

## 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.

### Admission, 50 Cents

It's a real pity that more students were not on hand to see the Thursday night fiasco on the top floor of New East.

That is the home of that great deliberative body, the Student Legislature. But not much deliberating was done that night.

We suggest that tickets be sold to any such performances which might be held in the future. Almost anyone will pay to see a circus.

A stubborn minority of Student Party legislators put Campus Radio on the shelf, despite pleas of Student Government President Paul Dickson for immediate passage of the legislation to set up the radio station and its board of directors.

After changing his mind a time or two during the past weeks, Dickson committed himself to the project and went to the trouble of appearing before the legislature, asking for its support. He said he had felt some doubt about immediate action on radio plans, but he said his misgivings had been satisfied. Dickson's speech was sincere and rational, but it fell on a few deaf ears.

The four deafest ears belong to Reps. Hugh Blackwell (SP) and Jim Little (SP). It had been acknowledged before the session began that backers of Campus Radio had enough support to get the legislation passed if it could be brought to a vote.

Blackwell, the self-appointed god of Student Government finances, wants to withhold action until he personally can decide what will be done with every penny of Campus Radio money. We sincerely appreciate Blackwell's concern that SG money not be wasted, but it is hard to understand his everything-has-to-have-my-stamp-of-approval attitude. His experience with SG financial matters is unquestioned, but his apparent attitude that only he knows right from wrong is questioned.

With a series of seemingly endless and mostly picayunish amendments to the legislation, Blackwell almost singlehandedly imposed his will on the entire legislature. He literally talked the legislation to death. Only a third of the bill had been read when time ran out on that last meeting of the year.

Little, who did his share in preventing the vote, opposed immediate action because he wants to have a campus-wide referendum. We maintain that a referendum is unnecessary, now or ever. Student legislators were not elected to run to their constituents every time a major decision is to be made. An increase in fees is the only issue which really requires a referendum, and this issue does not exist.

The conservatives have had their way on Campus Radio. They refused to even let the issue come to a vote, apparently because they were afraid it would pass.

What has been done cannot be changed. Campus Radio has been delayed, and we think needlessly. But delay is not fatal, even though it might be weakening.

The DTH will air all opinions, pro and con, next fall, the referendum will be held and we hope it will be passed.

Then we can all go about the business of enjoying a new student service which has, at least temporarily, been denied to the many by the few.

### A Tradition To Revive

The oldest commencement award is the Mangum Medal, first awarded in 1878 by the Dialectic and Philanthropic Societies. More than half a century ago competition for the medal was the highlight of graduation ceremonies, and all seniors were required to participate.

The awarding of the medal has been the responsibility of various groups since that time, but the Di and Phi are in charge again. The societies are interested in seeing a new interest put on speaking, and we join them in urging seniors to take part in this year's competition on May 18. Applications are available on bulletin boards around campus and at the Graham Memorial desk.

## 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; 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.

# Viewing The Goodykoontz Case

## A True Concept Of Productivity

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Friday's issue of the DTH contained an article by staff writer John Jennrich supporting the faculty's position in the case of Dr. William F. Goodykoontz. It bore the title "Support Given Faculty Position."

The policy of holding a teacher from promotion or dismissing him because of his failure to publish is not one of the University as a whole, but it is strictly one of individual departments.

There are many departments which follow this policy. The Department of English is one. But how much does the "faculty" (the instructors, graduate students, associate professors, assistant professors or even the full professors) have to say about who is hired, fired or promoted? Very little. The burden lies with the head of the department.

The title of Jennrich's article is incongruous. It should have read: "Support Given George Harper's Position."

The statement that Goodykoontz "has attracted the almost fanatical admiration of a few students. But many other students have a considerably different opinion of him . . ." is fallacious. Although many students do not agree with his opinions, they respect and admire him for what he believes and is — a dedicated and inspiring teacher in the best sense of the words.

Many students admire him; few do not. There is probably no other teacher on this campus having such a large percentage of former students who say: "He is the best teacher I've ever had."

But Jennrich continues: "The reason

Goodykoontz is not being rehired is because he has not made a favorable impression on his colleagues in the Department of English. This unfavorable atmosphere may have foundation in a great variety of reasons, including his failure to publish." Contrary to these opinions, Goodykoontz has made a more than favorable impression on all of his colleagues in the Department of English, all but George Harper.

The truth of this is easily proven. The notion that Goodykoontz might have made an unfavorable impression on his fellow teachers because of his failure to publish is ridiculous. It tends to vitiate Jennrich's original assumption of faculty competency. Faculty approval, indeed, is as it should be, but I believe that more than a "few" students "care about what will happen to the University after they leave."

Jennrich has, however, stated one truth: "There are too many other professors still on campus who have . . . not published anything of significance in their field." It seems that the criterion of a teacher's future rests not on the type and value of the publication, but on the length — quantity before quality.

This destroys the foundation of the very argument for publish or perish. Publishing, in itself, can be of great value. But its value should not come into temporal conflict with the primary concern of a teacher — to teach.

How many of the faculty members have anything to say about who stays, who gets promoted or who leaves? Are they "really the people best able to judge their colleagues?" Do they really know how effective their colleagues are in the classrooms? How do they judge their colleagues? On their list of degrees? On their personal appearance? On their opinions? On the num-

ber of papers they have published?

Or do they judge them on their ability to inspire, activate and arouse their students? Goodykoontz has been described by Harper as a "non-producer." The students and Goodykoontz have a true concept of what makes a teacher productive and what does not. Harper and his "senior professors" lack this concept.

Jonathan B. Arterton  
St. Anthony Hall

## Leaders Of SFT Said Respectable

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Happily the heckling and Mickey Mouse chants were absent from Monday's Students for Teachers rally. Responsible students demonstrated that all campus protest is not conducted by a few so-called "peaceniks" or emotional "activists" who seem to embrace any cause of current controversy.

Leaders like Paul Dickson and Pete Wales are showing that student protest has a definite place in this often too tranquil university. The debate over the Goodykoontz dismissal is one in which students should have a definite voice. In fact, their open participation is almost necessary in an incident that so directly influences their academic futures. To deny students a voice is to say that this incident has no relevance to their carefully programmed "education"; that the concern is in the hands of Dr. George Harper alone or a few administrative officials; that students may not try to rectify what they consider an injustice to themselves, as well as Goodykoontz.

After all, the release of Goodykoontz (allegedly for lack of publishing and nebulous "other reasons") must have been to insure that UNC students were receiving only the most competent faculty. If these reluctant beneficiaries of Harpers' dictum decide that they are being cheated by the loss of a stimulating teacher, it is their every right to declare their stand publicly at an open air rally so that there will be no mistake of just who is supporting that stand and why.

Although there are many views on the publish or perish controversy, rallies are not to be condemned for merely taking a particular side.

Supposedly we are being taught to soberly appraise issues and to stand up for our convictions. The orderly and informative way in which the rally was managed demonstrated that students can indeed be both vocal and responsible at the same time. Our administration should be proud of such a display of student concern instead of condemning it as "agitator" inspired.

If Phi Beta Kappa members and Honor Council leaders are campus agitators, then I am privileged to be a part of the academic "rabble" that they led in a quiet storm through South Building. We must live with the education that this university offers us and it is our own loss if we forever huddle in dorm rooms muttering about our plight.

Student rallies of this type should not only be tolerated, they should be firmly supported by students no matter what their particular opinion.

Richard L. Nichols  
247 Ehringhaus

## 'Idiot Of Week' Nomination Made

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I would like to nominate Student Body President Paul Dickson for the DTH's Idiot of the Week award. If the Tar Heel doesn't give an award in that category, it should create one especially for Dickson.

Anyone who attended the Students for Teachers rally in Y-Court Monday heard both sense and nonsense, but Dickson's pledge to take the publish or perish controversy to the General Assembly is thoroughly silly.

I don't know George Harper at all, but somehow I just can't help but believe that his hiring and firing practices are more reliable and less damaging than those that might be used by the same crowd in Raleigh that enacted the speaker ban,

thumbed its nose at the Consolidated University by changing N. C. State's name, is currently entertaining a proposal to abolish the State Board of Higher Education (because it objects to the speaker ban maybe?) and has been toying with a lot of hairbrained schemes for selecting University trustees. Haven't they done enough damage?

If Dickson is trying to impress us with his influence in high places, I'm perfectly willing to take his word for it if he'll just stop trying to prove it. I can see it now:

Clarence Stone, Chairman  
Department of English  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Leon Galis  
Department of Philosophy

## 'Controversial': Meaningless Tag

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

"Controversial" is a term that I have heard applied to Dr. W. F. Goodykoontz in explanation of the decision of the Department of English not to renew his contract. Like a great many other explanations, this one has the effect of settling down like a cloud over all of the issues that are, or might be, involved.

The biggest "Webster's" around defines "controversial" as "subject to controversy, relating to, or of the nature of, controversy; polemical disputations . . ." It defines "controversy" as "Act of disputing or contending . . . on a matter of intellectual interest; as, the Darwinian controversy . . . A cause or case of variance or contention; . . . discussion, . . . debate, . . . quarrel; strife."

Obviously this is so broad that to say that someone or something is, or is subject to, controversy is extremely ambiguous. While I haven't heard Goodykoontz debate Darwinism, he may well engage in discussions of other matters of intellectual interest. I think he has assigned "Catcher in the Rye" to one of his classes, and, you know, that book, despite the fact that it was nominated for the National Book Award, contains a few four letter words that might shock some very protected 12-year-old somewhere. But then, so do Chaucer, the Bible, and many other standard and approved works.

But let's get to brass tacks. If anyone wants to evaluate the character of his fellow man, there are all kinds of straightforward unambiguous ways to do it. You can call a man a thief, a traitor, an adulterer, or any number of descriptive epithets. You can say that he is quarrelsome, impolite, prejudiced, mean, or violent. So far you are still getting some kind of message across, whether true or false. But when you say: "This man is controversial," you've made some vocal noises which express your displeasure with him, but you've done very little more.

I've heard it said that Goodykoontz doesn't get along with his colleagues in the department. There are all kinds of interesting possibilities for confusion here. Aside from the fact that Goodykoontz cannot recall a disagreement with any of his colleagues except George Harper, the chairman of the department, it's quite conceivable that there is a person, or persons, in the department who do not like Goodykoontz.

This would not be an astonishing fact, if true, because where two or three are gathered together anywhere in this world for any purpose, there is likely to be somebody who doesn't like somebody else. Academicians are mortal too, and subject to all the ills that flesh is heir to, give or take one or two.

So far, the issue is still obfuscated in darkness, because the mere fact, if true, that A doesn't like B proves nothing about the character, or disposition, or personality, of either. A good rule to remember is when you hear a rumor that someone is "controversial" or "doesn't get along" with somebody else, try to reserve judgment.

Many rumors in this world are false. Still others are meaningless. Finally, for any given person in the world except Will Rogers, there is, in all probability, somebody he doesn't like. And if I don't like you, perhaps, after all, it's really my fault.

Timothy Ray  
202 E. Rosemary St.

### Students Against Teachers

## New Movement Springs Up

By DAVID ROTHMAN

DTH Columnist

Frightened by the proliferation of the academia, enraged by the in loco parentis theory of the university establishment, convinced of the need for a radical critique and disgusted by the food in Lenoir Hall, a group of concerned individuals has formed Students Against Teachers, a movement based on liberal research and determined to define the distinctive identity of this school's undergraduate population while exploring the path to meaningful debate in such a manner as to promote the creation of a critical dialogue — all this while realizing that the bulk of our university structures, goals, and methods are not self-generated but derivative.

Known as a liberal action organization, SAT plans to hold a rally next Monday at Y-Court. Steve Weissman, Mario

Savio, Barry Goldwater and Alfred E. Newman will address the demonstrators.

SAT at present is busily printing up pamphlets and placards. Its representatives have met with the administration, which has indicated a willingness to negotiate.

WRAL-TV, together with the DTH and the wire services, is expected to provide adequate coverage of SAT's activities.

Already, 1500 students have signed petitions favorable to SAT's cause, which apparently enjoys widespread support.

At the rally, SAT will present a series of demands concerning the publish or perish issue. Should these requests not be met, SAT plans to sponsor mass protest, including a possible sit-in in the Pine Room.

SAT has been endorsed by Jesse Helms, William Long, Arthur Beaumont, Othelia Connor, Amistead Maupin and Dr. George M. Harper.

"... No More Talking, Plenty Of Fresh Air, And Lots Of Cold Showers."



## The Dominican Republic: Get Out? No, Annex It

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Those bearded, grubby beatniks are crazy! We shouldn't get out of the Dominican Republic; we should annex it.

Annexing the Dominican Republic as a state of the United States is the only way to prevent the power-hungry communists from taking over the island. It is the best way to prevent another Cuba, another Red base off our shores.

Although he is on the right track, President Johnson is not doing all he can to protect the American interests on the chaotic island. We need many thousands more troops and Marines there to protect Americans left on the island and to rid the area of those dirty communists.

Of the original 3,000 or so Americans in the Dominican Republic there are probably a few left, including helpless, defenseless newsmen, who are being murdered in droves. The real way to protect these people — and the thousands of soldiers down there — is to annex the Republic.

It is well known that Bosch, Wessin y Wessin, and the other guy with the funny name (something like Caamano) are communists. The FBI, CIA, and the John Birch Society have documented evidence — no doubt — that they are tools of Castro and Khrushchev, I mean Brezhnev.

Though obviously yielding somewhat to the impassioned, fanatical, pleas of beatnik demonstrators, President Johnson is following in the true American spirit of

Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy was certainly great for his revision of the Monroe Doctrine, which gave the U. S. duly-expected power in Latin America, and Johnson is doing even better.

Teddy was not afraid to send troops to some alien land to protect American interests from some foreign conspiracy. LBJ is also admired for his great attempt to prevent the international Jewish-Catholic-communist conspiracy from gaining a stronger foothold in the Caribbean.

Another, though distasteful historical character Johnson reminds patriots of, is Adolf Hitler. Hitler, you remember, invaded various, weaker countries in Europe to protect Germans there. Though this was wrong for Hitler, there is no logical reason why the U. S. cannot use the same technique to acquire worthwhile territories, such as the Dominican Republic.

There are only 20,000 troops in the Dominican Republic, but we must not waste a single second in employing all the troops we have (except those beating the Russians in Viet Nam) to take over the Dominican Republic. The country would be a welcome addition to our possessions, since it could be used as a base for invading Cuba.

Then we should take Haiti, another hotbed of rebels and conspirators, and Canada, where people want to blow up the beloved Washington Monument! It's manifest destiny!

Alan Banov  
550 Ehringhaus