

since most administrators in the state contact the State Department of Education when they are invited to a meeting and know little about its sponsors. In spite of the fact that the FSU people contacted the State Department of Education twice, they received no reply. As a result the conference was very poorly attended. In August, both the Republican and Democratic nominees for the office of State Superintendent of Education (Dr. Anderson is retiring at the end of this year) endorsed the South Carolina court suit against the 1966 guidelines (Charleston News & Courier, August 8, 1966).

In the spring of this year the National Education Association announced that it would be able to make a grant to Southern teachers' associations to hold a conference in each state. The conference would deal with faculty desegregation, and the condition of the grant was that the conference had to be sponsored by both of the teachers' associations, Negro and white. Such a conference would have undoubtedly contributed to progress in the area of faculty desegregation but at this time no such meeting has been held in South Carolina. It is reported that the South Carolina Education Association, the predominantly white teachers' association, was unwilling to co-sponsor such a conference with the Palmetto Education Association, the Negro teachers' association. Another opportunity for a positive contribution to education in South Carolina was apparently forfeited.

The Newspapers

In both the Columbia State and the Charleston News & Courier throughout the summer there appeared editorial attacks on the guidelines, officials of the U.S. Office of Education, and the role of the federal government in education. On April 6, *The News and Courier's* lead editorial was entitled "Guidelines to Disaster." The editorial accused the federal government of seeming "determined to create new formulas of mixing." The lead editorial of the June 27 issue of *The State* called Commissioner Howe "the U.S. Commissar of Integration" and said that the guidelines could better be described as a "federal strait-jacket." A July 9 lead editorial in *The State* said that when Gov. McNair and the other Southern governors had met with Secretary Gardner at the National Governors' Conference all they got was "a lot of gobbledegook and guff from Harold Howe's henchmen." On July 24 another lead editorial in *The State* again referred to "Commissar Howe" and his "emissaries." The editorial said that "These guidelines not only go far beyond the requirements of the (1964 Civil Rights) law, they run counter to its very spirit in several particulars." The editorial observed that, "Commissar Howe has said that public schooling itself will not be tolerated unless the races are mixed in a manner acceptable—not to Congress or the Courts—but to the Howe hierarchy."

On July 19 *The State's* lead editorial was entitled "Tyranny in Education" and took the liberty of expanding on the National Republican Coordinating Committee's position paper dealing with the role of the federal government in education. The editorial suggested that the President should see to it that "his minions in the Office of Education" were advised of his statement that the tradition of local control of schools would not be forsaken. *The News and Courier's* lead editorial of July 30 intimated that the Office of Education would be disrupting the tranquility of South Carolina schools if it continued to insist on "forced integration of faculties as well as student bodies." The August 16 lead editorial of *The News and Courier* said that, "Mr. Howe and those who share his educational views also have no legitimate place in government." The editorial also observed that, "The American way of life is supposed to be a free way of life, not a social laboratory for off-beat experiments in human relations." On September 6 *The News and Courier's* lead editorial referred to Commissioner Howe as "a zealot for integration" who could be removed only by getting rid of "the administration that allows him to pressure the people with the people's own money." These editorial opinions from the state's two largest newspapers are representative of similar opinions expressed in the editorials of other state newspapers.

This examination, then, of the position of state educational, political, and newspaper leaders toward the 1966 school desegregation guidelines reveals a posture of defiance, misinterpretation, and an almost total lack of cooperation with those seeking to abolish the dual school system in the South. Intemperate language was the order of the day, and repeated condemnation of the guidelines and inferences concerning the legality of the guidelines contributed sig-