

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Know Your Enemy

"Know your enemy" is an idea U.S. educators and opinion leaders are endorsing with ever-increasing seriousness as it applies to Soviet and Chinese communism.

A decade ago, few U.S. schools offered any instruction in the nature and workings of communism. Fear existed in some areas—and many minds—that to explain communism was somehow to contaminate those who studied it. Patriotic organizations opposed such study.

Today the climate has altered markedly. From the public and from professional educators alike come mounting demands for better understanding of the system under which our dominant world-rival lives.

Twenty-two large American cities require that some study time in social science courses be given to communism, though only two places have full-blown, semester-long courses in this field.

Another 43 cities figure that a certain amount of time is spent on the subject, since it is included in required textbooks.

Three eastern seaboard states either make mandatory or strongly recommend the school study of communism. Florida has a new law requiring all public high schools to devote no less than 30 course hours to "Americanism vs. Communism."

A good many states, according to a New York Times survey, offer guidance in the study of communism as part of the regular school curriculum covering history, economics, politics. Large numbers leave the whole matter in the hands of the local communities.

Opposition to the teaching of this subject still exists, despite widespread endorsement from parent-teacher groups, school boards and other authorities, and the turn-about of the American Legion, a once-stout adversary now joined with the National Education Association to foster such studies on an expanding scale.

One survey showed 37 per cent of school superintendents still disapprove courses in the field. In some areas where study is encouraged or required, the treatment is heavily larded with propaganda, often with an extremist tinge.

Such efforts imply that United States youngsters can't see communism in its true light when left to themselves, though they have never shown marked susceptibility to its doctrines. Even in the depression 1930s, only a relative handful succumbed to the Red glow.

Wisely, the notion is spreading that both young and adult Americans can not only withstand communism's "lure" but need solid knowledge of the system to make informed decisions as voters and leaders in an age clouded by its perils and threats.

Toward this end, educators favor objective study of the subject, in a balanced frame of comparative studies, with guidance not from legislators but specialists, and with teaching by trained instructors using the newest and best materials.

It sounds like a prescription that could arm young Americans well for the ordeals which lie ahead.

Guilty Of All But The Charge

(The Denver Post)

Sometimes people think that American teachers are a gang of softies whose only purpose in life is to move a class of students along from one grade to another, no matter whether they learn anything or not—and then up comes a case like that of a Chicago high school math teacher to confound the theory.

This math teacher was suspended by the Chicago School Board the other day for making life too rough for his students. He will be tried before the School Board.

His misdemeanor was to flunk any student who could not score 100 pct. on his mathematics tests.

That sounds like a very tough teacher indeed. He is not quite that tough, however.

He gave the students four chances to pass the test with a grade of 100. If they passed the first time, they were excused from regular class assignments and received a grade of superior in the math course.

If they passed the second time, they received an "excellent" mark.

If they passed the third time, they were classified "good," and if they passed the

fourth time, they were given a "fair" mark.

If they could not do all the problems on the fourth try, they were flunked and would have to make up the credit in summer school.

This teacher has said he is in trouble because he interfered with the general system of passing 95 pct. of the students in Chicago schools.

He felt that by making the students pass their examinations perfectly, that he was holding them responsible for their mistakes.

Well, it is easy to see how this teacher would be in conflict with the educational policies of a school system, for this is a very tough attitude toward mathematics, or just about anything else, and, apparently, he is a very stubborn fellow.

Most recently about a third of his students failed his course, and he has been shifted around from one school to another for eight years.

The one thing that is hard to understand, however, is the charge on which he will be tried: inefficiency and incompetency.

It is hard lines when a perfectionist is accused of that!



JIM BISHOP: REPORTER . . .

Historically, Germans Guess Wrong On Wars

The Germans, of course, are the greatest miscalculators in modern history. When war is imminent, they guess wrong, both as to the enemy's will to fight and their own chances of victory. On a recent trip to Berlin, I was surprised to learn from officials and businessmen that, even though Germany is standing unarmed in the middle of the shooting gallery, she is still willing to risk war.

For the first time since the pre-Napoleonic era, Germany is not a principal; she's a pawn. Public opinion around the world is concerned about the Soviet attitude, and the American attitude toward a solution of the Berlin dispute, but no one bothers to ask Germany how she feels, or why.

From the Berlin Hilton Hotel to the Rathaus, I asked every responsible German I met what he thought of a solution to the crisis. If it were possible to capsize many mouths, it would read like this:

1. The Russians will not go to war over Berlin. When they rattle their rockets, they are bluffing. We need no solution.

2. We are afraid that American opinion will weaken, and they will make a deal with the Russians.

3. We do not count on real assistance from the British and French. They regard us as historic enemies, and they have no will to fight for Berlin.

4. No one is going to prevent the reunification of all Germany. Our brothers in East Germany want it. So do we.

I had a conversation with Bur-

gomaster Amrehn in the Berlin Rathaus. He is a short, dark, spectacled man who, in common with so many Berliners, believes that the Russians will not go to war no matter how much they are goaded.

The Kaiser guessed wrong in 1914. Hitler guessed wrong in 1939. There is an excellent chance that the Germans are guessing wrong again. For a reason which escapes me, they feel that the preponderance of military power favors the United States and its allies and that, if there was a war, the Soviet Union would be annihilated and Germany would be reunited. If there is no war, and the U.S. remains firm against Russian threats, Germany will be reunited eventually through free elections.

Both premises appear to me to be in error. The recent Soviet rocket tests in the Pacific proved that they have guidance systems in advance of ours. They can send a big missile 7,000 miles and drop it within five-eighths of a mile of the target. Their atomic tests proved that they have thermonuclear bombs in the power range of five to ten million tons of T.N.T. Put the bomb in a reliable rocket, or delivery system, and you have a family of deadly weapons. Then too, assuming that both sides are bluffing, history shows that a nation can bluff itself into an untenable position. War becomes the only solution.

"How can you Berliners feel so complacent," I asked an official of the German Information Service, "when the rest of the world is terrified?" He smiled. He shrugged. "When one is in the

eye of the hurricane," he said softly, "one can seldom hear the wind."

I do not mean to imply that Germany—and this includes the Federal Government at Bonn as well as Willy Brandt's group in Berlin—seeks war. It is simply that they do not believe that the Russians will press the button. They sit over coffee at restaurant tables and they argue that, in thermonuclear war, there can be no winner. Ergo: if there is no winner, then no one will go to war.

Perhaps. Hundreds of millions of prayers wing skyward every day hoping that this reasoning is correct. But we must also acknowledge that, even if war is unprofitable, communism thrives on chaos and devastation. Democracy does not. When the people lose more than they can bear, they become politically radical.

The one premise made in Berlin to which I subscribe is that the French and British have no heart to face the Russians in a showdown over Berlin. Among the NATO ground forces, morale is lowest in the French First Army, which holds the southern sector.

They have been fighting Germans for too long to want to fight to save Berlin for Adenauer. The British have a fondness for status quo. They would like to remain in Berlin with the U.S. indefinitely, so long as Germany remains divided. A unified Germany, they feel, would make it strong enough to start trouble all over again.

I would like to be complacent, like the Germans. I can't. They couldn't pick the winner in a one-horse race, even if it was fixed.

"Sorry, It's Designed to Hold Just Me"



Castro Popularity Wearing Thin With Cuban Populace

By MILTON CARR

United Press International
For some time now, Fidel Castro has signed off his marathon speeches in Cuba with the words: "Fatherland or death! We shall triumph!"

But will he? Will the great popularity he has enjoyed with the Cuban masses during the last two and one-half years carry him through the months and years ahead?

Will the Cuban people stand for having communism rammed down their throats, even by their national hero?

These questions are being asked in Havana today as well as in other parts of the world. There are no pat answers. But there are indications.

Up to now Castro has won every battle, including that of an armed invasion supported by the United States. But as he draws Cuba farther along the road to communism he faces internal problems which may be harder to overcome.

There is no doubt that Castro has lost popularity during the last year, particularly the last four months.

His formal announcement on May 1 of Cuba's entry into the Communist bloc, the currency change last month during which the government confiscated \$3.5 million in cash from the people, and the current food shortage—all have had their repercussions.

More are likely to come.

The government now controls 85 per cent of the industry and 50 per cent of the agriculture. The only remaining private enterprise in Cuba is in the hands of the small farmer, business man and merchant. They, too, are scheduled to be gobbled up by the socialist system.

But while it was relatively easy to confiscate the holdings of foreign companies and wealthy individuals, it will be harder—and more painful to more people—to take several thousand small businesses from their owners. How

they will react to this, is something for Castro to consider.

The transition to communism in Cuba is moving so rapidly that the majority of the people do not yet realize what is happening. But among those who are aware of the implications, there is a growing dissatisfaction with Castro, though his iron-fisted control of the populace precludes public criticism.

One influential public voice against communism was silenced when the government forbade priests to discuss politics in the pulpit. But in Roman Catholic Cuba, the church—despite government interference—may prove to be the greatest bulwark against Sovietization.

Religion is the only organized force in Cuba which Castro has been unable to subdue. The traditional religious street processions have been restricted. Parochial schools have been taken away from the church. But churches remain open, and the faithful deplore what is happening.

Castro's rallies no longer are bringing the spontaneous turnout that they once did. An effort is now required to attract large crowds. Streets no longer are deserted at night when Castro makes a radio and television speech.

Despite the secret police, volunteer informers and the omnipresent militia, one can hear more criticism of Castro in Cuba today than ever before. True, the critic looks over his shoulder before he speaks.

The strong arm which defends Castro and discourages uprisings and invasions is the militia—hundreds of thousands of armed men and women who train in their spare time and vow to fight to the death to defend the revolution.

The government's greatest support lies within the underprivi-

leged group, and particularly the farm workers, which represents the majority of the Cuban population.

Castro is not neglecting the battle for the minds of the Cubans. His words and slogans are everywhere. They blare from sound trucks, from radio and television sets. They hang in red letters on banners, on billboards, on beer trucks, even on palm trees.

The newspapers, all government operated, contain nothing but the government, or Communist line. Communist publications dominate the bookstands.

OTHER EDITORS' OPINIONS

The Evils Of Thrift

(The Wall Street Journal)

Secretary of Commerce Hodges observed the other day that while the economy has been recovering it hasn't been recovering as rapidly as it should. What's needed, he says, is more spending—"not just by Government, not just by business but by the mass of the American consumers."

Mr. Hodges can't really be worried by a lack of Government spending; his colleagues in Washington seem to be taking care of that very well. As for business, Mr. Reuther is seeing to it that one of the biggest expense items, wages, is on the rise; or at any rate, he is trying to set a good example by raising auto industry spending.

So the real villain is the mass of us, you and me. "Obviously," Mr. Hodges says, "consumers have been playing it cautious . . . hanging on to more of their dollars." What's needed is some way to "convince people right now to spend at retail one percentage point more of their disposable income." That would really set things humming, and incidentally increase the Government's tax take so it could spend more too. Further, the Secretary insists, it wouldn't be "wasteful spending" because everybody has latent wants.

Well, we have latent wants, all right, and so do other members of our family, although it would take more than one percentage point of our income to satisfy them. We just hadn't realized, and probably never had you, that by being wrapped up in old-fashioned notions about thrift, and by postponing some of our wants until the exchequer looked better, we were playing such hob with the Government.

Mr. Hodges doesn't say how he's going to convince the masses to be more spendthrift, but since Congressmen have debated laws for "compulsory savings" they might equally consider making spending compulsory. Why should people be allowed to play it cautious, when they not only miss a lot of high living for themselves but strike a low blow at the public welfare?



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Kennedy Faces Big Congress Sales Job

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Any way it is figured, the Kennedy administration cannot claim the overwhelming successes it expected in the session of Congress just ended. And the outlook for the second session of the 87th Congress in 1962, which is an election year, is considered no better.

What the administration is up against is the combination of Republicans and conservative Democrats who have the real majorities in both Senate and House. They made the record. And these same majorities will still be in control next year.

Arguments on the why and whereof of this record—good or bad, as you choose—will now be carried on in home districts as congressmen mend political fences before returning to Washington.

But it wasn't just politics that killed so many of the administration's New Frontiers programs. Congressmen are always tuned in on home. The right-wing coalition still senses that there is strong opposition to turning the country over whole-hog to ultra liberal reforms.

Kennedy still has a big selling job to do, to convince a larger majority of the American people on the rightness of his policies before he can expect better results from Congress in the last two years of his administration. This is what the 1962 Congressional election campaign will be all about.

For the session just closed, the administration claims 30-odd major accomplishments. Some of them weren't so major and many didn't provide all the administration could.

Congress was not generally hostile to giving the administration money for its new programs. While the requests were cut about \$3 billion, the total appropriated

is over \$85 billion, or \$12 billion more than last year.

Some of this is for future expenditures. The amount to be spent in the fiscal year ending next June 30 is estimated at \$68 billion, which will mean a \$6 billion deficit.

National defense was raised by Congress \$600 million over the \$6 billion increase asked by Kennedy, to make a \$47.6 billion total.

The larger cuts: \$870 million less for foreign aid, \$150 million less for Labor Department programs and \$120 million less for agriculture.

Major measures defeated include federal aid for education, health insurance for the aged, omnibus farm legislation, tax reform, postal rate increases, manpower retraining, revision of conflict of interest laws for federal employees.

Creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and a Youth Conservation Corps were turned down. Reorganization of Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communications Commission and National Labor Relations Board was disapproved by Congress.

Next year, the President is expected to repeat most of the requests which Congress did not act on.

There will also be renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements and tariff policy to consider. Another hot subject is likely to be formulation of broad new transportation policies. General tax reform, postponed this year, will probably be the most controversial item on the calendar.

Everything that may happen in Congress is of course dependent on developments abroad. A shooting war crisis in Germany, South-east Asia, the Near East, Africa or even Latin America could bring Congress back into special session.

That could knock out all programs for development of the American economy and result in tight controls.

WASHINGTON WINDOW

Kennedy Vote Record Leaves ADA Unhappy

By LYLE C. WILSON

United Press International
WASHINGTON (UPI)—The left-wing Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) needs some burly Negro help in the ADA campaign to show President Kennedy the error of his ways.

ADA is unhappy with the record of the first session of the 87th Congress, just adjourned. It charges that Kennedy made a deal with Southern Democrats on civil rights and the filibuster. The deal, of course, would have been for the administration to permit Congress to adjourn without acting on either of these issues.

Congress did adjourn without any such action. It must be noted, however, that the powerful Negro pressure groups have not yet begun to complain loudly against the Kennedy administration. Their interest in easing the Senate's filibuster rule and in more civil rights legislation is great. Any indication that the White House had double crossed them on these matters scarcely could fail to arouse angry protests. These are sensitive areas.

ADA's political reflexes are especially sensitive to Kennedy administration performance because ADA must still be reckoned as in semi-mourning for what might have been. What might have been, of course, was the Democratic nomination of Adlai E. Stevenson for president.

Editorial Comment
ADA contends its adverse criticism was aimed at Congress rather than at the President. The editorial expression of opinion, however, said:

"The President gave the Southern bloc in Congress exactly what it wanted—no civil rights legislation and no aid to the anti-filibuster fight. In return, they voted against him."

That scarcely reads like applause.

The leaders of ADA judge Kennedy by the standards which they believe their hero would have established if he instead of Kennedy had been installed in the White House. ADA asserts that Kennedy's alleged deal with the Southern Democrats failed to win their support for his program and that they voted against him most of the time on really significant issues. Perhaps that is a fact.

Kennedy's Alternatives

It is equally true, however, that Kennedy would have jeopardized all of his legislative program in the recent session if he had forced a showdown on the filibuster and on civil rights. ADA now is demanding of Kennedy what the Democrats were demanding of Dwight D. Eisenhower during much of his White House term. They demand presidential leadership.

Specifically, ADA wants Kennedy leadership in the next session to force Congress to act on civil rights, the filibuster, medical care for the aged, tax reform, aid to education, reciprocal trade and all else to which the Democratic platform committed the party.

If Kennedy attempts next session to force feed Congress with the civil rights and filibuster issues, the legislative uproar is likely to be such as to defeat all other Kennedy administration measures that can be beaten by a general coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats.

JFK's Accomplishments

Instead of complaining against Kennedy, ADA should be congratulating him for his light-footed political maneuvers in getting from the recent session some of his major legislation. The President can safely continue his civil rights and filibuster program so long as Negro politicians do not turn on him. Kennedy's executive orders in behalf of Negroes and appointments of Negroes to high federal office are a sufficient shield against ADA. Good politics, too.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Monday, Oct. 9, the 282nd day of the year with 83 to follow in 1961.

The moon is new.

The morning star is Venus.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history:

In 1701, Yale College was founded.

In 1934, King Alexander of Yugoslavia, on a state visit to France, was assassinated by a member of a Croatian terrorist organization.

In 1953, Pope Pius the 12th, the 261st Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church died.

A thought for today: British writer John Gay said: "Life is a jest, and all things show it; I thought so once, but now I know it."

THEY SAY . . .

I predict that soon cars will not be for getting places, but status symbols in which you will sit in traffic jams all over the country. —R. H. S. Crossman, British member of Parliament.