

## The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.

### Publish Or Perish?

The new Students for Teachers organization probably represents the greatest cross-section of student life of any group on campus.

Beatniks and Joe Colleges and everyone in between seem to have at last found a common cause for which to work.

The protest centers around one man and one situation. The man is William Goodykoontz and the situation is "publish or perish." Goodykoontz is a lecturer in the English department. His one-year contract for next year has not been renewed, and the excuse given to him is that he has not published.

Some of Goodykoontz's friends and concerned students have jumped to his defense, accusing the administration of unjust practices.

But something just doesn't ring true here. If the University really practiced a policy of "publish or perish," a large part of the faculty would be gone tomorrow. Many professors who have never published any more than Goodykoontz haven't been released, and they won't be.

Therefore, it must be apparent that the issue is not as simple and clear-cut as some are trying to make it seem. This is a specific case and personality must play some role in it.

The administration is in an awkward position. If there are underlying factors in the decision not to rehire Goodykoontz, as indeed, it seems there must be, public mention of them is not necessarily the best way to handle the problem.

But why should the administration not be completely honest with the man? To spare his feelings? To save its own neck for some reason? An official explanation would help clear the air, but there are no grounds for forcing it.

Perhaps the dealings with Goodykoontz have been completely frank. If so, the Students for Teachers group is on sound ground in this protest. For the time being, at least, it must proceed on this basis.

But this failure to rehire a teacher is a rather isolated incident. The group should not restrict its vision, because the real issue is perhaps "publish or stagnate" rather than "publish or perish."

At the University of North Carolina, the chances are that a non-publishing faculty member is more likely to lose promotions rather than his job.

### Horse Trading For Trustees

It's about time someone in the General Assembly finally said it.

Rep. Jim Green of Bladen County said, "We've just got to put the method of selecting trustees (for the University of North Carolina) on a higher plane than it has been."

He called the old method "mass horse trading of votes — a you-vote-for-my-man and I'll-vote-for-yours sort of thing."

And he did something about it. He named a secret six-man subcommittee of the House University Trustees Committee, of which he is chairman. The subcommittee will screen a list of 64 names and recommend 27 to be named University trustees.

The names of the people serving on the subcommittee have not been released, and may not even be made known to the full Trustees Committee.

The committee may feel as if it's buying a pig in the poke if it accepts the subcommittee's recommendations, but the benefits of pressure-free selection are worth the price.

If legislators don't know exactly who is making the trustee selections, they don't know who to try to influence to get "their boy" on the board.

The compromise of the inevitable "deals" and "reciprocal backscratching" do not put the greatest emphasis where it should be at all times — on selecting board members solely on their qualifications.

If the full committee approves the subcommittee's selections, the list will become the House slate for the board. The Senate will submit a slate and the names will be compared. The names which do not appear on both lists will be decided on in a joint committee.

In the past the entire selection was carried out in a rather tedious balloting process by a joint House - Senate committee.

Green is apparently trying to help wipe some of the stain of political wheeling and dealing off trustee appointments and the board and the University itself will profit from it.

## 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; Mike Yopp, associate editor; Kerry Sipe, managing editor; John Greenbacker, news editor; Fred Thomas, copy editor; Mike Wiggin, night editor; Fred Seely, sports editor; Richard Smith, asst. sports editor; Andy Myers, John Jannrich, Mary Ellison Strother, Ernest Robl, Bob Wright, David Rothman, staff writers; Bill Lee, Pete Cross, sports writers; Jack Lauterer, photographer; Chip Barnard, art editor; Becky Timberlake, secretary; Jack Harrington, business mgr.; Woody Sobol, advertising mgr.; Tom Clark, subscription mgr.; John Evans, circulation mgr.

Second Class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. 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.

## Publish Or Perish

# UNC Joins 'The Senseless Scramble'

By PETE WALES  
DTH Columnist

Publish or perish, the controversy that is sweeping the nation's campuses, has slipped into Chapel Hill.

An organizational meeting was held yesterday by interested students from every area of the campus to discuss the recent release of Dr. William Goodykoontz from the Department of English.

The central issue of the meeting was that of faculty publication.

The issue arose when Goodykoontz, a controversial lecturer, did not have his contract renewed after two years in the Department of English here. The reasons, according to Dr. George Harper, department chairman, were principally lack of publication and Goodykoontz' age (51).

Harper said that he did not consider putting Goodykoontz' name in for a three-year appointment as an assistant professor principally because he had not published enough and was too old to be starting off in the department.

Goodykoontz had received his M.A. and PhD here in the early 50s and came back in 1963 from Davidson. He

came on a one-year appointment as a lecturer and was reappointed for this year.

In the spring of 1964, his first year, Goodykoontz had an opportunity to try for a position at Florida Presbyterian, a new college. Harper encouraged him at that time not to leave because he was a good teacher.

When Goodykoontz talked to Harper about a week later, Harper said he had not meant that he was going to get an assistant professorship, but that he wanted him to stay on as a lecturer for a few more years. This is according to Goodykoontz.

Then, this spring, Goodykoontz was reading a bulletin about who was teaching which courses for next fall and noticed his name was missing. He went to see Harper who told him he was not being re-hired, primarily because he had not published enough.

Goodykoontz at that time was in the process of writing two different books. He had been held back because the department was switching him around in different courses, so that he was spending most of his time working up new notes and programming courses.

According to Goodykoontz, who has talked to Harper three times since his release, the main reason cited was his publishing.

In a conversation with this writer, Harper said that publication and age were the principal reasons for release, but that there might be others to help prevent a three-year appointment.

Goodykoontz has been known as a controversial teacher for his sometimes bizarre class presentations. No one denies that he spends enormous effort on his classroom work. Even Harper admits this.

The central issue now bothering the students who met yesterday is not whether Goodykoontz can be rehired. Goodykoontz himself has stated that although he originally wanted very much to stay, he no longer wishes to pursue it because of his falling out with department authorities.

The issue now is whether or not the University, like Harper, should put publishing potential ahead of teaching ability in hiring professors. Harper has stated firmly that publishing is more important.

He wants people who can "produce."

Goodykoontz has asked Harper if he might make a presentation before the senior members of the department on this issue. Harper has refused on the grounds that whether or not he is hired should not be debated.

I would agree. But the issue is not whether he is hired. It is whether the Department of English, and to varying degrees other departments at UNC, should continue to put publication ahead of teaching.

This is more than a University problem. It is national in scope. Departments give teachers who publish the early raises and promotions because they know that these are the first to be stolen by other universities out hunting talent.

What's more, they don't even base this on the quality of publications, but on the quantity. One high-ranking English professor published 19 articles in one year. We wonder about the consistency of their quality and the amount of time spent that year in the classroom.

The racket is more pronounced at other better-known

universities. But UNC, especially its Department of English, is fast joining the rat race. Rather than showing the individualism and leadership it possessed in the Graham era, it is joining the pack.

All that is needed in the country is one or two good universities who will proclaim their withdrawal from the senseless scramble. UNC with its prominent position in the educational world could play a decisive part — if it has the courage. And it will take substantial courage.

Meanwhile students, who are here for education and stimulation, not to watch dust gather on insignificant and petty publications, must make their preferences known. They and their parents are paying for their education. Let them demand a good one.

Let them make quite clear to the faculty and the administration, many of whom have a violent dislike for the publication racket, that they think teaching is more important than publishing. They will have support if they would merely open their mouths.

Perhaps yesterday's meeting will give birth to such a voice.

### 'Who Told You It Buckled In The Front?'



### The Vocal Group

## Holding Back Liberalism

By DAVID ROTHMAN  
DTH Columnist

Liberalism at UNC is being set back by a small but vocal group of students and faculty members.

Viewing protest as an end in itself, they are doing a great disservice to the cause of progress within North Carolina and the rest of the South.

They consider themselves enemies of the "powers that be"; yet within their group exists an "establishment" as real as any in South Building or the Governor's mansion.

By unspoken word they have created their own set of dogmas. Almost any leftist cause, however unjust, seems to enjoy the sympathy of at least some members of this self-appointed establishment.

One example of their "progressive" dogmatism would be the attack on the administration's Vietnamese policy. "End the war!" the stalwarts yell. Then, once they catch your ear, they admit they don't have a definite solution in mind. That, they say, should be left to the diplomats.

Another example might be the so-called free speech controversy. The University community has regularly registered its objections to the infamous Speaker Ban Law. Students and faculty alike have worked to strike it from the books. But are the "progressive" dogmatists satisfied?

Certainly not. Restricted by their opinions regarding the labor movement, the "progressive" dogmatists view as inevitable a clash between the faculty and the administration — or one between students and the administration. The AAUP, for instance, is dubbed a "company union," and

the same term probably is applied to the Student Government. Class warfare, it seems, supposedly is unavoidable, and the "progressive" dogmatists cannot appreciate the administration's stand against the Speaker Ban Law.

Ironically, the casual but ironclad discipline within the ranks of the "progressive" dogmatists often fails to extend itself in a useful direction. UNC, for instance, has only 84 Negro students, but how concerned are the "progressive" dogmatists? Obviously, they are somewhat concerned, but they are too busy worrying about Viet Nam and similar matters to attack this situation with the same vigor they use in denouncing U. S. foreign policy. In the newspaper trade, their attitude would be tagged "Afghanistanism."

At UNC there are thousands of "Carolina Gentlemen" who still carry the prejudices of their hometowns, even though they have lived three or more years in this "liberal" community. But what do the "activists" do?

They picket Vice President Hubert Humphrey; they slander President Johnson; they call American fighting men "murderers"; they denounce the "military-industrial complex." Then they wonder why, their most important cause — the South's progress in race relations — is not given the careful attention it deserves.

The answer, of course, is that UNC students have associated the protestors' radical stands on other issues with their support of integration. Thus, the "Damn it all!" dogmatists lose one of their few legitimate battles: the fight for racial equality.

### In The Mailbox

## Radio Bill Passage Urged

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

An open letter to the Student Legislature: Tonight the question of campus radio will come before you again. This topic has been discussed for more than a year.

We of the 1965-66 Graham Memorial Activities Board now support the immediate establishment of a campus radio board and the requisition of funds necessary to start and operate the station.

Publicity alone would make the station worthwhile. GM's budget of \$32,000 next year will be wasted unless the students on this campus are informed about, and participate in, the sponsored activities. Campus radio on an AM-FM basis will provide a new means of communication invaluable in publicizing these activities.

Too, AM coverage of speakers, seminars and performances could make available these activities to persons who could, for some reason, not attend the event.

These reasons spill over into all other clubs and organizations on campus. Coverage of campus news, broadcasting of election speeches, and legislative reports are all additional possibilities — if the bill passes.

The bill as it stands eliminates political control by parties. We urge you not to amend this bill — pass it as it stands. A politically-oriented station would defeat its purpose.

Tonight, please keep in mind the above when you vote on this bill which could revolutionize campus communication. On behalf of GMAB, may we urge you to vote "Yes."

David Knesel  
GMAB publicity chairman

Camilla Walters  
GMAB current affairs chairman

## Whitewashing Viet Mistakes

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Michael Wiggin, in the May 1 DTH, said he would be overjoyed to see the people of Viet Nam left alone to decide how they would live. But he points out that there is evil, greed, and communism in the world, and so we have to stay and help. However, if evil, greed and communism exist in South Viet Nam, we helped put them there.

Diem outlawed all opposing political parties and forced them to go underground. The communists were then only one group among several in the opposition, the National Liberation Front. Only after America sent military aid to Diem did North Vietnamese enter South Viet Nam in any significant number. Thus we forced the popular South Vietnamese leaders into the hands of Hanoi's nationalistic Communism, not to be equated with Chinese or Soviet communism.

The St. Louis Post Dispatch of April 7 contained these statements by Richard Dugman: "A recent official report from Saigon to Washington on the economic aid program was carefully edited before being sent off, to make the situation sound better than it was. One of the deletions was a reference to corruption among Vietnamese officials and their frequent failure to win the good will of the people. Province chiefs sometimes have acted as agents for landlords in areas newly cleared of Viet Cong. The officials have moved in with the army and begun immediately to collect back rents that had been unpaid while the area was under guerrilla control."

This leads one to wonder how many

other stories of "corruption among Vietnamese officials" are deleted from Viet Nam reports and how many people in Viet Nam have joined or sided with the NLF because of the corruption? From a number of news items that have gotten through, terror and torture seem to be the main weapons of the South Vietnamese army while American "advisors" turn their heads.

So, while evil, greed, and communism exist in South Viet Nam, we are doing our share to aid these, and negotiations with the NLF might help stay the tide by allowing a coalition to come into being, and taking away the "need" for evil, before the NLF accepts a sufficient amount of Chinese or Soviet aid to change the present character of the NLF.

Wiggin continues: "The communists have made it clear that they intend to do all they can to destroy our way of life and unite the world under communist rule." He concludes: "I like to dream too . . . but not at the expense of half a world of free people."

If I thought for one minute that the Vietnamese communists and others in the NLF were destroying "our way of life" and "half a world of free people," I think I might agree with him, but there isn't anything like "our way of life" in South Viet Nam. The economy, superficially capitalistic, is like something out of the middle ages, with feudal-like landlords who demand high rent, medieval-like merchants (not necessarily the small ones) exacting high profits from our economic aid program.

Neither group is checked by the kind of laws that characterize "our way of life." The NLF isn't interested in conquering "half a world of free people," but merely in gaining freedom from a military dictatorship for South Viet Nam. The "government" in Saigon is not in keeping with "our way of life" or "freedom." It's controlled by the military, i.e. it needs military approval to exist.

There have never been anything resembling elections in that country and now that the NLF controls "more than half of South Viet Nam" (N.Y. Times, April 11), free elections may be impossible. Only by coming to terms with the NLF, and assuring them a voice in elections can that country ever approach anything like "our way of life." "It is a rare student of the South Vietnamese scene," a Wall Street Journal staff writer observed (April 7), "who doesn't believe that ultimately there will have to be some sort of reconciliation between the communist revolutionaries, deeply entrenched in the countryside, and the established political hierarchy in Saigon as part of a broad program of political reform."

Wiggin asks: "Should we be so moral and fair in a game that has no rules?" Why not? That's the only time that morality and fairness count. That's the only time they show the true character of a person or a nation. Anyone can be moral or fair under social pressures. A person or nation of a character worth defending is moral and fair under any conditions.

Peaceniks are in basic agreement with Wiggin's main values — our way of life and freedom. Every day Students for a Democratic Society is working hard to further these values — to work for equal rights in citizenship, jobs, housing; to help landlords do their duty by their impoverished tenants; to curb unethical practices of businessmen; to preserve and strengthen our Bill of Rights — freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, etc.

Let's work together for "our way of life" and "freedom."

Constance Ray  
202 E. Rosemary St.