

# Faculty Activists Regarded Trite

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Professor Arnold Nash's letter in the DTH of Dec. 4, in which he defends the recent actions of the campus chapter of the A A U P holding a closed meeting, was reminiscent of the old saying: "With friends like that, you don't need any enemies."

Not that Prof. Nash is to be singled out for blame, mind you. If anything, he is to be commended for his candor. For what the good professor seem-

ed to be saying, in effect, was that the local chapter of the AAUP is in the main just a harmless group of pedigreed people — good fellows all — who respond to the subtle stirrings of social responsibility by coming together (rather infrequently) to discuss matters that are largely beyond their power to influence, even if they had the bad taste to want to influence such matters.

And the cloak of anonymity rightly surrounds such meetings, he would probably con-

tend, because of the potentially daring nature of the ideas expressed in the process of free and full debate — ideas which, inaccurately reported, might misrepresent the actual position of one or all of the participants in this exciting adventure in group dynamics.

What the good professor seems to be wondering, in sum, is why the devil all this commotion by certain members of the Fourth Estate and the body politic in general? "Is there nothing sacred anymore?" he

seems to ask.

Some will undoubtedly say that I am being too hard on Prof. Nash in translating his remarks as I have above. Those who say this would probably be right. After all, the local chapter of the AAUP did come out against the Gag Law.

Despite this sterling demonstration of courage, I am reminded of another occasion last year, when the Town of Chapel Hill was gripped by political paralysis in the wake of civil rights demonstrations, and Prof. Nash led the local chapter of the AAUP in staging a thrilling demonstration of moral myopia.

Reminded of this fact and others concerning the AAUP's suffocatingly narrow definition of its proper role, and mindful of the present storm of criticism directed at the AAUP, I wonder when Prof. Nash and his like-minded faculty fellows are going to awaken to the meaning of all this criticism, and to an understanding of the opportunity it contains.

For it seems to me eminently reasonable that the criticism of the AAUP is a far broader criticism of the faculty in general, which the AAUP — as an independent-looking body — happens for better or for worse, to symbolize to the general public. The criticism means that the public looks to the faculty for discussion about, and leadership in resolving, the problems of the University; and that the public is greatly disappointed to get neither from a group which should be vitally concerned with both, if for no more noble reason than enlightened self-interest.

The press and the public undoubtedly are of the opinion that some problems must arise when you put more than 12,000 people together in one spot and set them to the task of education. The press and the public undoubtedly also believe that it is most unlikely that the Chancellor and the President can possibly be aware of all the problems and complications involved in operating a University of this size — everything can't possibly be all sweetness and light.

But because the AAUP seems to be trying to convey that impression, one is invited to believe that anonymity cloaked the AAUP's meeting not because they probably wouldn't be, and neither would much else of substance for that matter, in the best traditions of a bad bureaucracy — is not only convenient but essential.

Be this as it may, what the public — including many in the University community — are saying to the faculty, especially as it is represented by the AAUP, is: Put aside your false propriety, your profession-

al pomposity, and have a go at discussing the problems we know are there, and out in the open if you please, because we are interested in what is happening at our state University.

What the public is also saying, it seems clear, is that if Prof. Nash and his friends don't do this they can't expect less public hostility (in the form, for example, of Gag Law), but more.

And what former students of yours, like me, are saying, Prof. Nash, is that this desire by the public is not really the burdensome wrench in the machine of progress you think it is. Rather it is an opportunity to show the public that the University is not populated wholly by professional wool-gatherers, heedless of their social responsibilities and either afraid of controversy or so unimaginative as to be incapable of it. It is an opportunity to show the public that there also exist in academe men of good will, deep learning and robust spirits; men who have not lost the intellectual boldness and spiritual tenacity which supposedly brought them to their places of present privilege; men who are possessed of a bit more passion and spark than the "typical member" of the AAUP, whom you so aptly described in your letter as "one who in addition to his obligations to his special field of study and research seems to have rather more interest in such topics as the role of the University in society or academic freedom or the government of his institution than does perhaps his colleague who as a professor tends to restrict his academic concerns, as teacher and as researcher, to his discipline."

Such a statement as the foregoing, Prof. Nash, which covers "rather more than 200 faculty members," strikes me as more of an indictment than a mere description. I mean, it's awfully nice of you fellows to be so good as to take dutiful note of what I had always regarded as prime responsibilities of men — all men, especially learned men — in a democracy. But for some reason I am not exactly overcome with enthusiasm for your sentiments, which border on being condescending.

But then, perhaps my lack of enthusiasm really results from the realization that you and your 200 or so fellow AAUP members supposedly represent UNC's faculty activists. What, I shudder to wonder, are the faculty passivists like?

Gary Blanchard  
Princeton, N. J.

Editors' Note: Blanchard was DTH co-editor last year and is presently attending the Woodrow Wilson School of Public Affairs.

**The Daily Tar Heel**  
72 Years of Editorial Freedom

**Chapel Hill**  
Site of the University  
North Carolina  
which first  
opened its doors  
in January  
1793

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news — 933-1012. Business, circulation, advertising — 933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.,  
Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8.00 per year.

Published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations, throughout the academic year by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc., 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.

## A Time To Give, But . . .

Christmas is a time for giving, but the way things are these days we just don't have the resources to do much giving, and many of those whom we admire will unfortunately be somewhat slighted.

Our staff, and our friends in Student Government, are among those whom we must omit at gift-giving time. But, if we were millionaires, this is what some of them would get:

Mike Yopp, our Managing Editor, would get a bed to put in the office, as he seems to spend just about all of his time here.

Larry Tarleton over in Sports would regain his bachelorhood so he could date a few of those girls who come up to us and say, "Who is that CUTE boy over there in the corner?"

And Pete Gammons, his assistant, would get a sweater with "North Carolina" on it, so he could get rid of his Groton School relic.

Pete Wales, of course, would get a membership card in the Ku Klux Klan,

and Betsy Timberlake a new typewriter which automatically turned out the Campus Calendar.

Alan Banov and Ernie McCrary would get a much-deserved salary raise, and John Greenbacker and Kerry Sipe a few less stories to do.

Over in Student Government, Bob Spearman would find a new car under his Christmas tree, Don Carson would unwrap Don Curtis (who else?), Arthur Hays a new pipe, Paul Dickson a few more votes, Jim Hubbard a certificate allowing him to purge several members of the University Party without the incumbent backlash, Don Wilson an Oscar for his intrepid work in Dramatic Arts 51 (Acting), and Sherry Stanley a Course Evaluation Handbook, ready-made.

And Dean Long would get a Residence College, Chancellor Sharp a few less telephone calls and Dean Carmichael a few less women's rules.

But we're poor, so we really can't do anything but wish.

## The Conference — Money Well Spent

The student-faculty-administration conference concerning the proposed Residence College System proved to be a smashing success this past weekend, offering hope not only for the Residence College System itself, but also for future relations between the three groups.

The conference, which was held at the Penn 4-H Center near Reidsville, did not solve all the immediate and specific problems of the proposed system. If anything, it raised new questions for the planners to consider. But it did place students, professors and deans on an equal footing and allowed them to approach this exciting new concept in the University's organization in a unique spirit of unity.

Every aspect of the Residence College System was not just discussed, but dissected, analyzed and evaluated. Out of the frank, off-the-record discussions came many new proposals—some realistic, some challenging, and a few simply amazing. But whatever their relative merit, all the ideas grew out of an atmosphere of complete candor that should serve as a model for future meetings of this type.

And certainly everyone who attended would be quick to speak in favor of more such gatherings. By removing the discussions from the time-consuming everyday duties of the campus and placing them in an undisturbed setting, the conference planners insured that the discussions would not be curtailed by the ringing of telephones, the hum-

drum duties associated with an office or the desire to hurry off to a beckoning party. Instead, all were able to limit their thinking to the problem at hand and to spend as much time as necessary in discussions, conferences or—in a few instances—arguments.

The result was a session that will mean much to the future of this University. The Residence College System will probably take on many new and important aspects as a result of it, but that is not the most important factor. More important is the new atmosphere of understanding that was created between leading members of the faculty, the administration, and the student body. Let us hope that future problems and ideas of this magnitude will also be discussed in such an atmosphere, for understanding is the key to progress—the progress that Carolina must have if she is to realize her potential.

## Our Weekly Awards

The snows are threatening to fall, but even that won't deter the weekly DTH Awards. So . . .

**MAN OF THE WEEK:** Billy Cunningham wins in a landslide, a landslide of 48 points, that is. We realize he took quite a few shots, and had some trouble at the free throw line, but a record is a record, fans.

**LIZARD OF THE WEEK:** The defenders of the Germans Club, who said their raucous performance at the Fall Germans Concert should not be criticized because those who took objections to the drinking and loud noise were "guests," even though they had paid out six bucks a couple for the right to be a guest.

**CAMPER OF THE WEEK:** Jane Duherry, a Duke University coed whose disappearance sparked a massive search. When found near Chapel Hill, she told searchers she "just wanted to be alone for awhile," claiming the whole thing had been touched off because she had flunked a psychology test.

**DEAL OF THE WEEK:** The purchase of Cameron Village shopping center in Raleigh by an insurance company, who shelled out a reported \$8.4 million for the right to own a shopping center with all the inconveniences of downtown.

**BEST CHRISTMAS SEASON BUY FOR MARRIED COUPLES:** "His" and "Her" sports balloons, which can be bought at Neiman-Marcus in Dallas for a cool \$6,850 each, including flying lessons.

**HEADLINE OF THE WEEK:** In the Raleigh Times, reminding readers there were "Only 13 Shoplifting Days Until Christmas."



Letters To The Editors

## Liberals Attacked Twice

### Neely Returns To Me-Tooisim

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Chuck Neely, in the Dec. 10 Tar Heel, claims that Barry Goldwater's "disastrous" defeat last November has thrown the Republican Party into the position of an "impotent critic" and "non-existent opposition" on the American political scene. It strikes me as rather naive to think of the votes of 27 million Americans, or four out of every ten voters, as an "impotent" and "well nigh non-existent" force.

The article calls for the Republican Party to reject the "perverted dogma of the new conservatism," the "unrealistic escapism," and the "nihilistic rebellion" that was supposedly characterized by Goldwater's candidacy. Neely claims that the new task of the GOP must be to work for "positive, progressive legislation," yet somehow the party at the same time is supposed "to play a vital role of restraining the authoritarian bent of modern liberalism." How can this be? What is modern liberalism other than a massive accumulation of "positive, progressive legislation?"

Barry Goldwater was defeated primarily because of the "rash" and "trigger-happy" image which surrounded him throughout the campaign. He also was a relative novice as a politician who consistently said the wrong things at the wrong time. He did indeed approach the campaign and present his ideas negatively, always tearing down big government, but seemingly never communicating to the public as to why big government and totalitarian Communism should be opposed, and why his suggested alternatives were better.

His choice of running mate yielded him no significant political gains. He did receive somewhat of a raw deal from the press; and many of the Republican regulars deserted him. There are the basic reasons why Barry Goldwater lost in 1964, not because conservatism is repugnant to the American people.

I don't propose, as does Mr. Neely, that the GOP should adopt more of a "me too" position in order to regain lost power and to restore a more conservative approach to American government. The GOP should simply use as their base the 27 million Americans who did support Barry Goldwater and his conservative ideas, in spite of the candidate's many mistakes and often inflexible thought.

They should certainly temper slightly this Goldwater conservatism, for it obviously must be made more appealing and acceptable to the public. They should find a dynamic, attractive and politically mature candidate for 1968, a conservative candidate, not a pseudo-Republican like Rockefeller or Romney. Basically, they should continue to work from a truly conservative foundation. This, and not a general reversal of thought, as suggested by Mr. Neely, is the logical formula for a 1968 Republican victory.

The irony of this article, however, is that Chuck Neely claims he was formerly an ardent Goldwater disciple, as indeed he was. I only hope that the rest of the Goldwater disciples aren't as eager as he is to abandon their cause. I, for one, am planning to continue the fight.

Greg Low  
208 N. Columbia St.

### Santa Claus Is Left Wing Plot

Editors, The Tar Heel:

The idea of Santa Claus is one of the most insidious and dangerous pieces of liberal demagoguery with which our beleaguered American way has had to contend in recent years. Santa Claus is not a native of our shores; this product of the teeming, inscrutable European East was imported in 1644 by Dutch immigrants, and remained a harmless folk custom until relatively recently, when the lunatic left began their devilous use of him.

Once a year, the biggest news-

maker becomes a bearded old man who wears red and gives things away. The liberal backers of Santa Claus display a perverted political acumen in choosing as the target for their propaganda the innocent children of our land, who are taught that something can be had for nothing.

The source of this bounty (the very thought of which is foreign to our free enterprise system, in which nothing is free) is, like big government, big; and, with a brazenness of which even the present Administration is not capable, Santa Claus is dressed in red.

The shrewd liberal backers of Santa Claus, finally, have realized that a sparing use of their tool is liable to be more effective than would be a year round bombardment; they bring the bearded gentleman in when it is cold and wet, when resistance is low.

But eternal vigilance is the price of freedom! What do we know about the Santa Claus plot? What can we do about it?

The plot is clearly well-financed: the very fact that people believe in Santa Claus proves that they were given things at Christmas when young. The sources of these gifts must be found and checked; until then, emergency laws should be passed against the giving of any gifts during December and January.

The plot, equally clearly, has much misguided intelligence behind it. Our school and university teachers should be investigated, to see who the Santa Claus braintrust consists of, and how much egghead support it has.

Finally, a massive education program must be undertaken at the nursery school and kindergarten levels. One way to obliterate the idea of Santa Claus would be to have Christmas parties for the youngsters at which they would exchange play money for their gifts, thus early becoming fiscally responsible, and at the same time learning the true meaning of Christmas in America.

How can we have separation of church and state with Santa Claus in Washington?

Name Withheld

## De Gaulle Spurns Texas Hospitality

By ART BUCHWALD  
The New York Herald Tribune  
It is not generally known that President de Gaulle planned to visit President Johnson right after the elections, but somehow plans went askew.

This is what happened.

A few days after the election President de Gaulle's Foreign Minister came into his office and said, "Monsieur le president, I have just received word from our ambassador concerning your state visit to the United States. I have the tentative schedule with me."

"Good. What time do I get to Washington?"

"You're not going to Washington. You're going to the LBJ ranch in Texas."

"Alors?"

"We will fly directly from Paris to Texas, where you and Mrs. de Gaulle will be met by President Johnson and Mrs. Johnson in a golf cart."

"What is a golf cart?"

"It's a small car that Americans use to play golf in."

"Have you been drinking?"

"No, Monsieur le president. It is traditional on the LBJ ranch to ride around in a golf cart, and our security people feel it is safer than if you drove around with him in his Lincoln Continental."

The Foreign Minister continued. "The first thing will be a tour of the ranch. The American President will in all probability start chasing his cattle in the golf cart."

De Gaulle said, "I am not going."

"Please, Monsieur le president, listen to the rest of the schedule. After the tour you will go to the main house to rest and meet the President's relatives. Then you will be measured for a 10-gallon hat and cowboy boots."

"I have the bomb. I do not have to go."

"But, Monsieur le president, after the measurements, you and Mrs. de Gaulle will be escorted outside to a barbecue."

"What is barbecue?"

"It is a Western type dinner consisting of pork ribs, sausages, beef briskets, and chicken legs cooked over a smoky fire and smeared with a very hot sauce. It is served with hot chili beans and sour dough biscuits. For dessert there is fried apple pie, served with six-shooter coffee."

"I am not only not going, I am getting out of NATO."

"Monsieur le president, our ambassador says it is important that you and the President sit down and talk."

"When do we do that?"

"Probably after you write names in a cement block in front of the ranch house."

"What is that?"

"You have to get on your knees and write your name in a block of cement. It takes the place of laying a wreath."

"Monsieur le ministre, I think I must ask you to resign."

"I am only repeating what is in the cable."

"But when do I get to talk to the President?" de Gaulle said.

"Right after the sheepdog act. You will witness trained dogs rounding up sheep on the ranch. It's quite moving. Then you will have your talk. After the talk there will be a joint press conference held on a bale of hay and protocol hopes you will wear your Texas hat when you appear for it."

"Is that all?" de Gaulle said.

"There is one more paragraph. The ambassador wants to know what are your feelings about getting on a horse?"

**The Daily Tar Heel**  
Fred Seely, Hugh Stevens  
Co-Editors

Mike Yopp  
Managing Editor

Associate Editor — Pete Wales  
Business Manager — Jack Harrington  
Asst. Bus. Mgr. — Betsy Gray  
Photo Editor — Jack Lauterer  
Advertising Manager — Woody Sobol  
Asst. Ad. Mgr. — Jim Peddicord  
Sports Editor — Larry Tarleton  
Asst. Managing Editor — Ernie McCrary  
News Editor — Alan Banov  
Copy Editor — Mary Ellison Strother  
Night Editor — Fred Thomas  
Sports Reporters — Pete Gammons  
Pete Cross, Tom Haney, Al Kaplan

Art Editor — Chip Bernard  
Intramural Reporter — Bill Lee  
Subscription Manager — Tom Clark  
Salesmen — Dick Baddour  
Stuart Ficklen, Jim Pottes

Subscription Manager — Tom Clark  
Circulation Manager — John Evans  
Reporters — John Greenbacker  
Kerry Sipe