

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR

Do Us A Favor, Governor

How big is too big?

Administrators of the University of North Carolina have been trying to answer that question since the first growing pains hit Chapel Hill years ago.

With a four-branch University, the problem has come to be primarily one of student population distribution. Last fall 12,130 students enrolled here, 9,806 at Raleigh, 4,721 at Greensboro and 1,815 at Charlotte.

The problem is this: How large can Carolina and N. C. State get without turning into overstrained diploma factories, leaving the other branches at less-than-capacity operation?

Dr. A. K. King of President William C. Friday's office has been making an extensive study of the problem since last fall, and Friday will make a report and recommendations to the board of trustees in May.

One of the unanswered questions is what effect the community college system will have on the University. Will community college graduates flood the University within the next year or two? What curricula will they want?

Information on the experience of other states with these same problems is now being gathered as a part of the study.

So why has Gov. Dan K. Moore decided his opinion of the situation is needed?

An Associated Press story said Thursday morning: "Should enrollment growths be arrested at the University of North Carolina branches in Chapel Hill and Raleigh, supplying increased nourishment to the Greensboro and Charlotte units?"

"Gov. Dan K. Moore is inclined to think so and, at his suggestion, the question will be among those explored by the State Board of Higher Education in a study of where higher education is in North Carolina and where it is going."

The story said Moore "apparently feels" the Chapel Hill campus is approaching its maximum size.

Moore said that he felt that "we should not over-expand at Chapel Hill or at North Carolina State until the other smaller ones are brought up as far as needed or practical."

Then, in a comment reminiscent of his denials of pressuring UNC trustees on the Aptheker-Wilkinson speaker controversy, Moore said:

"I, of course, am not telling the board (of higher education) what to do, but merely suggesting areas of consideration."

The governor certainly underrates himself.

As in the speaker question, he has again publicly stated himself out on an issue; that is, he favors growth restrictions on the Chapel Hill campus.

Does he expect us to believe that knowledge of his position will not affect the members of the board when the time comes for them to make a decision?

How eager will they be to make a choice which will be in opposition to the governor's feelings, which have been clearly implied, if not directly stated?

By speaking out the governor has again complicated a problem facing the University.

Do us a favor, Governor.

Buzz off.

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Ernie McCrary, editor; Pat Stith, managing editor; Barry Jacobs, associate editor; Andy Myers, news editor; Gene Rector, sports editor; Jim Coghill, asst. sports editor; Rick Nichols, night editor; Grady Hubbard, wire editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; David Rothman, columnist; Carol Gallant, secretary; Ed Freakley, Bob Harris, Steve Bennett, Steve Lackey, Glenn Mays, Lytt Stamps, Peattie Fearrington, staff writers; Wayne Hurder, Ron Shinn, Mike O'Leary, copy editors; Bill Rollins, Gene Whisnant, Sandy Treadwell, Drummond Bell, Bill Hass, Jim Fields, sports writers; Jeff MacNelly, sports cartoonist.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.



Phil Clay

Compulsory High School Education Is Necessary

Nothing is so important to our state and nation as its education system. The requirements for national defense and economic growth underline this need.

The poverty program, in attempting to solve several socio-economic problems, is finding that education is the root of the problem. In this article, we shall take North Carolina as typical of the extent to which quantity and quality is lacking in our educational system.

Several statistics help us see the size of the problem: 1) Of the 113,000 students who entered the first grade in 1948-49, more than 67,000 dropped out before graduation. This represents 60%. 2) More than 50% of North Carolina males examined by the Selective Service are rejected because they fail to meet the mental requirements. 3) Median years completed by adults over 25 years is 8.9, compared to 10.6 nationally. This ranks North Carolina 45th in the nation.

These statistics and others give North Carolina the distinction of being one of the ten most ignorant states in the union! This is, to say the least, an ignoble distinction. The present law requires students to attend school until they reach the age of 16 years. As a result of parental neglect or lack of enforcement, many do not attend school until they reach this age.

My position is that attendance should be mandatory and enforced until the child has reached the age of 18 years at which time we can expect that he will have completed his high school education. This is a strong suggestion, not likely to fall on receptive ears in the General Assembly. Too many of our politicians know full well that their security is directly proportional to the ignorance of their constituents.

To make high school education compulsory will require some basic changes in our educational structure and in our social outlook. Most fundamentally, it will require a new definition of high school education.

We propose it to mean more than education in the liberal arts and college prep courses, but we propose broad commercial, vocational and industrial curricula which are geared to offer something relevant to everyone. Work-study programs, industrial internships may be necessary.

These new comprehensive high schools should meet our rewards to all, not just to the bright college-bound kid. They will require more and better teachers. These teachers must not only be willing to teach the bright and the obviously talented, but they must be willing and able to discover that hidden talent in a less bright child and help him cultivate it so that he will be on the tax role instead of the welfare roll.

More classrooms and educational facilities will be needed. School officials will be forced to come up with imaginative new programs to appeal to all students and to insure that no thirst goes unquenched and no mind goes unchallenged. Cross-class and cross-racial academic and vocational environment must also be prerequisites to quality education.

Finally, increased liaison with parents must be effected. This will require, in most cases, greater initiative on the part of teachers and in larger areas, it will require a school sociologist or counselor. In many areas, parents must be taught the value of education in the context of their own experience, and not in middle-class intellectual terms.

To these proposals, strong voices of opposition are heard. These voices are bound to tragic myths about education. The following are several points they make.

First, some say that education is not for everybody. This reflects the idea of an educated class. They think education is a luxury to be enjoyed by and limited to the "haves" in our society. This idea is totally bankrupt because education is not an item of luxury, but an item of national defense.

Others point out that some people are uneducable. This is true only because we make it so. Progressive educators feel that programs can be developed to bring almost everyone to functional literacy. If there are those in our society who are truly retarded, then a strong system of schools for them should be developed.

Some voices proclaim that forcing the lazy, shiftless and filthy to attend school will lower the quality of education and result in chaos and disorder. This would not happen in a comprehensive school system that offers something for everyone.

To those who would make this charge, I only remind them of the faces in the riot. The conditions of squalor and anger are the

Barry Jacobs

War Debate Still Justified

The debate in Congress over our involvement in Viet Nam has reached a high level of intensity; and, inevitably, the cry has been raised that enough has been said, that the prolonged debate only hinders the war effort and gives hope to our enemies. Sen. Everett Dirksen of Illinois, Republican leader in the Senate, said substantially this earlier this week.

The debates and hearings on Viet Nam do present a ticklish problem. They do give the impression—a true one—that the American people are not united in their support of the



war. Advocates of shutting off the criticism claim that this evidence of dissent encourages the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese to carry on with the war in the hope that the dissident elements in this country will force the United States out of the war.

The war, these people say, is there. Perhaps we made a mistake in getting involved in it, but there is nothing we can do about it now. Arguing about whether we should be in the war serves no useful purpose and only hurts the country. The national security, they say, requires that free expression on this question should be muzzled.

While those opposing extended debate on the war all are supporters of our role in it, those favoring the continuation of the discussions and hearings come from both sides. All critics of the war, of course, want to

continue the debate. They hope to convince others, and perhaps even the Administration, that we should get out of the war.

Some of the advocates of continued debate, though, are supporters of the war who feel that a full airing of the issues and policies that have resulted in our involvement in the war is both beneficial to the country and a right of the people. The American citizens have a right to know exactly what we are doing in Viet Nam, how we got there, and what our aims are.

At this time, a free debate on the war still seems justified. The people have been in the dark for a long time about this war, and it may take a long time to enlighten them. Yet, as long as the people, through their elected representatives, are running the country, they must be enlightened. An informed public is the cornerstone of our system of government. Congressional elections are coming up, and the war is certain to be the No. 1 issue. To cast intelligent ballots, the voters must be aware of the facts and opinions that are being presented.

In this situation, of course, a free flow in information is not an unmixed blessing. The image of dissent that the debates project won't help the country. That, however, is one of the penalties of our system of government. If the Administration feels that the military situation is serious enough to justify curtailment of basic rights, then it should order the country on a full-scale wartime footing, including not only censorship, but also such things as price and wage controls.

The Student Speaks

Myths About Iowa Should Be Corrected

By BRIAN C BRUSH

After reading David Rothman's entertaining satire on the state of Iowa, and after hearing my fellow students express many misconceptions concerning that state, I feel it is my duty to break through the popular myths and misconceptions and make my contribution to the education and "culture" of the readers (and writers) of The Daily Tar Heel.

Myth No. 1: Iowans are illiterate and uncultured. The fact is that the state of Iowa has the highest literacy rate in the nation. Furthermore, in addition to the three state institutions of higher learning, there are approximately 30 accredited private four-year colleges and universities and numerous junior colleges to serve a population of approximately 2,800,000.

Last year Time magazine ran a feature on the University of Iowa, calling it one of the finest state universities in the nation, and particularly emphasizing the quality of its medical and law schools.

Iowa has long been the base of research for Dr. James Van Allen, discoverer of the famed Van Allen radiation belts, who has contributed much in the way of space re-

search.

Iowa's sister institution, Iowa State University, has long been recognized as outstanding in the fields of engineering, science, and agriculture.

Myth No. 2: Iowa is rural and backward. Iowa is indeed proud of its agricultural productivity. Last year the total value of its agricultural produce ranked second only to California, and it must be remembered that Iowa ranks 25th among the states in area.

Principle products are corn, soybeans, beef, pork, and poultry. When Soviet leader Khrushchev toured the United States he was particularly interested in our tremendous agricultural productivity and spent considerable time as a guest of the owner and operator of a typical modern Iowa farm.

It should be noted, however, that the value of Iowa's industrial output last year was roughly three and one-half times the value of its agricultural output. In addition to toiling in such agriculture-related industries as farm machinery and meat-packing, Iowans also produce on a large scale such diversified products as refrigerators,

air conditioners, washing machines, but-tons, and radio equipment, among many others.

One firm in Cedar Rapids produces much of the intricate and complex radio equipment that soars into outer space with our astronauts, and regularly gains million-dollar contracts from the federal government for research and development in the space field.

To keep this short, I will simply add that Iowa is not flat, and Iowa does not produce much wheat! Iowa has no speaker controversy (although it is conceivable that such a misfortune could happen in any state), and it is quite easy (and legal) to buy an honest - to - goodness drink in the state, although the liquor laws are strictly enforced and penalties for violations (such as drunk driving) are severe.

Iowa, of course, has its problems, as do all states, and all states have their claims to fame, but if any objective analysis one can only conclude that Iowa was surely blessed by God. Perhaps not all young Iowa girls take ballet lessons, but believe it or not, there are some who do. It helps their basketball.

