

# The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor

Bill Staton, Business Manager



Dale Gibson, Managing Editor  
Rebel Good, News Editor  
Harvey Elliott, Features Editor  
Owen Davis, Sports Editor  
Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor  
Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager



Dow And Napalm: Is It Right?

## Dow, Lipsitz Match Minds In Debate On Morality

A Dow Chemical Company representative comes to campus today armed with arguments, not napalm, for a confrontation with representatives of the New Left.

The representative will be debating political science professor Lewis Lipsitz at 8 p.m. in Gerrard Hall on the question of Dow's moral right to make napalm and their right to recruit on campus.

Most campus radicals will probably be there eager to put the Dow man on the spot and learn what he has to say. However, if the situation is as usual, there will probably be few people there from the other side of the fence to either back up the Dow man or to try to learn from the radicals. This is highly unfortunate.

Middle of the roaders and conservatives on campus have a tendency to complain bitterly about the strength and vociferousness of persons on the left but they themselves never show the desire to either try to learn what the radicals have to offer or to confront the radicals with their own ideas and try to stand up for their views rationally.

Tonight will probably be a repeat of the usual, with students complaining in their dorms about the radicals and such but not bothering to show up at Gerrard Hall for the big debate.

We hope not. We hope that you, radical, middle of the roader, or reactionary, will come and try to learn from the others and offer them something to think about.

## Agnew Attacks The Best Aspect Of Poverty War

One of the few really beneficial contributions of the Johnson administration seems headed down the drain at the hands of the Republican Administration.

Vice President-elect Spiro Agnew told urban administrators at a national convention in New Orleans Monday that participation by the poor in poverty programs should be encouraged "where they can make an effective contribution."

"All too often participation of the poor has been construed to mean playing both patient and doctor; when all too often the unhappy result has ranged from protracted delay at best to extravagant boon-doggling at worst."

One of the best features of Johnson's War on Poverty was his incorporation of the poor into some essential aspects of the fight letting them be both doctor and patient. An now Agnew wants to eliminate that participation because it has too often been inefficient.

In expressing such a desire Agnew's ignorance of the problems of poverty shine through clearly. What he is asking for is a remodification of the poverty program so that it will work to bring the poor back into the economic mainstream of the country without doing anything to bring them psychologically and politically back into the mainstream. And, if the Nixon administration succeeds in getting the changes that Agnew advocates, they will quickly find out that the efficient organization that they are seeking will do little to really improve the situation of the poor in the country.

The main poverty program that has been the subject of attacks by politicians have been the Community Action Programs that

allow the poor to get together and request funds from the federal government for certain activities, such as adult education, child care programs, etc. These programs have often not been the most efficient and there has probably been a lot of money spent by CAP's that should not have been spent. However, what Agnew wants is more inefficient and harmful in the long run than any boondoggling by an organization of the poor.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 recognizes in establishing the CAP that there is more to poverty than a sheer money problem of the poverty-stricken. The CAP program, the bill states, seeks the "elimination of poverty or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work."

To accomplish that goal takes more than just an efficient organization run by a bunch of government bureaucrats or local politicians, which is apparently what Agnew thinks it takes and which he wants.

By having control of the programs the individual can eliminate that personal sense of inadequacy and helplessness that characterize the poor and which keep them from advancing in our society. Elimination of the psychological problems the poor, both black and white, face is far more important than any amount of efficiency and until these problems are eliminated there is little hope that the poor can enter the mainstream of America, making efficient expenditures of money foolish, when they exclude the poor from decisionmaking.

### Letters To The Editor

# Booklet Needs Faculty Umph

To The Editor:

The most important information in the Course Evaluation Booklet is what Warren Schonfeld and Joyce Davis included in the preface: only about half of 300 different members participating gave their permission for their evaluations to be published. It seems that in the next Evaluation Booklet to come out a special effort should be made to publish the evaluations of all the teachers participating—good and bad.

I recognize that a certain amount of teacher cooperation is helpful in putting together this type of report, but to publish an incomplete evaluation booklet is to sacrifice the quality of it to comply with the demands of the teachers who get poor ratings.

If it takes extra time to interview

students against the wishes of the teacher in order to get a truthful, publishable evaluation of their course, then it is worth it. On the whole I think the booklet was worthwhile, but doesn't the student have the right to know the truth about the uninteresting, ill-prepared, unconcerned teachers too?

Mike Kessler  
109 Fraternity Court  
Sigma Nu

### Closed-Mind 'Liberalism' Hit

To The Editor:

These comments are in response to a

letter from a "liberal" soldier of the "Kennedy-Humphrey" classification, Lt. Donald P. Martin. He asserts that, "...there are certain institutions which can not be democratic and can not be primarily concerned always with the welfare of the individual. One of these is the military."

Since you, Lt. Martin, are in your words, "a liberal," do you not hold ideals of democracy, the right of people to choose their own form of government, freedom of speech, etc.? Does the military not contradict these ideals—especially when your U.S. army supports tyranny and fascism in Vietnam, South America, and even in Chicago. Perhaps you have been brainwashed by the liberal hypocrisy so widely disseminated in the United States.

In the words of Herbert Marcuse, "Its

(this society's) productivity is destructive of the free development of human needs and facilities, its peace maintained by the constant threat of war, its growth dependent on the repression of the real possibilities for pacifying the struggle for existence..." To you, Lt. Martin, I suggest you examine the relevance of Marcuse's exposition on one-dimensional thought in his book, One-Dimensional Man.

Sincerely,  
Charles Richter  
Assistant Professor

### Grad Remarks Uninformed

To The Editor:

In a letter to the Tar Heel on Saturday (Grad Hits Demonstration) an army lieutenant makes a few ill-informed observations about the nature and necessity of military discipline with which I would like to take issue.

As an example of military discipline the writer describes a tactical order given by an officer to an enlisted man in a combat situation. He points to the absurdity of the EM's refusal to carry out the order on the grounds that he is a free citizen, and doesn't have to.

Unfortunately, the lieutenant uses this argument to demonstrate that free speech (indeed, a 'free' mind) in the army can not be permitted. An analogy in civilian life illustrates the error: it is not necessary to suspend and/or abrogate the right of free speech to cause men to stop at red lights or to pay their taxes, in other words, to obey lawful orders.

The military's myopic view is that the only alternative to total discipline is anarchy. "Perhaps," writes the lieutenant, "many of you who have not been in the service find this idea to be authoritarian, an infringement on the personal freedom of the individual." There are many of us who have been in who feel the same way, lieutenant, primarily because of the inability of officers such as yourself to understand what personal freedom and individual dignity mean.

Sincerely,  
Martin H. Violette  
209½ McCauley St.



### Chapel Hill Weekly

# UNC's Thrust At Greatness (?)

Maybe it was only unlucky coincidence, but few things have been more awkward for UNC than for the Consolidated University to unveil its Long-Range Planning Summary at the instant that the UNC Board of Trustees was recommending the adjunction of Wilmington and Asheville-Biltmore Colleges as the fifth and sixth branches of the Mighty Oak.

The Long-Range Planning Summary is a splendid document, charting the Consolidated University's course for the next decade. Supported by statistics, charts, reasonable projections and God knows how much prayerful consideration, it tells that the four branches of the University are doing now, what needs to be done in the decade ahead, and what the University could do given proper support by the State.

In a foreword to the Summary, President William Friday says:

"This study gives the best estimate now available of the probable demand for university educated manpower in the next decade. It also shows clearly that the University of North Carolina (four branches) and the other institutions that furnished the information used in this study (Duke and Wake Forest) have programs either in being or in the planning stage that could meet this demand."

(Not a word to be found about the need for two more UNC branches to do the job.)

"The demand will be met," Mr. Friday goes on, "if the University (four branches) is given sufficient support to provide the necessary staff and facilities and, further, if enough qualified and motivated students apply for admission to certain critical fields."

There is not, in the University's entire Long-Range Planning Summary, so much as a fleeting mention of Asheville-Biltmore and/or Wilmington Colleges.

A great deal of attention is paid, however, to the present University branches at Greensboro and Charlotte. Greensboro is credited with "making steady progress to University status," some years after having been adorned with nominal University status. Charlotte, the Summary notes, "has just established itself as an accredited undergraduate college," some three and a half years after having been legally declared a university. (Please bear in mind that those are the Consolidated University's assessments of its two urchin branches.)

The Long-Range Planning Summary

states, "A problem which confronts the University is that of strengthening, enlarging, and enriching the programs of (Greensboro, and Charlotte) without inhibiting the continued growth of (Chapel Hill and Raleigh)."

The Board of Trustees' solution to this particular problem, as to how to nourish two stepchildren without draining the parents, is to adopt two more stepchildren.

The Long-Range Planning of the Consolidated University, as opposed to the eager recommendation of the University Board of Trustees to bring Wilmington and Asheville into the fold, raises some disturbing questions.

One question is whether the University is making any sort of effort at all to follow the legal guidelines for adding new campuses.

Under the legislation enacted by the 1963 General Assembly, the trustees must find that sufficient educational need exists to justify establishment of additional campuses. No such need has been substantiated. In fact, the University's own Long-Range Planning Summary states clearly that the existing branches are sufficient to satisfy projected demands.

Under the 1963 law, it must also appear probable, to the trustees, that additional funds can be made available to establish and maintain such additional campuses without impairing the quality and extent of instructional and research programs at existing campuses.

To put it charitably, the trustees haven't the foggiest notion as to whether such additional funds would be available. If the trustees had to make a wild guess, they would have to say chances will be ghostly at best of rowling that kind of seed money out of the Legislature anytime soon.

The law governing the grafting of additional branches onto UNC is subject to approval of the State Board of Higher Education, and then approval and provision of adequate financial support by the General Assembly.

It might be noted that the State Board of Higher Education has just issued a landmark study report calling for a central agency which would oversee all of North Carolina's institutions of higher learning. By sheer coincidence, the Higher Education Board's report preceded the UNC trustees' recommendation by a matter of days. The Higher Education Board's recommendation for a central agency was a direct challenge to the University's autonomy. To suggest, or

even dream, that the State Board of Higher Education will now fly right into the face of its own proposal by approving two more branches and more empire-building for the Consolidated University, is to suggest the fantastic. And yet, that is exactly what the trustees are asking the Higher Education Board to do.

Conceivably the University would press on, despite a flat no from the Higher Education Board. Such things have been known to happen. But then would come the matter of approval and funding by the General Assembly.

No prudent soul would predict what the General Assembly might do about higher education or anything else. But it should be noted that Governor-elect Robert Scott is already on record as recommending that the basic structure of higher education in North Carolina, in particular the Consolidated University's structure, be allowed to set a spell, without any radical changes. Even the trustees would have to concede that adding two more branches would be a pretty radical change.

Then there is Thomas J. White, State Senator, Advisory Budget Commission chairman, Appropriations Committee chairman, and UNC trustee, who will serve in the 1969 Legislature as Governor Scott's legislative liaison man. When Charlotte College came up for adoption by UNC, Senator White stood alone in protest. He thought the University was moving too fast. He still thinks so. And yet, when the Wilmington and Asheville recommendations came to a vote, Tom White, as a UNC trustee, was in favor of adoption. Why this obvious change of heart? Well, Old Tom said, in effect, so long as they're tying the UNC rag on every bush, they might as well tie it on Wilmington and Asheville too. A sterling piece of logic, refreshing in its candor.

The final question, then, is what's behind the whole move in recommending that the University bring in Asheville and Wilmington as its fifth and sixth branches.

The Consolidated University itself argues persuasively against such a proposition, at the same time that the Board of Trustees urges its implementation. This could be written off as a staggering arrogance of power—for the University to show such a recommendation to be ill-conceived, ill-considered and unjustified, and then expect its acceptance simply because the University recommended it. We cannot yet assign that sort of arrogance to UNC.

Another possible answer is that most of the UNC trustees are uninformed, misinformed, or added. That answer also is hard to buy.

The only other possible answer we can come up with is that the expansion is a cold-blooded political move, calculated to buy the University broader legislative support, to whip up popular adulation, and to frustrate the State Board of Higher Education.

Whether intentional or not, the University has given the back of its hand to the Higher Education Board's recommendation for central control of all institutions of higher learning. And whether the Higher Education Board's recommendation is sound or not, the University has responded with a flat no without waiting for a fair public hearing or dispassionate legislative examination.

The University has, in our opinion, made a political decision and then, altogether lamely, attempted to support it with educational arguments.

The only conclusion left to be drawn is that the University of North Carolina is now willing to trade its institutional integrity for legislative clout. It will, by bringing in Wilmington and Asheville by whatever pretense, be able to pick up support from Mountain and Down East legislators and their constituents.

Regardless of the appropriations and public esteem that might accrue, the day the trustees' recommendation wins final approval will be a sorry one for UNC. This University, which has been so contemptuous of the legislative log-rolling, the groveling for public favor, and the regional university status accorded to East Carolina and those others, will have gone them several times better in shouldering its way to the trough.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods. Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers—editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C. Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester. We regret that we can accept only prepaid subscriptions.