

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 26, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. XLX, No. 31

'Welcome,' Jim Beatty, A Dedicated Individual

A living symbol of supreme dedication, these are the words that seem best to describe Jim Beatty, a Carolina alumnus, and one of the greatest distance runners the world has known.

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to welcome him back to this campus. When he was here he participated vigorously in numerous phases of Carolina college life, contributing much to athletics and to other extracurriculars. His services were appreciated by many—his athletic prowess was read about by all. But that which is played up and read about an athlete like Jim Beatty seems too often to focus on the sensational—on the isolated instances of athletic success. We read most often about the "good race" or the world-record time—and not often enough about the great amount of personal sacrifice or discipline which are, so to speak, the "occupational hazards" of post-collegiate athletic endeavors.

We read and talk about Jim's success in particular track meets, but we seldom pause to reflect on the many many hours of work that have

brought him that success; we tend to think of the great athlete in terms of glory and newspaper headlines, rather than in terms of work and personal dedication. And this puts the emphasis in the wrong place.

The true strength and character of a Jim Beatty seems not to reside in the fact that he can outrun any other man in the world for two miles, but rather, in the fact that he is a dedicated individual, that he has powerfully strong convictions, and that he is willing, in a time when most of us won't even walk to work in pursuit of the American dollar, to run miles daily in pursuit of personal and physical discipline.

This dedication and pursuit of convictions makes Jim Beatty and other amateur athletes of his stature truly great men. They do not receive monetary remuneration, they do not run in search of headlines; they strive in the pursuit of excellence, they sacrifice because of convictions—and it is this for which we seek to honor Jim Beatty, a living symbol of supreme, successful dedication. (CW)

Are You A Rude Student?

In this age of hustle and disorganization, too many crude and rude acts are becoming a common-place occurrence. That which was shunned by our elders seems to find its place in the younger student-generation as quite the thing to do.

The faults and foibles of students are, certainly, not without parallels in other segments of American society, but they are none-the-less disconcerting when encountered with overwhelming frequency.

A discussion of rude acts, performed in most cases even unconsciously, would lead one afar, but staying close to home, it is with regret that we note two particular rude acts which seem highly indicative of a thoughtless student body. It is not so much that the student body as a whole commits these blunders, but rather, by toleration we seem to admit their acceptability.

Not the worst, but the first and most common rudeness we would mention is the frequency with which students totally—indeed ignorantly—disregard signs which plead for "No Smoking." These signs are

most often posted in new or "renovated" buildings; they seem to be pleading for the preservation of the desks and floors which suffer from the scars of cigarette burns; they seem to ask only one small favor from the "weed fiend" that he refrain—for fifty paltry minutes—from scarring and stinking up the place with his ugly habit. Surely, this is not asking too much. It is not a demand, merely a request—a request that we passively preserve the limited supply of buildings and desks with which we are trying to educate ourselves.

Second, and most disgusting, of the rude-students' habits is the "packing-up" which occurs at the end of a lecture period. In many instances, a professor will inadvertently run his lecture or comments over the established time for a particular class, but this seems, in most cases, to be in attempt to make a point more clearly to the class, in an attempt to help them understand something.

Therefore, we fail to see how the rude student can justify shuffling his feet and books, as he packs up his junk to charge on to his next "educational" encounter. How can he stop taking notes so rapidly? How can he forget the point being made so suddenly?

We can only conclude that if the student's mind can be "turned off" so quickly at the end of the hour, it must never be "turned on" in the first place—which must account for his ignorance. (CW)

Happy Day

The silly observances of "Days" for everything from Strained Grapefruit Juice Day to Organized Ping-Pong Day has gone too far.

The Security Council of the United Nations adjourned for five hours yesterday afternoon, in the midst of the all-important Cuban discussions, to observe U.N. Day.

And how was U.N. Day observed?—the delegates heard a concert given by the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra. (JC)

The Other Road



Higher Education Board Was Evaluated Along Mich. Lines

(Eds' Note: This is the third installment in an analysis of the state's Board of Higher Education and its role in developing North Carolina's colleges and Universities.)

By CHESTER DAVIS
In The Winston-Salem Journal and Sentinel

In essence the subcommittee proposed to (1) turn control of the board over to professional educators, by increasing the board's membership from nine to 15 and requiring that seven of the 15 be college presidents, and (2) to strip the board of every regulatory function it possessed.

When you recall that the Board of Higher Education originally was intended to be a regulatory-educatory body with broad powers and, what's more a board made up entirely of laymen with a statewide viewpoint, it is not stretching the facts to describe these proposals as disembodying.

The curious thing is that these proposals made by the subcommittee were supported by Dallas Herring, a member of the Board of Higher Education, they were at least accepted for the moment by Major L. P. McLendon, chairman of the Board of Higher Education, and they were approved by Dr. William Archie, executive director of the Board of Higher Education.

The fact these men tolerated and even endorsed what amounted to the gutting of their own operation reflects disenchantment (Dallas Herring), awareness that the board was not meeting the function for which it was created (William Archie), and the fact the doctored Major was sound asleep at the switch.

But not for long. By May of 1962 Major McLendon was crying, "While I was silent and in this the Major is kinder to himself than the facts justify" they gutted the board. McLendon's objections to the proposed changes ran along these lines:

The claim that the Board of Higher Education must have regulatory as well as advisory powers if it is to be effective. (This claim is entirely in line with the recommendations of the study commission which recommended the creation of a Board of Higher Education in 1955. It is in line, also with the thinking of the legislature as reflected in the plain wording of the 1955 law establishing the board.)

The argument that college presidents have no more business serving on a board designed to regulate the colleges than the president of the Duke Power Company has serving on the State Utilities Commission.

The claim—a valid one on the facts—that the law which established the board plainly ruled that college presidents and other self-interested persons should not serve as members of the board.

The claim—more subject to question but very possibly valid—that these changes would, in effect, place the control of the Board of Higher Education in the hands of the University of

North Carolina. Here McLendon argued that the college presidents on the board would tend to support the university's position on all issues since they so badly needed the university leadership and political potency in their struggle for increased financial support from the General Assembly.

A QUESTION OF PURPOSE
The essential issue posed by the subcommittee's recommendations was whether the Board of Higher Education was to remain an advisory and a regulatory agency controlled by disinterested laymen or whether, instead, it was to be changed to a purely advisory body dominated by college presidents.

In posing that question, McLendon triggered a great outburst of editorial—and other—wisdom. In the main this opinion tended toward two conclusions: (1) that North Carolina had a real need for some overall board to plan and supervise the development of an education system in a time of vast expansion and expenditures, and (2) that to be effective such a board probably should have regulatory as well as purely advisory functions.

Leo Jenkins and Bill Friday, two of the most politically potent educators in the state, supported the proposed changes. Inasmuch as the Board of Higher Education originally was established, among other things, to protect the university from the ambitions of schools like East Carolina College, the two men made strange bed-fellows. In this instance they were not willing to take on a bitter and probably prolonged fight as a price for sleeping together.

Instead they suggested a compromise. Their compromise proposal was approved by the majority of the Carlyle Commission on July 6, 1962. Under this proposal:

The membership of the Board of Higher Education would be increased from nine to 11 members. Of these seven would be laymen and four would be college presidents. The president of the Greater University of North Carolina would be the only permanent member of the board.

The board's important power to allocate functions to the various institutions would be restored.

The board's budgetary functions would be made more advisory and much less regulatory. The old idea of a line-by-line analysis of each institution's budget was ruled out.

The board's power "to prescribe uniform statistical practices" was watered down to one of collecting, analyzing and publishing statistics on higher education.

Under the existing law the board is "to plan and promote the development of a sound, vigorous, progressive and coordinated system of higher education in North Carolina." In the proposed compromise plan this is changed by deleting the words

"and promote."

A TWO-FOLD PROPOSAL

Boiled down to essentials the compromise proposal does two things: (1) it gives laymen a seven-to-four majority control of the Board of Higher Education, and (2) it so re-words the law that the Board of Higher Education is made into more of an advisory than a regulatory body. Even so, the compromise plan permits the board to retain some of its more important regulatory functions.

In approving these proposed changes, the majority of the Carlyle Commission made these points:

First, the Board of Higher Education, as presently set up, has not fully met the purpose for which it was created.

The chief defect of the Board of Higher Education is that it has not provided the affirmative, creative leadership which higher education needs in this state.

It has not done the necessary job of formulating state-wide higher education plans and policies which have coherence and perspective in broad terms.

(To Be Continued)

Letters To The Editors

Talk Shouldn't Be Harangue

Lowenstein: Give Analytic Speech

Never have so many been so happy about so little at UNC. Monday night Mr. Lowenstein talked about Spain and the Franco regime. Part of his audience was disgusted; part was romantically excited.

Mr. Lowenstein infuriated that part of his audience expecting a rigorous political analysis—as it should be—in the case of Spain—with a thorough description of the brutality of the Franco dictatorship, more representative of the business to which universities are usually dedicated. Then he concluded, for the good of the American and the Spanish people, that American aid to Franco should be stopped, as to enable a more democratic regime to come into power through free elections.

Granted that Franco's regime is a dictatorship supported by force, that the Spanish workers' living conditions are miserable relative to the rest of Europe, and that Franco's era is passing for the betterment of Spanish democracy through its integration into the Common Market. But the fact that Mr. Lowenstein presented an emotional newsreel rather than a political analysis is granted too.

It is pitiful, at a university dedicated to intellect rather than emotion, to hear a 50-minute presentation of Spain's politics engulfed in so much detailed "documentations" of crimes committed by Franco's police

and to hear a speaker admit, at the beginning of his speech, that he is emotionally involved in the problem to be analyzed and discussed—scientifically, I suppose. But it is more pitiful to hear an attempted discussion on Spain ignoring the consideration of essential factors of Spanish political life without which conclusions will necessarily lead to falsehood, such as: 1) what brought about the Spanish Civil War, 2) political alternatives of Spain at the time, 3) economic alternatives of any kind of regime after the war, and most important 4) to what extent could Spain have been democratized given the anarchy of Spanish institutions and beliefs at the time.

I am sure some people will think I am too petulant and impractical for matters of discussion, in asking for so many "unnecessary details" from so far back. Well, it is a matter of opinion whether we should at least try to think analytically or not, and this is also a reason why Ayn Rand hasn't been the only one to preach at Gerrard Hall.

—Hugo Speicher

Phelps, Blanchard Remain In Cuba

To the Editors:
I would like very much to be the first contributor to a fund I hope to see established for a great cause on the UNC campus. This fund will be a part of the great GPTCC action

Several times, during the preceding weeks, it has been our great pleasure to be a guest of the Spencer girls and their fine piano. Seldom have we spent more enjoyable evenings, and never have we entertained for a more gracious and responsive group of people.

This gives the lie to the oft-repeated maxim that today's college audiences are among the rudest and least appreciative to be found. Indeed, after a too long spate of night of night club engagements around the county, we found the comely residents of Spencer dormitory to be as warm and receptive as any audience we have known.

(Note to these girls from Cobb who asked for equal time: your piano has had the course. If you pressure your dorm mother, she just might have it tuned, repaired or replaced. Try it and see.)

It was on a day not wholly unlike this one that we were sitting in Professor Lyman Gotten's course in Modern Poetry—some eight years ago. To the immediate left of us sat a good friend, who when called upon to speak, would deliver his opinions in organ-toned rhetoric.

We turned to him and expressed the opinion that with a voice such as his, he should be in radio or television.

"You're right," said Charles Kuralt. "I've been giving it a lot of thought lately."

On the subject of courses, one of

the most stimulating offered here at university is Professor Hugh Holman's course in the English Novel. You will have to look long and hard to find a more richly rewarding and deeply satisfying experience than this.

The weight lifting boys keep complaining to us that their sport is being slighted by the powers in charge. They suggest the weights be moved from the dark and chilly cranny of the Tin Can to a more appropriate place—such as a certain unused room in the warm, snug confines of Woolen. State has such a room set aside, as does Wake Forest. How about it, someone?

Special memo to coeds, all ages: The "Supplement on Women" in October's Harper's magazine may shock you or anger you, but it is guaranteed to make you think and examine your values anew in this constantly changing society, where pressure seems to come from all sides. Of particular interest to you is the article entitled, "Growing Up Female" by Dr. Bruno Bettelheim. Read it! then read it again.

Our Franklin Street Favorite is our good friend, Kemp Nye, who used to be a champion broad jumper for the Marine Corps. If you doubt this, ask him to show the picture to you—K. B. flying through the air with the greatest of ease. I think he used to be breaking records; now he's selling them.

On Lincoln, Duke, And Cuban Trips

By ARMISTEAD MAUPIN, JR.
MAIL

Last week's quote from Lincoln on racial inequality brought some fan mail from one of the ivy-covered minds at Duke University.

This one admirer informs us that it was "just like a damned conservative to live 100 years in the past." And, after graciously conceding that many Carolina graduates had been so fortunate as to win posts in the Kennedy administration, the writer concludes that our "conservative propaganda lies won't work."

Well now, we're a bit taken aback by this eloquent assault on our principles. And he's right, of course. We conservatives do live in the past. We cling with a stubborn tenacity to such outmoded documents as the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. We live with the illusion that the decentralized government of our forefathers was a desirable and healthy thing. We still look for a solution to the nation's problems in the philosophies of Thomas Jefferson and John Locke, rather than entrusting our futures to the wisdom of Walter Reuther and Harry Golden . . . we're funny that way.

There's no doubt about it, Sam;

you made a good point there. Yes sir, a really good point.

—TEDDY
William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of NATIONAL REVIEW, contends that "the argument against electing Ted Kennedy to the Senate is not that he is the brother of Jack Kennedy, but that he approves of Jack Kennedy."

FIGURES
Since Wednesday was U.N. Day in N.C. or something, we were particularly interested in some State Department figures on the subject. This year the U.N. and its affiliated organizations will spend \$502 million. The United States will pay 47 1/2% of it.

P.L.
For the first time in a long time we agree with a DTH editor. We are referring to Chuck Wrye's wish that Larry Phelps and other members of the Progressive Labor Club would have a "very, very long" stay in Cuba this Christmas. And this raises the point that the American Legion might not be needed after all. For, if the P.L. keeps up at this rate, it will simply be laughed out of existence.

otherwise known as the "Get Phelps to Cuba Campaign." I believe the majority of the UNC students would aid this cause, and would like to envision Larry Phelps accompanied by the Progressive Labor Club and the New Left roaming around Castro's kingdom.

This campaign will be conducted by Mr. Phelps in consultation with his publicity manager Mr. Gary Blanchard, most noble supporter of free thought, will agree to the following conditions:

1. That Larry take all members of the P.L.C., New Left, and a dozen other useless groups at UNC with him.

2. That Phelps take Gary Blanchard along to supply the great news story to the CHARLOTTE OBSERVER and take our own outstanding Jim Clotfelter, more commonly known as (JC), along so the DTH can once again bring out the spot publication of distorted news.

3. That Phelps and all his comrades stay in Cuba until I (and all other students who are sick from reading about Phelps) graduate.

Maybe some student who has lots of excess time on his hand could write or go to the State Department and express our desire to see Phelps get permission for his Cuban trip. We could even send pickets to Washington or parade to the South Building and have "A Minute for Phelps" demonstration. Pending survival of the Cuban campaign, one way tickets on extremely slow boats to Red China will be supplied to the Phelps delegation.

—Morris Houten

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

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

Bill Waunett — News Editor
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. 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: \$4.00 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.