

## 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.

### What Did He Say?

The Daily Tar Heel has inadvertently joined those who have accused Chancellor Paul F. Sharp of calling leaders of the Students for Teachers organization "professional agitators."

The headline over the news story of the Chancellor's Parents' Day speech in yesterday's DTH said, "Sharp Says SFT 'Professional Agitators.'" It was unintentional and unfortunate that such a misleading head was written, because Sharp said no such thing.

He was attacked in the Y Court rally Monday by Pete Wales, SFT co-chairmen, for accusing that group of being "professional agitators." Wales said, "Look at me — former president of the Men's Honor Council, Phi Beta Kappa." He named several other well-known students, then asked if they should be considered agitators.

At least one of three things is apparent from Wales' remarks: (1) he was not present at the Chancellor's Sunday speech (2) if he was, he did not listen to it, or (3) he has a rather guilty conscience.

This is the statement Sharp made:

"The nature of student protests in recent years has undergone a marked change. Those of us who recall the changes following World War II, I think, will remember that following World War II, we began to develop the phenomenon of what I call the professional student. He stays on with us for years as a student while many of his colleagues go on to appointments in the university and move on up the academic ladder. He remains the professional student. Lacking the recognition that his movement up the academic ladder prefers upon him, he becomes a professional agitator not concerned with the welfare of the university, but to a surprising degree with that of his own group, the professional students."

Certainly no one would accuse Wales, or any of the students he named at the meeting of falling into the category the Chancellor described. It is paradoxical that no one has said they were included in the "professional" group except they themselves.

Wales said, "By golly, I'm not trying to pervert the truth . . . I'm trying to get at it now, and we're not getting much of it." But how much truth is there in his charge that Sharp has accused the SFT itself of anything?

This is not a defense of the Chancellor out of deference to his position. We would do the same for any man whom we think is not being treated fairly. We took this stand for Dr. William Goodykoontz. We think he has not been dealt with honestly, and therefore his treatment has been unfair.

But many of those who are protesting on behalf of Goodykoontz are treating the administration just as unfairly as they claim Goodykoontz has been dealt with.

The SFT has the potential of accomplishing something really worthwhile. It can help clear the air on the "publish or perish" situation, but as yet the group has done nothing to allay our original fears about its objectivity in approaching the problem.

If a man sets out to prove the world is flat, he can make a pretty good case for it. But that does not make the world any less round. If this group is setting out to prove what a terrible plight non-publishing professors are in, they can convince quite a few people.

But *The Daily Tar Heel* views the problem as a definitely two-sided one. Our feelings on the situation have been stated in a previous editorial, and there is no need for repetition now.

We defend, against all criticism, the right to take any stand as long as we are sure of our ground. We expect and welcome the criticism, which is a good deal more than some hyper-sensitive organizations can say. A valid defense can withstand criticism.

## The Daily Tar Heel

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 Jennrich, Mary Ellison Strother, Ernest Robl, Bob Wright, David Rothman, staff writers; Bill Lee Pete Cross, sports writers; Jock 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.



'New Wine'

## 'No Poverty Of Ideas' In Selections On Poor

By HENRY McINNIS  
DTH Reviewer

"New Wine," Spring 1965, Vol. III, No. 3. Issue on Poverty. A Christian Journal of Opinion. Published by the Westminster Fellowship.

Although this issue of "New Wine" is on the subject of poverty, it is a happy thing to find no poverty of ideas in the outstanding articles. The danger, of course, is to be glib about the poor. This compilation averts that danger on the whole but is not entirely successful.

Hitting the mark best is Alan Keith-Lucas, who writes the careful piece, "Does Public Welfare Encourage Immorality?" Although his article is the studied, sociological answer to this most frequent question, it shatters myths about welfare assistance in general while it neatly urges sympathy for mothers with dependent children.

Keith-Lucas wisely points out: "It is in fact a curious reflection on our conventional concept of sin, and perhaps on what occupies our mind, that we reserve the name 'immorality' largely for our sin, that of lust, and that it has become so closely tied to legality so that any extra-marital intercourse for whatever reason is ascribed to this sin when in fact it may have much more to do with entirely different reasons." Lust is the one sin which Jesus explicitly forgave twice on earth, the writer adds, and it is "as the ancient church knew well, only one of the seven deadly sins."

"Our Concern About Poverty" The issue's prestigious piece is "Our Concern About Poverty" by Terry Sanford. If you want to know how sincere and deep education is as a vital concern to Sanford the man, and not merely Sanford, the governor, you will find out here.

He clearly sees the cycle of poverty as self-perpetuating because it is set in motion each generation by poor education. He justifies the tremendous expenditures that he envisions must be raised and spent to make a ripple in the murky waters of poverty.

Eliminating Poverty "Can We Eliminate Poverty," by James L. White, coordinator of the state Economic Opportunity Program, explores the proposition that "the poor are with us always." Readers may hardly find fault with his auspicious beginning: "There can be only two answers to the question: 'Can we eliminate poverty?' Those answers are 'No' and 'Yes.'" He writes that "the success of community action programs will be in direct ratio to community involvement and participation." This is a fact that communities are now facing. There are cynics in every Tar Heel town and city who regard the whole Economic Opportunity Program as another welfare matter. They cripple any movement to get local enthusiasm and action going because they equate the program with big government encroaching on local autonomy. White supports President Johnson's Great Society with admirable eloquence but with simplicity.

The Oppressed Minority The article on "The Poor: America's Oppressed Minority," states the generalities most people are acquainted with. The author, Barbara Brandt, has a degree in philosophy, has done graduate work in sociology. The article is a touch and go affair, not saying anything that can't be heard by some wandering student flitting from one classroom to the other. It is a sociological stew, lacking in salt and too heavy on the fat. A little more meat, next time, please!

Provoking Article The most provoking article is "Marx, Liberals and Poverty," by Joan Drake, a graduate of Fordham University and graduate student at the state universities in California and New Mexico. What she manages to write on Marx could have been copied off a course summarizer at the Book Exchange and even that little was poorly related to poverty. Her understanding of liberalism is a poverty pocket itself.

An example of the typically confused view of liberalism is: "Liberalism has never had a coherent view of society or its institutions nor seen them as a positive force." Come now! Back to your American history.

Punctures Balloons "Fallacies About American Poverty," by Robb Burlage, states the obvious fallacy which too many Americans hold that "the problem is only a matter of individual disability and not a problem of the economy and society as a whole." Burlage offers the suggestion that poverty and unemployment are basically matters of low economic growth and economic distribution and allocation. No fool's observation, this!

Other fallacies he punctures like fatuous balloons are: education and skill upgrading must come before any increases in personal income; the majority of the poor are Negro; poverty is found only in pockets of distress, not permeating the society; and the European immigrant groups made it up by their own bootstraps — the Negroes and Appalachians can too.

This was an article that enhances the value of "New Wine" and it should be widely read and discussed, for it is a clever and accurate diagnosis of the superficial American attitude.

Poverty And Population William Darity, a Negro and currently director of program development of the North Carolina Fund, penned the unsatisfying but timely piece, "Poverty and Population Control."

It is based on a study in the state's richest county, Mecklenburg, among low-income women associated with an oral contraceptive program. The implications for poverty are hardly startling and will certainly not be food for cocktail chatter this season, at any rate. For dull reading, however thorough and scholarly it is, the article rates an A.

Fit For Digestion The title "Sin, Morality and Poverty" is part of that new wave theology-socio-economic-political-cultural hash we must bear with these days. Mercifully, what follows, by William Stringfellow, is less pretentious. Read it and digest it. It's a fine piece of observation.

Several reviews are worth glancing at but for recommended reading, see Carol Schmidt's review of "The Church and Poverty," by Byron Johnson, and Michael Harrington's superb "The Other America," reviewed by Scott McNurray.

### Letters

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters should be typed, double spaced and include the name and address of sender. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length.

## Preserving Knowledge

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

With all due respect to Miss Sterling's observation concerning job tenure for Jesus and Socrates in positions in this University, she fails to miss the very point in fact. Were it not for their students, Plato, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, et al, who did "publish," their teachings would bear no meaning at all.

Aside from all this, these two "teachers" were so well liked that one was caused to commit suicide and the other was crucified by the very people he was teaching. The fact that they were teachers, good or bad, is not the point. The fact that both had something worthwhile to say is important, however, and it is of no use to us unless we can have some semblance of accuracy and scholarship concerning their teachings.

In defense of the faculty viewpoint I would like only to point out that it is the first obligation of an academic society to

put emphasis on scholarship, and primarily, its own scholarship. It is one's first duty to learn in order to teach, and learning, obviously, must come through diligent scholarship on the part of the teacher. It is also the teacher's duty not to stagnate what he has learned; he must continue his studies as long as he teaches. It is his duty to organize and communicate his knowledge in a scholarly fashion.

A teacher, therefore, must, by academic standards, publish in order to preserve his knowledge.

In reference to the current "publish or perish" trauma now going on here I might mention that I have great respect for William Goodykoontz as a teacher, and as a "publisher," to use Miss Sterling's terms. In fact, I do not see where Goodykoontz' situation enters into an isolated discussion of "publish or perish." His situation is too personal.

Tom Myers  
Davie Circle

## Now About Goodykoontz...

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

As a graduating senior I have tried to ignore the obtuse arguments recently presented on the editorial page. However, Sunday's comments on the subject of publish or perish are appalling to me and require some sort of answer.

First, the editorial shows a gross unfamiliarity with UNC and the facts of the Goodykoontz case. Dr. George Harper, chairman of the Department of English has repeatedly told inquirers that the main reason for firing Goodykoontz was his lack of publications and potential publications. Thus, publish or perish is an admitted policy in the department.

Harper did mention that there were personality conflicts in the department, but this seems to me to be an even less rational reason for firing a teacher.

Secondly, Students for Teachers does not resent the efforts by teachers to do research. Constant work is necessary to expand any field of knowledge.

However, the desire for expanding the limits of our knowledge should not be forced upon a teacher while he is trying to meet the demands of his students.

Also, it is quite possible (and highly probable) that expansion of knowledge can occur through transmission of words spoken to students instead of words written to other professors.

I hope that the editor of this once-enlightened newspaper will in the future at least get the facts of an issue before he presents his opinion.

Neal Jackson  
204 Manly

## An Apology To Thurmond

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Sunday we had the privilege of hearing a speech by Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, sponsored by the Carolina Forum. Introductory remarks made by one of the co-chairmen of the forum urged that those members of the audience who did not agree with the Senator's views should conduct themselves as they would if they supported his views wholeheartedly. This statement seemed to serve as a guide for the audience, but not for co-chairmen Bill Schwartz and George Nicholson themselves.

Being seated on the stage, any movement that they made was distracting to the audience. If these two could not refrain from talking and fidgeting out of respect for the speaker, they could have at least done so for the benefit of the audience. Yet they insisted on making their presence known by constant shifting, whispering, and even hovering around the speaker.

dium during the question and answer period. Only when the senator himself shamed them did they have the courtesy to sit quietly, and they didn't stay that way very long.

As Carolina students we object to this conduct on the part of any other students toward an invited guest on this campus, and do most violently condemn it when the offending parties themselves are the ones who extended the invitation to the speaker. We would like to offer our apologies to the senator, and do sincerely hope that no further incidents of this nature occur.

Nelson B. Watts  
321 Ehringhaus  
James Scott Edwards  
449 Ehringhaus  
Frank H. Shields  
450 Ehringhaus  
G. W. Flynn  
147 Ehringhaus

## Right To Vote Unfulfilled

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I hope I am not misrepresenting Sen. Strom Thurmond's position on Sunday night by the following summary. Although the substance of the civil rights demonstrators' grievances is legitimate, the methods used are in effect a revolution against the rule of law; and in any case, lawful means are presently available to redress abridgements of the right to vote. Therefore, the demonstrations are to be deplored, and the voting rights bill of 1965 (which is on several points unconstitutional) is an example of the administration's mistaken policy of acceding to illegally expressed requests.

The question I was unable to communicate through my own inarticulateness to Thurmond during the question period is this: If the preservation of the constitutional form of government we presently enjoy is indeed a laudable aim, and if the civil rights demonstrators are indeed asking for nothing more than their constitutional rights, would not those most anxious to preserve the Constitution, such as Thurmond (and indeed most of us), be the first to support measures to assure that all demands of the discontented be expressed through constitutional channels?

The response of Thurmond might go as

follows: constitutional channels already exist for Negroes to gain the previously denied right to vote. Why then are Negroes still demonstrating? Because they are led by subversive elements which are intent upon the overthrow of our legal form of government. Now this is a question of fact, and although the Senator made some strong allegations, he did not prove to my satisfaction that the only reason civil rights demonstrators are acting the way they are is that they are being misled by Communists or others desiring overthrow of the system.

The problem lies in Thurmond's refusal to recognize that the legal means open to most citizens of the United States are unavailable to Negroes in the South by virtue of the entire legal system presently existing in that region of the country. For this reason the right to vote remains unfulfilled, with no legal means of redress. And for this reason, too, those anxious to keep the expressions of Negro sentiment within the law are intent on passing legislation like the voting rights bill. Otherwise, the disenfranchised will turn to new, more violent means to attain their ends, means which will truly disrupt our constitutional system.

Terry Fowler  
413 Patterson Place

## Radio Referendum Needed

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I was both amused and dismayed by John Stupak's statement in the Saturday Daily Tar Heel. His statement was either illogical or an attempt at deceiving the student body and possibly both.

Stupak maintains two points: (1) The campus overwhelmingly wants campus radio, and (2) Certain Student Party leaders are blocking campus radio for their own political gain.

These two statements directly contradict each other. If the campus overwhelmingly wants campus radio and these certain Student Party legislators keep it from passing, then they will be committing perjury at the polls next time they run for office. On the other hand, if they can gain politically by blocking campus radio

as Stupak asserts, then that must mean their constituents do not want the campus radio that Stupak says they want.

Stupak and Carson have misrepresented the facts, both to the student body and to proposal submitted to Student Legislature, not pass the legislation now. This is not construction while we are applying for an FM license, which takes a minimum of five months to receive. Out of the other side of his mouth, he says that legislature must pass the bill on campus radio now so that construction can be carried out this summer.

Why doesn't Stupak admit he is pushing this project for one reason, his own personal gain. He wants to be appointed the station manager.

Smith Freeman  
311 Lewis