

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.

A Chance For Both Sides

Governor Dan K. Moore has been maintaining a silence on just about everything that has been more painful than his mumps.

But despite his ailment, he finally said a mouthful Thursday.

The dust had hardly settled from Senator Ralph Scott's charges about Moore's "lack of leadership" when the governor started talking.

A move is afoot in the General Assembly to abolish the Board of Higher Education. It apparently is more serious than most observers first thought, because Moore has taken a stand on the issue.

He said it would be "unwise" to abolish the board, but, "I believe the board's primary functions of long-range planning and coordination should be redefined and strengthened." Legislation to carry out such improvements is being prepared at his request, Moore said.

It is too early to tell just what he has in mind, but the chances are that the board may come out of the hassle with some needed improvements, rather than abolition.

And the governor finally commented on the speaker ban law and its possible effect on accreditation of state schools.

He said he will meet before next week with officials of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges about the problem, and he will "report my findings to members of the General Assembly."

Moore said he thinks there is no threat to accreditation, but he does not want to "overlook any possibility, however remote."

His words are late, and not forceful by any means, but they are better than nothing at all.

As Senator Scott said Friday, Moore "gave us the thunder but what we need now is the rain."

DTH Awards Of The Week

Most Comforting Fact of the Week: Classes end in nine days.

Most Interesting Fact of the Week: The AFL-CIO has said the average American worker needs \$123 a week to "maintain the necessities of life." This amount leaves nothing for luxuries and savings, the labor federation said. The "minimum" budget would provide one egg per person per day, one suit every two years for the wage earner and 3.5 dresses a year for his wife. It would be interesting to see how she divides that dress.

Quote of the Week: Wrestling coach Sam Barnes, who published a book, "Ready, Wrestle," this year. His team ended the season with a 4-5-1 record, and Barnes said, "It just goes to show you can publish and perish at the same time."

Don't Kid Yourself Award: To Army Chief of Staff General Harold K. Johnson, who has issued an order telling drill instructors to clean up their language. "I do not believe that we need blink at or condone those instances where the impropriety of the actions of our leaders and instructors can be interpreted clearly as offensive to many of the individuals who are subordinate to them," he said.

Most Unfair Contest of the Week: One of the frogs entered in next Wednesday's state-wide frog-jumping competition in Raleigh. The unnamed specimen has an obvious advantage in the contest—he has three legs.

Disappointment of the Week: Cultists in a primitive village of New Guinea recently spread the word that a giant egg would appear in the sky and hatch American goods and dollars on the people. Nothing happened. What has happened to our foreign aid program?

A Painful Silence

UNC students have the opportunity to hear a national debate on the issues concerning Viet Nam. A closed circuit radio broadcast from Washington may be heard in Carroll Hall, Gerrard Hall and Roland Parker lounge in Graham Memorial.

McGeorge Bundy, adviser to President Johnson on Viet Nam, and George Kahin, director of Southeast Asian Studies Program at Cornell University, will answer questions from a panel of academicians, half supporters of government policy in Viet Nam, half opposed to it.

Regardless of personal viewpoint, the program can be of value to every student. A local panel discussion will be held in Gerrard after the radio broadcast, and there the "doves" and "hawks" will be able to express their opinions.

The meeting will be worth little, however, if only "one side" shows up. We join Student Body President Paul Dickson in encouraging all students who can to attend the forum and discussion.

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 McCary, editor; Mike Yopp, associate editor; Kerry Sipe, managing editor; John Greenbacker, news editor; Fred Thomas, copy editor; Mike Wiggins, night editor; Fred Seely, sports editor; Richard Smith, asst. sports editor; Andy Myers, John Jemrich, Mary Ellison Strother, Ernest Robl, Bob Wright, David Rothman, staff writers; Bill Lee Pete Cross, sports writers; Jack Lautner, photographer; Chip Barnard, art editor; Becky Timberlake, secretary; Jack Harrington, business mgr.; Woody Sobel, 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.



In The Mailbox

Too Few Talented Teachers At UNC

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

The student critics of the University's proportions of emphasis on research, publication and teaching ability, have, in return, been sharply criticized.

As reported in state papers, Chancellor Paul Sharp has identified such critics as "professional students who become professional agitators." If they are radicals and beatniks, then it is clear that they cannot be right in this dispute. They are merely part of that notorious disgruntled minority that is causing all the trouble, on all kinds of issues, all over the country. Hopefully they have been effectively silenced by this

expose of who they are, and now the administration can return, undistracted, to the business of running the University.

But suppose they were right. Suppose that poor teachers were too abundant in the classrooms of the University — how could the problem be dealt with? The answer up to now has been clear: poor teachers cannot be too abundant; poor researchers perhaps, unprolific publishers certainly. But poor teaching is no problem. There is no such thing as poor teaching; there are only poor students — students who, when they do not succeed, organize into mass movements of criticism.

Otelia Chooses Sides In Publish Or Perish

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Many students have asked me which side I was on in the publish or perish contest. I have answered that I was on the side of good teaching.

I believe research and publishing is important, but it should not take precedence over good teaching. I have audited classes here, where it was perfectly evident that the professors were primarily interested in the book they were writing for publication, and not interested in the students they were teaching. A few people are able to do both. A way should be found to enable

the majority to concentrate on one project at a time. Perhaps they could write during the summer.

But the University should grab a good teacher and hold on to him, even if it has to give him a year's leave with pay.

I am not qualified to pass judgment on the current debate involving Dr. William Goodykoontz. I have not taken his courses, nor have I talked to the administration.

However, I did attend the rally at Howell Hall in Goodykoontz's behalf recently. I never saw anything like the spontaneous enthusiasm for Goodykoontz, or the standing ovation they gave him when he left the platform. I decided he was worth at least one audit of his class, so the next day I sat in on his class, and I found him very good and interesting, and I may add, that his subject was one that I was familiar with, as it is one of my favorite courses.

I don't think the students in these demonstrations are radicals. I know many of them, personally, and they are fine young men.

Of course the final decision in hiring and firing rests with the administration. It could not be any other way. But the students have a big stake in this matter also. The administration should welcome the opinion of the students in determining whether professors are effective, or ineffective teachers.

I may say in closing that I was very proud of the University students who demonstrated for good teaching at the Y Court. They exercised self-control and restraint, but they left no doubt about the seriousness of their intentions to be heard in this, and other cases like it to come.

I thought how fortunate UNC was, not to have the rioting, and rock-throwing, etc., that is going on in this country, and all over the world, not by the communist, but by the young people. The youth of today are willing to suffer and go to jail for what they believe. Can we older ones say as much for ourselves?

Otelia Connor
Chapel Hill

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.

Phillips Russell
300 Chase Ave.

Social Critics And The Ills Of Society

By TIMOTHY RAY
DTH Columnist

Through the DTH William G. Otis has recently blamed social critics for juvenile crime, abstract expressionist painting and sculpture (assuming that's what "paper mache, metal scraps, and garbage" refers to), illiteracy among high school graduates, and a catalogue of social ills.

It appears that he believes that, first, the world was once a paradise; second, social critics wrote a few books which everybody hurriedly read, and then, as a result, civilization was destroyed. Any writer would be thrilled if he believed that words could so profoundly affect human institutions, though the kind of writers that James Gardner and I are hope that our words would improve the world, rather than reduce it to the sort of jungle that Otis seems to perceive it to be.

I am reminded of his response to my criticism of his defense of the speaker ban. In that article, he said, first, that I had accused him falsely of saying that all anti-ban people were communist; second, that the sciences weren't affected by the ban anyway; and third, that the General Assembly passed the ban in order to protect taxpayers from having to support a platform for subversives.

Regarding the first point, he is partly correct. Otis didn't call all anti-ban people communists. He exempted anti-ban Goldwaterites. His original statement was that some of the anti-ban people favored a change in our form of government.

This was clearly meant to be an indictment. Yes, I would like some changes: I would like the North Carolina Governor to possess the veto; I would like a rule

that Congress cannot grant the President the power to decide when to make war, as it did, in effect, last August, regarding SEATO. I think this power should stay with Congress, as before. In the context of Otis' remark, these changes appear trivial, since they would not communize America. If he did not have in mind changes that would make the nation communist, his remark is irrelevant and confusing.

If Otis thinks that the ban hasn't hurt the sciences, he should ask the scientists here about the physicists who have refused to join the faculty because they object to the ban. Third, if the taxpayers were the reason for the ban, they could have been completely provided for by a rule that no one can give money to a communist for speaking here, build an auditorium that isn't already needed for non-communist speakers to speak in, or schedule a communist speaker at a time and place when there was a non-communist speaker in need of that particular time and place. Of course, to be consistent, they would have had to rule out the purchase of any communist books or periodicals with tax money, which they did not do. The whole point of phrasing it in "taxpayer" terminology was to attempt to avoid making the elimination of freedom of speech blatant, which failed.

Otis compares us with children who protest over fishsticks. I have nothing against fishsticks. I don't like, however, to see racial discrimination still practiced anywhere. I don't like to see any populace, including this one, uncritically accept any war that its government is involved in, because I think wars, on the whole, have done mankind incalculably more harm than good, and because, in every war, each side seems perfectly justified, to the people on that side.

As far as demonstrating goes, I think one should have more than "the license of our dedication" — a lot more — one should have examined all the facts he can and then have done a lot of calm thinking. Otis doesn't like protest. I don't suppose he likes to see women voting either, because it took protest to get woman suffrage.

Let's look and see, although that's an unavoidably risky business, because if we decide, after we look, that something or other ought to change, and if we act on the basis of our beliefs, then we become known as "radicals." The term has a tendency to stick; some "radicals" like it after they get called it a few times. Actually, it can be a useful term to distinguish people who don't believe in the business of saying: "Okay, I'll leave X alone, to please you, if you'll join me in trying to change Y," from everybody else.

Otis calls us adolescents. From his tone, one would expect to see some aged historian shaking his head over the decadence of modern society. But, no, it's only a fellow student, defending the present state of things from change, or maybe it's some point in the past that he prefers. It's hard to know which.

Hour Is Late For Ban Action

The Charlotte Observer

Avid supporters of the speaker-ban law imposed in 1963 on state-supported institutions of higher education have not been swayed by the most reasonable arguments against this gag rule.

Even those legislators intellectually opposed to the restriction have, with a few notable exceptions, feared to speak up for repeal of the hastily enacted law. As Gov. Dan K. Moore told a group of North Carolina editorial writers in Chapel Hill last month, "It's simply not politics to try to take the law off the books."

The legislature is scared to death to try to do anything about the law in this session. Gov. Moore has been no help with his expedient approach to the whole subject.

For this new crop of lawmakers to give the matter the kind of thoughtful discussion and debate it did not get in 1963, someone will have to summon the courage to introduce repeal legislation.

When university accreditation is threatened, with all that is implied in the loss of reputation, faculty and academic standing, the hour is more than late.

And The Enemy Is Us

The News and Observer

Students at UNC are embroiled in a new fuss. A number of them are standing up for a 50-year-old lecturer whose one-year contract in the Department of English was not renewed.

No one should fault the students; it will be a sad day when vocal vehemence does not from time to time punctuate life at that vital institution. But no one need mistake the fuss for the issue, either. The part-time instructor, William F. Goodykoontz, has a "history of dissatisfaction at other institutions," according to the department report which recommended against rehiring him.

And at Chapel Hill, apparently, he gets along with the boys and girls, but is a cocklebur with his colleagues and those responsible for him. Also, unfortunately, he seems to lack potential either as a scholar or as an administrator.

The Chapel Hill campus is a tolerant at-

mosphere but there are no squatter's rights there on the bottom rungs of the ladder. Temporary faculty posts at a university belong to men on the move, either up or out.

The stimulating issue the students have grasped at is the "publish or perish" notion. Many laymen would agree that this prod too often seems to result in learned writings about the irrelevant. But Goodykoontz has not published too little; records at Chapel Hill indicate he has published nothing, has contributed no new knowledge to his field besides his degree paper years ago. Skillful teaching methods are hardly half the scholarly teacher.

The ardor with which some students are defending Goodykoontz will do no harm. They will come to know him and themselves better. Chancellor Paul F. Sharp recognized this in quoting a comic strip character who spoke more truth than he knew in exclaiming victoriously, "We have met the enemy and he is us."