

Point of View

Editorial

What Can We Do About Trash?

In our July 18 issue the SENTINEL reported the ugliness of the big trash pile that was accumulating at the corner of Carey and Highland. It was steadily growing day by day.

There are two "NO DUMPING" signs at the site carrying a message of \$100 fine to be assessed to the perpetrators. These messages were completely ignored. The pile was spreading and festering a breeding spot for rodents, etc.

There were mattresses, chairs, stoves, tires, toys, auto parts, tree limbs, broken lumber and glass, refrigerators... you name it.

The SENTINEL carried pictures of the rubbish in its Aug. 8 and 21 issues and pleaded that something should be done to eliminate that tasteless sight.

Something was done through the pleadings of the residents nearby and through the SENTINEL

push. The trash was removed by the City.

WELL, we are very sorry to report that the PILE OF TRASH IS BACK at the corner of Carey and Highland and already the size of the previous load. THIS IS TOTALLY DISGRACEFUL and an insult to those who have worked so hard to keep the area clean.

Then there's another unsightly mess on the empty lot on "H" Street about 75 yards north of West Owens. The whole lot, stretching about 100 yards, is littered with broken glass and a number of piles of trash.

THIS TRASH SPELL MUST BE BROKEN. It calls on the thrust of our community leaders and the community as a whole to put pressure on those responsible. It is truly hurting COMMUNITY PRIDE. Let's not ignore our responsibilities.



CARL ROWAN

Back To School — With Problems, Hope

WASHINGTON — All across America this week, lunch boxes will be dusted off, book bags will come out of the closet, notebooks will be purged of last spring's homework as school bells summon some 46 million youngsters back to school.

For the kids, it's a bit-sweet time. Few are really happy to see summer vacation end; but there is the excitement of getting together again with old and new friends, finding a teacher who brings "David Copperfield" to life, discovering one day that all those unfathomable formulas, do make sense.

For many parents and educators, I'm afraid the bitter aspects of school may be stronger than the sweet. These are not the

best of times for public education in America.

Serious deficiencies and inequities remain in finances and facilities — and in pupil achievement. The learning process is disrupted by truancy, dropouts, violence. Busing still divides communities. There is renewed talk about a voucher system, which could seriously damage public schools. And looming above all else is the basic question of whether schools really make a difference, whether ghetto kids are teachable.

Despite these problems and doubts, our public schools should not be automatically flunked. They may not deserve many A's but in some areas, they do rate

decent marks.

The Headstart Program is one. A number of long-term studies have confirmed the value of pre-school compensatory education for low-income children. Youngsters who get this help are less likely to fail later in school and are less likely to need special education classes. Moreover, students who attend pre-school score higher on standard math tests than those who have not had such training.

Perhaps the most heartening news for disadvantaged urban children is that new evidence indicates that innercity schools CAN be improved and that good schools CAN turn out better educated kids.

For a time, serious doubts exist on both

counts. The famous study by James Coleman in the 1960's found that even though school children had nearly equal educational resources, students from black and poor families did not do as well in school as middle-class whites. Coleman concluded that family background and socioeconomic factors — not schools — were the major determinants of a child's achievement.

Later research had challenged this. The Council for Basic Education found that beginning reading ability in four inner-city schools depended mainly on the schools themselves, not the children.

An important study in England noted big dif- (See Carl Rowan page 7)

Jamaican Campaign: Tropical Storm Warnings

By Andrew Young

It's campaign time in Jamaica, and elections there are rough.

Families and friends divide. Violence, bloodshed and even death erupt amid the emotions of the contest for power. Against this turbulent background it is reassuring to note that Jamaica has weathered eight democratic elections since 1944, and seems always to return to her more relaxed tropical demeanor once the vote is in and the victor determined.

In the meantime, the Jamaican press, radio and television flail away, often in scurrilous fashion, celebrating freedom at the expense of truth. And once again the United States, the powerful neighbor to the north, has become a prime campaign target. The issue this time is destabilization



ANDREW YOUNG

I do not believe that the U.S. government has been involved in attempts to destabilize Jamaica. But the question as to whether the allegations of destabilization are simple campaign rhetoric or unwarranted paranoia obscures the point,

because a case can be made that there is outside interferences in this diverse island nation.

Throughout the Caribbean area, for instance, there exists an underground network of narcotics and gambling interests that can find its way into Jamaican politics.

There has also been a recent infiltration of powerful and sophisticated weaponry, as evidenced in a recent attack on a bus carrying enthusiasts of the People's National Party from a campaign rally. Prime Minister Michael Manley, leader of the P.N.P., told me during a recent trip to the U.S., "The power of the bullets ripped away the entire side of the bus. This was powerful stuff that can't be bought in Jamaica."

Manley's party activists insist that if the

present pattern of violence and killings is not the work of governments, then it must be the designs of ardent right-wingers, funneling money and weapons to local thugs associated with the opposition.

The questions about destabilization may never be resolved, but the U.S. influence on Jamaican affairs will remain an issue.

The American difficulties with Jamaica began with Henry Kissinger in 1975, when the Jamaican government defended the presence of Cubans in Angola. Until then, our relations with Jamaica had been extremely amicable. U.S. politicians from Hubert Humphrey to John Connally enjoyed the sun and sand there, and Americans viewed the island as a kind of playground to be shared

with Britain and Canada.

When Kissinger launched his propaganda campaign against Cuban intervention in Africa, he sought Manley's support as one of the Third World's leading spokesmen. Manley, in turn, expressed concern about Kissinger's complicity with South Africa in the invasion of Angola, and subsequently adopted a position held by most of black Africa that the Cubans were assisting African liberation.

The tension between the Jamaican and U.S. governments subsided for a period with the election of Jimmy Carter, but the present obsession of this Administration with Cuba and Manley's friendship with Fidel Castro doesn't contribute to good relations.

The Administration's Caribbean analysts got

themselves somewhat bent out of shape over Manley's speech at the non-aligned summit in Havana last year. They are now convinced that Manley is losing control of his party to more "radical" elements of U.S.-educated intellectuals. Of all this, Manley says, "I just happen to be a friend of Castro's. I'm certain that he views me as a fuzzy liberal. I'm a Democratic Socialist and he is a firm Communist, and that is an essential difference."

In 1972 Michael Manley, son of one of Jamaica's founding fathers, Sir Norman Manley, was elected prime minister. Manley assumed leadership of a nation whose population was rigidly divided along class lines, and was overwhelmingly poor and young. Jamaica also found itself inflamed by (See Andrew Young p 7)