

Let's Be Honest

Students For Teachers is an organization with admirable intentions, but questionable forethought.

It began when a few students became concerned over the English department's failure to rehire Dr. William Goodykoontz, ostensibly on the grounds that he has not published any work during his two years as a lecturer here.

A ready-made "cause" was dropped into the laps of a few students who are willing to go to work when they see a situation which they think deserves correction.

They began organizing, and the popular response was impressive. But they haven't been completely honest with their new followers because they have grossly simplified the whole problem, whether they meant to or not.

The first question which comes to the mind of anyone who has even the slightest knowledge of University policies is, "What is the real reason for not retaining this man?" There are simply too many non-publishing professors in high positions here to believe for a minute that an English lecturer would not be rehired because he has not published, no matter what the department head claims. The organizers of Students for Teachers know Goodykoontz well, and they admit that he has done things which might provide grounds for the action, even if non-publishing were not involved.

But let's assume for a minute that everyone is satisfied that failure to publish is the only factor involved. The University is still within its rights not to rehire him. Like it or not, publish or perish has its merits, and the Students for Teachers are ignoring them.

As in any other part of our society, the academic world sets up its own standards — criteria which are more or less arbitrary, as, indeed, most criteria are. Students say, "But the man must be judged by whether or not he is a good teacher." Unfortunately, everyone of them has his own definition of a "good teacher." Some of his students sing praises to Goodykoontz — others damn him. The University itself must have a more substantial and less variable standard of judgment. Publishing is the measuring stick. It provides a tangible means of testing value judgments of ability.

Students argue that professors are forced to spend time on research work and shortchange them in the classroom. Since when do students want to be spoon-fed and coddled? Don't they realize that the researching (and, therefore, publishing) teacher is better informed and can do a better job of providing new and useful information than the popular "good teacher" who has been lecturing from the same notes for 30 years? The students are, in fact, being shortchanged by the non-researching teacher. Most students say they consider "good teachers" to be those who inspire them — cause them to think for themselves. It is absolutely contradictory to say research and publication hinder a teacher in providing such a classroom atmosphere. Perhaps he does not have time to make convenient little information sheets and "study guides" for them, but are these necessary to achieve the ultimate goals of education?

By all means, let the Students for Teachers investigate the situation. They will find Kenan professors who have never published any more than Goodykoontz. They will be hard pressed to find valid examples to support their cause.

Quite likely they will find that publish or perish simply does not exist at this University, and will probably never exist. They will discover, however, that publishing professors find promotions come easier. If they do the extra work (research, publishing), why not reward them? But the students will also find many men who fall only in the non-publishing "good teacher" category get significant promotions just as frequently as the publishers. If they do not admit this, they are not being honest with themselves or anyone else.

Honesty is the important issue here. We think the University should be honest with Goodykoontz and tell him exactly why his contract has not been renewed and we think students who say they are being cheated by an emphasis on publication should quit being so self-centered. Let's get honest with ourselves.

Second Class Postage Paid at Chapel Hill, N. C.

Oppressive Fish Sticks

'Establishment' Fires Back

By WILLIAM G. OTIS
DTH Columnist

Recently, hundreds of concerned students stormed onto the athletic field of a school in Washington and staged a sitdown, protesting infringements on their liberty. No doubt sensing their ardor and commitment, school officials promptly called an assembly and promised negotiation of student demands.

Such incidents as the foregoing occur with increasing frequency in our current season of protest, and hardly constitute a cause for great concern. What sets this one apart is the fact that the protestors were eighth grade pupils, and that their commitment was to end such oppressive measures as assigned seats in the cafeteria and fish sticks for lunch.

Of itself, this event has more humor than significance; however, it reflects the fundamentally adolescent motivation of an ever greater number of protest movements.

Fuzzy Thinking Settles Over Goodykoontz Issue

By PETE WALES
DTH Columnist

A pre-summer swarm of rumors and fuzzy thinking has settled around the Goodykoontz issue over the past four days, rendering it almost impossible to understand.

An open-air meeting is to be held tomorrow at noon in Polk Place. Students who are in the least bit interested in the quality of teaching here should try to attend.

The issue at hand is the failure of the Department of English to rehire a man known to students (graduate included) and faculty members as an unconventional, but highly stimulating teacher.

A lot of garble has been thrown over the circumstances of his departure.

Goodykoontz was hired two years ago to a one-year contract and rehired for the same period last year. He had no promises of being rehired again although he felt that his department chairman, Dr. George Harper, had implied that he wanted him to stay on a little longer.

The question is: Why did Harper not rehire him for another one-year contract or, better yet, recommend him for a three-year appointment?

Harper has said that the reason was primarily failure to publish, although he has said different things since then to different people.

While Students for Teachers believes that publishing is very important in making UNC a university instead of a college, it believes that classroom teaching is more basic, more essential. If a man publishes and has something to say, he should be rewarded. Likewise, if a man teaches especially well and has something to tell his students, he too should be rewarded. A balance must be struck.

But Harper's assertion that publishing potential is more important in hiring teachers than ability to teach is pure rubbish.

However, there may be other

"Protest" and "commitment" and "civil disobedience" are now in vogue.

So those of us who are looking to inter the medieval ways of the "consensus establishment" need only the license of our dedication, and off we shall march to demonstrate—be it against war, Baptists, imperialism, capitalism, university regulations, Republicans, the draft, vegetarians, prohibitionists, the General Assembly, police brutality, or whatever — just so we demonstrate.

Thus we shall spark a "creative dialogue" and hopefully implement some of our "radical social criticism," further deteriorating the puritanical provincialism of which we have so long been the captives.

The principle spokesmen at UNC for this type of mentality are James Gardner and Timothy Ray, who of late have presented the campus with a three-part Spring Epistle, apparently dealing with the

status of liberalism at the University.

"Apparently," I say, because the language of the articles was so marked by verbosity, and the ideas so diluted by the language, that in reality it was most difficult to discern what the epistle really was about. Perhaps in their bid to form a "broadly based liberal research and action movement . . . nationally affiliated, but free to address local university and community problems," they are preparing us for the establishment of a campus chapter of Students for a Democratic Society or Americans for Democratic Action.

Whatever the intent of this ominous proposal, their final objective is clear: to wrench us from our present state of Neanderthal superstition and mold a new society which "would never tolerate . . . a Raymond Mallard, or — university content to operate as a consensus establishment."

Here, here! The apostles of tolerance openly anticipate the day when we shall display intolerance to ideas and persons they oppose. More astonishing than this, though, is their depreciation of Judge Mallard, who chose to administer justice according to the requirements of the law, rather than the incantations of amateur sociologists.

Equally notable is their disdain of the University's hesitancy to axe the "consensus establishment," which has maintained, nourished, and indulged it since 1797 and has presided over our emergence as one of the better universities of the South.

Gardner and Ray appear to represent a new breed of the old crowd which has always desired to surround adolescent attitudes with intellectual substance and ethical foundation. They are among those whose facility with polysyllabic words substantially exceeds the merit of the ideas they seek to express.

They number with the most recent of those "radical social critics," whose past sophistication has sown the seeds of progressive education and reaped a harvest of high school graduates who move their lips as they read and who cannot compose a coherent paragraph; who have sown the seeds of boundless indulgence and reaped a harvest of juvenile hoods, switchblades, and bicycle chains; who have sown the seeds of tasteless euphemism and reaped a harvest of current "art" which can be hung on the wall in any of four or five different ways and be just as meaningful, and of "sculpture" consisting of paper mache, metal scraps, and garbage.

Thus have the opponents of the "consensus establishment" sown — and thus have they reaped.

Doubtless someone will take pen in hand to decry the "reactionary" thinking found in some DTH columns. So be it. Indeed, all is not right with the "consensus establishment"; that is true.

We have yet to deal successfully with racial injustice, an exploding population, and world communism.

But let there be at least one voice in defense of the ideas and institutions from which we have inherited all that we are, and which have thus far bravely withstood the onslaughts of over-grown adolescence and "radical social criticism."

er reasons for not rehiring Goodykoontz.

He is a very controversial teacher, one who uses gimmicks to excite and interest his students in the subject matter. He relates ideas in literature to present events to make them more meaningful. He often exercises the minds of his students with criticisms of the University itself, the world directly around them.

Agree or disagree, he makes people think. And what could be more essential to the learning process? We are not here to copy down facts. We are here to learn how to learn.

Something has to spark a student, some idea thrown out in the classroom, some analogy of something he is studying with something going on around him. Then he is able to peer into the vast store of knowledge available at the University and learn for himself.

If Harper wants to get rid of Goodykoontz because he has no room for controversy or new methods, the students want to know about it.

Examples such as this show very graphically why it is desirable to have some sort of mechanism for bringing student opinion into decisions regarding faculty tenure and promotion.

This is not so terribly new. Harvard and Columbia, to name only a few, have mobilized student opinion in the areas of curriculum and faculty hiring. Students have a fundamental interest in the classroom process and should be a part of policy decisions affecting this.

True, the students are transients. But to say they are not interested in the fate of the University now or in the future, as one DTH writer said, is absurd. The writer in question has not looked far among his colleagues.

Students wishing to indicate a little interest in this vital topic and who wish to find out what the issues are should make a definite appointment to attend the meeting tomorrow. The time will not be wasted.