Asia—who by opening our doors to scholars and ideas—neutralism at home and abroad will grow. We will fall not as a result of subversion—for never was there a people more wide awake and devoted to a common purpose than are Americans today—but because of indifference. And that is what neutralism really is.



The Reporter

that our intellectuals will lose confidence in our political leaders. When intellectual and political leaders part company—when mutual hostility and intolerance feed on each other—then a society's essential stabilities are in danger and political compromise is no longer effective.

The despair and then the deterioration of the intellectuals in France in the second half of the 18th century spelled the doom of the "ancien régime." The American intellectuals of the 1770s parted company with the whole idea of imperial authority. The ineptness of the British government in the

Decline In Immigration Cuts Foreign-Born Ratio Sharply

By CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

IF present immigration quotas for 65 other countries are abolished, and the total number of immigrants allowed to enter the U. S. each year were raised from 14,000 to 251,000, would the "homogeneity" of the U. S. population be disturbed?

"Yes," say those who oppose a bill, sponsored by New York's Sen. Herbert H. Lehman and Rep. Emanuel Celler, which would make such a change in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. And according to an analysis by Congressional Quarterly, these opponents probably will stymie the bill during the present session.

ETHNIC CHANGE While it is difficult to predict ethnic changes which might take place in the future, some interesting clues from the recent past seem to indicate that U. S. "homogeneity" is reasonably assured, barring a much greater increase in immigration than any now proposed.

Some 40 million immigrants have entered the U. S. since 1820—25 million from Europe, five million from the Western Hemisphere and one million from Asia. During the same period, however, total population has jumped from 10 to 163 million.

Immigration mounted from 1920 until it reached its peak in the decade from 1906 to 1915, when some 9.4 million immigrants, or almost a million a year, entered the country. With the first quota law of 1921 the influx began to fall off, and in the 10 years from 1941 to 1950 barely 1 million were admitted.

RATIO DECLINES Even these figures, however, are slightly deceptive. Many immigrants arrived in the U. S. only to decide later that they wished to return to the old country. In 1950, some 3.8 million aliens emigrated from the U. S., leaving net immigration for the period of 7.6 million. During the early 1930's, when the country was in the throes of a depression, emigrants actually outnumbered immigrants by 100,000.

The fall-off in net immigration, coupled with the rapid increase in the U. S. population, has markedly affected the ratio of foreign-born in the country. In 1950 the total population was 78 million, of which 10.3 million or 13.6 per cent was foreign-born. When the last census was taken in 1950, the total had climbed to 150 million, but the number of foreign-born was the same as 50 years earlier—163 million. This number now constituted only 6.8 per cent. Deaths helped to achieve this apparent stability, despite the influx of some 15 million new immigrants during the same period.

SHARP DROP Similarly, both the number and the ratio of Americans one or more of whose parents were born in another country has been declining. Census statistics for the white population only show that native white persons of foreign or mixed parentage numbered 25.9 million in 1930 or 21.1 per cent of the total population. Their number had dropped to 23.6 million in 1950 and their ratio to 15.7 per cent.

When lumped together in what the Bureau of the Census calls the "foreign white stock," the foreign-born and natives of foreign or mixed parentage numbered 33.9 million in 1930 or 22.4 per cent of the total population. Of this group, the largest number (6.8 million) were located in New York state where they constituted 45.8 per cent of the state's population.

CAROLINA'S LOWEST Percentage, however, New York trails even New England states. Foreign white stock makes up 43.9 per cent of Rhode Island's population, 48.5 per cent of Connecticut's. At the other end of the scale are North and South Carolina, where the foreign white stock is only 1.1 per cent.

In North Carolina, where the 1950 census showed a total population of 4,021,929, there were 16,134 foreign-born white and 30,200 native white of foreign or mixed parentage.

The national origins of the foreign white stock have shifted to some extent with the ebbs and flows of immigration over the years. Most immigrants from Germany, Ireland, Great Britain and Sweden arrived before 1900, while most of those from Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Canada and Mexico came in after 1900. Leading country of origin in 1950 was Germany, with 4.7 million, followed closely by Italy, with 4.6 million. Other major countries of origin were Canada (3 million), Poland (2.8 million), Russia (2.5 million), and Ireland (2.5 million).

In fiscal 1954, the first full year after the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1954 took effect, some 94,000 immigrants were admitted to the U. S. but only 91,000 under quotas. Mexico led with 27,000, followed by Germany (13,200), Canada (7,000), Great Britain (19,000) and Italy (15,000). Their ethnic impact must be judged in terms of the population that is growing by 2.5 million a year.

Quote, Unquote Re nice if your critics knocked only once, like opportunity—Hartwell (Ga.) Sen.

A Georgia man was arrested for being drunk on a bicycle. It's all a sober man can do to stay up at a Big Four conference. Senator Herald-Jonesore (Ga.) Herald-Jonesore

It Takes Just Three Seconds . . .

FIRE is still the No. 1 menace to the South's rich timberlands. This fact is brought into terrifying focus by the destruction of runaway blazes sweeping eastern North Carolina counties today.

The frustrating thing about the problem is that virtually all forest fires are man-caused and preventable. Incendiary fires alone—those willfully set by malicious, ignorant or thoughtless people—account for more than half the region's timber losses.

Although Dixie's commercial forest land represents only one-third of the national total, the region produces about half of the country's lumber and more than half of its wood products.

Yet forest fires destroy one out of every 16 acres of woodland in the South every year. In 1950—a bad year—approximately 77 out of every 100 acres burned

in the United States occurred in Dixie. The people of North Carolina and the South must be taught that fire is a saboteur. More than 6,000 different items—from aircraft carrier decks to railroad crossings—are made from wood. When a forest is gobbled up by flames, the nation loses products it urgently needs in war and peace.

It takes just three seconds to crush out a cigarette, yet careless smokers alone start about 18,000 fires a year. Prevention of forest fires is primarily a matter of organization and education at the local level. It takes everyday, individual care and decency. It simply means being cautious with campfires, brush burning and matches. But it also means severe punishment for perverted thrill-seekers who set fires on purpose.

and the public widened. It was unfortunate because, despite the momentary blight of Dada (it disappeared with flagpole-blighting), poetry is probably healthier today than it has been in centuries. It has recovered much of the virtue and vigor of the 17th century masters. If it is more complex, it is because the age is more complex. It is an age of destruction of old forms and the creation of a new form, when language itself has been broken down to create a new medium for the subconscious mind.

Modern poetry is not unintelligible. Its forms and language may be highly personal but meaning is there if you are a poet. Most of yesterday's poetry was bitterly attacked as "too complex" when it appeared. This was once true of Keats as it is true today of Eliot and some of the younger practitioners. But long before it was discovered that the art of painting went beyond mere imitation of nature, poets were aware of this secret in relation to their poetry.

The figure of Eliot still towers over the poetry scene today as a sort of elder statesman. His *Waste Land*, which gave birth to the "modernist" movement, is the spiritual sterility of the '20s, probably the most important single poem of the 20th century—and yet it is one of the most difficult to master fully if erudite students and muted students give the work a magnificent seldom if ever reached in modern literature.

But others as well have produced superb modern poetry—E. E. Cummings, Robert Frost, Robinson Jeffers, W. B. Yeats, Archibald MacLeish, W. H. Auden, Ezra Pound and William Carlos Williams in addition to Stevens and Thomas. Much of the prose of James Joyce, William Faulkner, D. H. Lawrence, Djuna Barnes and even Ernest Hemingway has risen above the heights of good poetry and can be so classified.

Something has weakened cultural America by alienating poetry and the people. Call it a decision if you like, or an herbivorous Woodward as on this page March 9, a system of education that produces "men of competence" rather than men of learning. But by rejecting modern poetry, the common reader is depriving himself of the nourishment of high art.



"Bah! . . . You should meet some of the idiots running around loose!"

People's Platform

Another Old-Timer 'Remembers When'

Editors: The News, Charlotte
I TOO, have "remembered Charlotte" and "watched Charlotte grow" and watched when one of the city's 12 bars was located in the building now occupied by a furniture company at Trade and College Sts.

A trade of Charlotte's Fire Dept., manned by Negroes, was housed at 214 E. Trade St.

The City Hall a red brick building, with a monster dragon atop, stood on the southeast corner of 5th and Tryon Sts.

Here-framed street cars and desks were only means of public transportation.
—JACOB THOMPSON

How Can Charlotte's Children Be Spared?

Editors: The News, Charlotte
THE LETTER in the Charlotte News, March 12, under the heading "From a Jail Cell: Close Abate Stores," was of special interest to a group of housewives in our community.

Is there anything we can do to protect our Mecklenburg County from liquor so that our daughters will be spared the fate of this girl?

—MRS. PETE THORPE, MRS. Y. W. STEIGALL (Editors' Note: There is no substitute for education.)

Art Classes Attract Many From Afar

Editors: The News, Charlotte
THIS is to express the appreciation of my organization for news coverage in your paper regarding the Eliot O'Hara watercolor classes held at the Mint Museum March 14-19.

We are proud of the fact that these classes were more successful than ever before, attracting many students from this area, as well as an impressive number from distant places.

—MARY FRANCES BARNES, Chairman, Art Classes Committee, Guild of Charlotte Artists

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

President Silent On Quemo and Matsuo

WASHINGTON
THE businesslike atmosphere of Eisenhower's recent luncheon with House leaders was broken when White House waltzers brought in the main course—quail on toast.

John Foster Dulles politely but firmly declined the offering, but he was trying to keep his waltz down.

"I have been traveling about a great deal," explained the secretary of state, "and I've been eating more than I should—purely as a matter of diplomatic courtesy. As a result, I am growing a trifle plump in the waist line. I know you won't hold me to any protocol, Mr. President, and will let me eat what I want."

"Certainly," agreed Ike. "What would you like to have?"
"Well, if you have a little cottage cheese in the refrigerator, it would do very nicely," replied the secretary of state.

He told him to try to find some cottage cheese in the kitchen. As the water hurried off, House Majority Leader John McCormack of Massachusetts also announced that he would appreciate some cottage cheese. McCormack, a devout Catholic, didn't bother to explain, but Lenten regulations limit him to meat once a day and he was planning to have steak for dinner in the evening.

A few minutes later the water returned with only one portion of cottage cheese.

"That's all there was," he reported to his boss, the President of the United States.

An Alphonse and Gaston sequence followed as the secretary of state and the House majority leader deferred to each other over who should eat the cheese.

"I insist that you eat it, John," said Dulles.

"No, no, Mr. Secretary," demanded McCormack. "I insist that you eat it. I

only ordered it to keep you company." McCormack won out and the cottage cheese wound up in front of Dulles. The House majority leader, unobtrusively, grabbed the quail and ate some potatoes and red cabbage.

Princeton Professor Quizzes

The two White House luncheons with Senate and House leaders did not vary much except that at the second luncheon, Senator Alexander Smith, New Jersey Republican and a former Princeton professor, got tangled up in some questions. His questions were so involved that the President stepped in to try to help him rephrase them. Then Secretary Dulles came to the rescue, also to simplify the question so everyone could understand it.

As finally ironed out and bulled down, Senator Smith appeared to be asking: "Would the islands of Quemo and Matsuo be of any help to the United States in November."

case trouble broke out again in Korea and we had to take it there?" The answer was "No." At both luncheons, the President refused to say whether the United States would or would not defend the two much-discussed offshore islands.

"That is a military decision and I will make it, but I am not prepared to say now what or when it will be," he told House leaders. He added that he did not intend to tip off the United States.

One of the most important questions Eisenhower was asked—this one at the Senate luncheon—was whether he would agree to a Big Four conference with George of Georgia, who recently urged such a conference was especially interesting.

The President was not categorical in his reply, but indicated that he would be willing to sit down with Marshal Balgoin of France and with the French and British sometime later—probably in November.

This was all many a common reader needed to know about modern poetry. He decided none of it was worth the trouble and the gap between the artist