

The Daily Tar Heel

In its seventieth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the University administration or the student body.

All editorials appearing in the DAILY TAR HEEL are the individual opinions of the Editors, unless otherwise credited; they do not necessarily represent the opinions of the staff. The editors are responsible for all material printed in the DAILY TAR HEEL.

October 25, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. XLX, No. 30

Cuban Blockade: Campus Discussion And I-A

To the student who is I-A with his draft board, to the student whose parents live in Washington, to the student who has a Navy friend in the Caribbean . . . the Cuban blockade crisis strikes him personally.

The crisis also leads to very personal reactions. The first "quarantine" announcement generally caused a dulled feeling of confusion — what does this REALLY mean? Is it just another move in the Cold War propaganda battle — or is this something different? How will Russia react — will Soviet ships try to go through?

The headlines Tuesday morning reinforced an uneasy feeling that this was different, that this was playing for keeps, and a resultant attitude that the President must be supported "in this time of crisis." The desire for national unity went to an unfortunate extreme when UNC students harshly criticized several student government officials for not wholeheartedly endorsing the blockade of Cuba; and when students criticized the Carolina Forum for holding a discussion tonight on Cuba, on the basis that no discussion should be allowed "in this time of crisis."

The uneasy feeling has remained, despite the casual comments heard everywhere that the Soviets will "back down" — perhaps this is heard so often because we cannot conceive of what would happen if Russia didn't "back down."

Yesterday afternoon the crisis became more acute: Russian ships heading for Cuba, U. S. troops sent to Florida, propaganda statements on both sides, frantic discussion in the United Nations . . . The feared incident, when a Russian ship going to Cuba is stopped by an American ship has not happened yet (as of 7 p.m. Wednesday).

As the Security Council argues the issues, as means of compromise

are attempted, as the OAS coordinates its proposed action against Cuba . . . there are still questions to be asked of himself by every American.

Is a naval quarantine legal in international waters — and is it the best way to deal with the Cuban situation?

How far will the Latin American nations follow the U. S. lead and what will happen if and when they refuse to go along with Uncle Sam?

Can the United States morally defend their possession of bases ring-fencing the Soviet Union, and simultaneously (as Ambassador Stevenson attempted with little success) argue that Cuba has no right to set up missile bases?

And how far are the American people really prepared to go to crush Communism in Cuba?

These are questions which, it seems, should be discussed and answered, even in this tense and dangerous time. There is no time short of outright war when discussion is out of place in a democratic country.

The President has acted strongly to curb a menace — the menace of Communist missile bases in Cuba. We think he has acted correctly — we fervently hope so.

We hope United States action will allow the Soviets some "out" — so they can retreat from a dangerous position and yet save face.

We hope the president will continue in his resolve to keep the hemispheric peace, together with the Latin American nations — always remaining open to negotiations on those issues which are negotiable, within or without the United Nations.

And we hope the American people will never fear to dissent, to question their government at all times, in hopes of retaining peace in the Americas and the world. (JC)

Future Alumni

The erection of new buildings on any campus is, indeed, a good sign. It is a sign of progress, progress in numbers, and, hopefully, progress in the educational enterprise.

With the swelling enrollments, construction of more classroom buildings is an absolute necessity

if the University is going to do its share in the higher education of the state. Thus, the continuing construction of buildings on this campus, an event too often merely taken for granted by students, should be cause for some immediate, if not lengthy, reflection on the part of everyone now attending classes in these buildings.

There are numerous old saws about contributing alumni, but this continues to be if not absolutely necessary then at least an essential means to furthering the hopes and aspirations of present and future students. Trite as it may seem, we too often as undergraduates overlook the fact that progress requires backing, not the least of which is financial backing — or more colloquially put — money.

The University continues to gratefully receive gifts from the Kenans and the Moreheads, but this alone is not enough; the burden of backing continual advancement in all areas of University undertakings should willingly be borne upon the shoulders of all who have been fortunate enough to receive education at UNC.

And it is now — now as undergraduate students benefiting from the gifts of others — that we should pause, look around and understand why we should do "our part" after graduation. (CW)

"Aren't We Supposed To Be Running Against Democrats?"



N. C.'s Board Of Higher Education— A Stormy History And A Few Gains

(Eds' Note: This is the second installment of an article on higher education in North Carolina. The first article dealt with the formation of the Board of Higher Education.)

By CHESTER DAVIS
In The Winston-Salem Journal and Sentinel

SETTING THE BATTLE STAGE

This set the stage for the specific clashes that were to follow. For example:

Late in 1957 State College requested permission to build 500 housing units for married students. The board cut this request to 300. This triggered an outcry. Officials of the Greater University complained that while the board conceivably has an obligation to decide the policy question of whether a state-supported institution should provide housing for married students the board had no business deciding how many such units were required. That decision, men like Bill Friday contended, properly belonged to the trustees of the Greater University.

Some time later Eastern Carolina College proposed to establish a four-year nursing school. The board vetoed this request, pointing out that the state already had one such school and that it was connected with a four-year medical school. Again there were cries of "excessive interference." Eastern Carolina went over the head of the board, taking its case to the General Assembly. The college, as political potent as it is ambitious, won in this showdown. Thereafter, any time either ECC or the Greater University had a dispute with the board they had only to appeal their case to the legislature to win more than the board had originally agreed to give them. The university, for example, obtained a boost in faculty salary scales in this fashion.

When, late in 1957, the board sought to send surveying teams onto the campuses of the Greater University to obtain information on physical facilities and the use of those facilities, the university refused them admission. Objecting to the competence of the people doing the survey and saying that the presence of outside investigators would create problems, the university said it would gather the desired information itself and give it to the board. This it did.

Throughout disputes like these you heard the same repeated theme: That the board was so engaged in regulating details that it was not filling its function of creating a system of higher education in North Carolina. "Excessive interference" with internal problems became a sore point on the campuses of the Greater University.

President Friday and others felt that the board created another obstacle between the university and the General Assembly. In January, 1958, William Aycock, chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, said:

"The executive head of this institution is, in the middle. He

is the narrow neck in an administrative hour-glass. One bulb consists of internal administration and the other bulb is superstructure. For the past few years the sands of administrative authority have been flowing from the internal bulb into the bulb of the superstructure."

One month later W. C. Harris Jr. of Wake County, reflecting a common feeling among members of the university's 100 member board of trustees, said, "The university is slipping away from us . . . We have reached the point where we either don't need our board of trustees or we don't need the Board of Higher Education."

ABOLITION IS ADVOCATED

The faculty of the Greater University shared this view. In February, 1958, a petition asking for the abolition of the Board of Higher Education was circulated on the Woman's College campus. In May of that year a university committee, headed by Henry Brandis, dean of the Law School at Chapel Hill, issued a statement criticizing the board for its interference in university affairs. Such interference, the committee said, "is direct and ultimately can be devastating."

By this point two facts were clear: first, that the presidents of the larger state-supported schools felt that the board was abusing its regulatory functions and ignoring its function as an advisor and as an advocate and, second, that this fundamental clash was aggravated by the personality of Dr. James Harris Purks, the executive director of the Board of Higher Education.

Dr. Purks, who has since retired and has been replaced by Dr. William Archie, was an educator in the classic arts and sciences sense. He took a dim view of usurying the state's colleges and universities as places for vocational-type training. In advocating this view he sailed on a collision course with men like Dr. John Messick and later Dr. Leo Jenkins—of East Carolina College. To these men Purks was just one more "aca-damn-ician."

Moreover, Harris Purks was unskilled in the art of political diplomacy. Brilliant and knowledgeable, he lacked the ability to sell himself and his program to the institutions, to the legislators or to the people. To aggravate matters, he possessed a somewhat brusque talent for bruising what, perhaps, were too easily offended sensibilities.

By 1958 the uproar had reached a point where Governor Luther Hodges felt compelled to intervene. He asked a committee of University of North Carolina trustees, headed by Tom Pearsall of Rocky Mount, to sit down with the Board of Higher Education and "work out the differences."

The upshot of these sessions was less of a compromise than it was a case of trimming the wings of the board. The trustees felt that the board was over-emphasizing its regulatory functions and that, to correct "his, those functions should be clipped.

The clipping was done by the 1959 General Assembly. That term of the legislature:

Re-wrote the budgetary authority of the board with the intent of

making this function more advisory and less regulatory.

Limited the board's authority to "prescribe uniform practices and policies" to one of prescribing "uniform statistical reporting practices and policies."

Specially gave the individual institutions the right of appeal to the General Assembly in cases where the board sought to make an institution discontinue an existing function or activity.

By new wording added to the law, insisted that the board meet its objectives through "the cooperation of all the institutions of higher education . . . each operating under the direction of its own board of trustees in performance of the functions assigned to it."

This wing clipping—and it was designed to be precisely that—closed out the first act in the story of North Carolina's Board of Higher Education. It did not, however—at least not in the minds of men like Leo Jenkins and Bill Friday—settle the fundamental question.

If it was the intention of the 1959 General Assembly to strip the board of its regulatory functions—and, according to men like Senator John Jordan of Wake County, this was the intention—the actual changes made in the law did not do the job.

For example, the 1955 act contained these words: "The board shall make for the development of a system of higher education and shall have the power to require such institutions to conform to such plans."

Those words were dropped from the 1959 act. But they were replaced by words almost as authoritative. They were, "All institutions included in the State System of Higher Education shall conform to the educational functions and activities assigned to them respectively."

In short, the 1959 amendments did not settle the question of whether the Board of Higher Education was to be a regulatory-advisory agency or whether, instead, it was to be essentially an advisory advocate with a minimum of regulatory authority.

The first five years of existence for North Carolina's State Board of Higher Education were stormy.

This agency, created in 1955 to plan and promote the development of a system of higher education in North Carolina at a time of enormous expansion, was intended to bring order in what, prior to 1955, was a disorderly situation; a situation marked by competition among the state-supported institutions, by duplications in the programs in those institutions and by a marked lack of any overall planning to meet the crisis—a crisis born of the postwar "baby boom"—then sweeping down on the state's colleges and university with the force and inevitability of a tidal wave.

By 1961 two facts were clear: First, the Board of Higher Education, despite mounting friction and despite a wing-clipping administered by the 1959 Legislature, had accomplished. These accomplishments included:

A Community College Act, passed by the 1957 General Assembly, under which five two-year colleges have been estab-

Letter

Steno To Council 'Wait A Minute'

To the Editors:

(Note all honor council members:)
To quote a recent Daily Tar Heel editorial, "come on fellows, let's be serious." I read that you boys are going to spend \$400.00 to buy a steno-machine to record future trials. "This machine is operated by a clerk who speaks into a steno-mask. He identifies each speaker and repeats the exact words by persons at the trial." (See yesterday's Tar Heel for further information.) Picture this scene at the next honor council trial where this \$400.00 wonder is being used for the first time.

Presiding Officer: I guess we're ready to begin. Are you ready with that machine?

case is the University versus John Stinson Koznosky. He is charged with entering a girls dorm after hours. How do you plead Koznosky?

Koznosky: Not guilty! I was in that dorm during visiting hours. I just got lost and couldn't find my way out.

P.O.: We'll have to clear that up later. Our first witness is
Steno.: Wait a minute, wait a minute!

P.O.: What's the matter?
Steno.: What did Koznosky say?
P.O.: He pleaded not guilty.
Steno.: (Into the mask) "He pleaded not guilty."

P.O.: Our first witness is Adolph Gruber, Koznosky's roommate. Will you tell the council what Koznosky was doing the last time you saw him on the evening in question.
Gruber: Well, he was walking . . .
Steno.: Just another damn minute! Don't go so fast. I can't talk in shorthand.

Thus I reach the point of the drama. Court reporters are paid good salaries to use this machine and keep records. Are you going to get a trained person to use the machine or will it be somebody who may forget to plug it in? I would suggest buying a good \$200.00 tape recorder and have a reporter jot down the names of the speakers. It would be no trouble to add the names to any transcript of the trial, which I presume, is typed up after the trial. A home recorder would give you four hours of recording time if you used both sides of the tape. The \$200.00 saved could be turned over to the Daily Tar Heel travel fund which I'm sure is somewhat depleted. Or perhaps given to another worthy organization such as the Red Cross Cancer Research or even the Campus Chest. I would hate to see you boys waste \$200.00 of the students money on a project which may or may not prove successful.

—Charles Erierson

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOFFELTER
CHUCK WREYE
Editors

Bill Hobbs — Associate Editor
Wayne King — Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors

Bill Waumett — News Editor
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spis. Ed.
Chris Farran — Matt Welsman
Feature Editors

Harry DeLung — Night Editor
Jim Wallace — Photography Editor
Mike Robinson — Gary Blanchard
Contributing Editors

DAVE MORGAN
Business Manager

Gary Dalton — Advertising Mgr.
John Evans — Circulation Mgr.
Dave Wysong — Subscription Mgr.

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8 per year.
The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.
Published by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.