

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. ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR

Let It Alone

The News and Observer

It should be understood right now — before any special session of the legislature meets — that if supporters of the Speaker Ban Law are allowed to alter the proposed compromise amendment to better suit themselves, then the special session may as well not meet. The additional changes suggested by Gates Rep. Phil Godwin would amount to nullifying the compromise and keeping this divisive controversy alive.

It is not surprising that the compromise offered by the Speaker Ban Law Study Commission does not please Mr. Godwin. He should not find it strange that many equally patriotic and sincere men are displeased and disappointed that the commission failed to recommend outright repeal of the law. Mr. Godwin may want to come to Raleigh for this special session and insist that he remains right and those who disagree with him remain wrong. Some of those who disagree with him will come prepared to take an equally adamant stand.

Clearly, however, such stubbornness at this point will not represent intelligent thinking, only continued posturing.

This issue has moved beyond the time when, as a matter of legislative debate, it might have been relevant to focus public attention on speaker policies at Chapel Hill. Such attention has been given fully during the two and a half years in which this harmful controversy has raged. It is just as pointless, too, for others to argue that this law grew out of unrelated racial demonstrations in front of the Sir Walter Hotel; and pointless now to rehash and condemn the unbecoming methods used to rush the law to passage in less than 20 minutes.

The job at hand is to end the divisiveness and arrest the harmful erosion threatening the Consolidated University and other State supported colleges. The study commission spent considerably more than 20 minutes laying the foundation for this job. Those who seek substantially to alter the commission's proposed compromise are dealing lightly or blindly with a matter of grave importance.

Grading The Profs

Greensboro Daily News

The Winston-Salem Journal surveyed 11 North Carolina campuses this week and found that eight undergraduate bodies plan, or now operate, programs for grading their professors. It is a natural offspring of the human impulse to turn the tables, but hardly a new idea. At Harvard, the *Crimson* has long issued an impish catalogue of candid comment on teachers and courses. At Chapel Hill last year, 7,000 copies of such a directory were published.

Since students alone consume the offerings of the classroom, we suppose they are entitled to have their say, especially about the kind of teacher, increasingly pushed up by the mad premium on "research," who is a whiz in the library stacks and a drone in the classroom.

But college instruction hardly lends itself to a popularity contest, and obviously the most pleasing and conscientious teachers are not always the best.

In fact, it has always seemed to us that the best instruction runs to two rather different extremes; there are, that is to say, two kinds of reputations that get around. The types can be suitably captured only in hyperbole, but that hyperbole may jolt one's memory.

There is the natural teacher whose zest for opening a closed mind or imparting a truth is all-consuming. He is kindly and deferent; he listens without cracking a smile to the most absurd proposition. He has a reputation for making Napoleon (who he?) come alive, or for shedding tears when he reads the closing lines of *Paradise Lost*. He is perhaps a bit of a ham; most good teachers are.

The other type is known because his name strikes terror into the heart. His course is known (in less polite words) as an illegitimate and perhaps he is also. In the classroom he is Simon Legree with a whiplash, invariably a master of sarcasm and threat. The timid students write their mothers about him. The dull students hate him. The bright ones tremble and survive.

Who is better? The Gallup-Poll consensus inevitably shows Mr. Chips (No. 1) to be wonderful, and the holy terror (No. 2) as a dictatorial monster who ought to be running a banana republic. But time has a cruel way of playing tricks. Sometimes, in retrospect, the kindly and elegant teachings of Chips go cloudy. One remembers how he put color into the farewell of the Old Guard; but as for Napoleon's imperial policy, it has gone cold. But the brute's trenchant sarcasms, printed in iron, are unforgettable.

Let us hope that both approaches will have their due.

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; John Jennrich, associate editor; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thomas, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobol, ad. mgr.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. 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.

"As A Rule, I Don't Blind Date Either!"



Letters To The Editor

March On Washington For Peace In Viet Nam

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
On Saturday, Nov. 27, there will be a March on Washington for Peace in Viet Nam. Those of us participating in the march feel that our government has not exhausted all means of seeking an alternative to the ever-increasing human suffering and mounting destruction in Viet Nam. A year ago the war in South Viet Nam was a civil war, even though opposing factions were instigated, supported and supplied from the outside, by both the United States and North Viet Nam. Today the struggle has become largely a war conducted by the American armed forces against a South Vietnamese revolutionary movement increasingly aided by North Viet Nam.

It is said that the United States is seeking peace and freedom from aggression for Viet Nam. Belligerents of all wars claim to seek peace. The real question is what peace terms they are trying to impose, and how. American intervention, both in men and in war materials, is now much greater than the intervention from the North. The terrorism practiced by the Viet Cong is now vastly exceeded by the terror, death, and destruction inflicted by American planes. The only victory to which this massive military action may lead is a conquest of a decimated South Viet Nam by the United States, a "victory" that would require an indefinite military occupation of an Asian country by American troops. Is this the peace we seek to achieve?

American military action is defended as the only means of preserving freedom and democracy, as opposed to tyranny and foreign domination, in South Viet Nam. In truth, the United States has supported and armed a government which can make little claim to represent the people of South Viet Nam. The Saigon government has offered no more freedom and democracy, and currently receives far less internal support, than the Hanoi government of the North. The alternative in South Viet Nam is not between freedom and tyranny, but between continued destruction and a negotiated settlement worked out by those who must continue to live there with one another — a settlement which the United States or the United Nations might help to enforce, but which it is beyond our ability, or our right, to impose.

Dr. Sanford Gottlieb, who will speak on "Which Way in Viet Nam" at 8 p.m., Monday, Nov. 15, in Carroll Hall, is co-ordinator of the March for Peace. This past summer Dr. Gottlieb served as advisor to the inter-denominational group of clergymen who visited South Viet Nam on the fact-finding mission sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation. On his way to and from Viet Nam, he met in Paris and Algiers with officials of North Viet Nam and the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front. Concerning the purpose of the march, Dr. Gottlieb has stated: "We seek to end this war. We affirm that no party to the conflict, the U. S. included, has done all it can to bring about negotiations, and since the war will ultimately end at the conference table, we ask new actions to speed that day. These new actions must be designed to show military restraint, not military escalation. We disagree with the Administration's assumption that added military pressure will bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table. No proud nation — and the regime in Hanoi represents the only Asian people in modern times to win its independence by militarily defeating a Western colonial power — will

talk peace as the result of aerial bombardment. In Hanoi's view, the United States is the aggressor in bombing North Viet Nam and should take the first step simply by stopping . . . I doubt that we can be certain of the intentions of those we facelessly call "the other side" until the Administration is willing at least to stop the bombings of North Viet Nam without conditions, ultimatums, or deadlines." This, Gottlieb stated, was "the one deed unanimously emphasized" by those with whom he talked that might open peace negotiations with Hanoi.

To those who consider this march detrimental to the morale of our forces in Viet Nam, if not disloyal to our country, we would call attention to the words of Senator Fulbright, speaking in the U. S. Senate, Oct. 22: "Responsible dissent is one of the great strengths of democracy. France, for example, is unquestionably in a stronger position today in her relations with the emerging nations of Asia and Africa because during the years of colonial wars in Indochina and Algeria a large and articulate minority refused to acquiesce in what was being done and by speaking out, pointed the way to the enlightened policies of the Fifth Republic. The British Labor Party, to take another example not only protested the Suez invasion in 1956 but did so while the invasion was being carried out; by so doing, the opposition performed the patriotic service of helping Britain to recover its good name in the wake of a disastrous adventure." We see the present March on Washington in these same terms and urge all who have misgivings about the present course of the Administration's policy in Viet Nam to join this call to mobilize the conscience of America. The tone of the march is affirmative and creative, and civil disobedience is prohibited. Among the sponsors of the march are Arthur Miller, Dr. Edwin Dahlberg, John Hersey, Erich Fromm, Saul Bellow, Martin Luther King, Jules Feiffer and Dr. Benjamin Spock, some of whom will address the marchers. Those interested in participating in the march may contact either of the undersigned.

William Wynn
Lewis Lipsitz
Chapel Hill

William Ouis

Recent Liberal Victory In New York Does Not Indicate National Power

Since the recent elections, liberals everywhere have had a veritable ball celebrating John Lindsay's ascendancy to the office of Mayor of New York City. Surely, they gloat, his victory shall lead the Republican Party away from the reactionary madness which whetted its ideological and inter once and for all whatever ideological dispute remains in the party by burying one faction of the disputants — the conservative faction, of course.

Conveniently, if not surprisingly, the liberals have overlooked a number of significant facts of both the New York City race and other contests. Foremost among these is the fact that William F. Buckley, Jr., the Conservative Party candidate for mayor, drew some 340,000 votes. This is about 46,000 more than were cast for Lindsay on the combined tickets of the Independent Citizens and Liberal Parties, and well over twice the margin by which Lindsay won. That Buckley received any votes at all is astonishing when one considers that his opposition comprised one candidate, Abraham Beame, who had the endorsement of every important Democrat from LBJ to James Farley, and whose party enjoys a 3-to-1 registration advantage and operates an experienced machine; and a second, John Lindsay, whose press was hearty in its approbation of his candidacy, and who represented the only feasible alternative to a city administration which had been at best lackluster and at worse entirely incompetent. The fact that Lindsay defeated Beame is much less surprising: they were about equally matched in political advantage and indistinguishable in political ideology; so people simply voted for the tall, handsome liberal rather than the short ugly one.

There have been many efforts made to gauge the effect of Lindsay's victory on the future course of the Republican Party. There can be no doubt that it portends well for the liberal, urban wing which last year was so inept in persuading the party to choose a candidate other than Barry Goldwater. It will not cite Lindsay's triumph as evidence that the party can win if it but runs a tall, handsome candidate, well practiced in mouthing the usual liberal platitudes, somewhat more self-righteous than the Democratic nominee, unconcerned with such political archaisms as "principle," and quick to grasp the expedient above all other alternatives.

Conservative Republicans though, will point out that Lindsay's victory was entirely local in character. In New York City, he may win success by embracing extreme liberal Republicanism while suffering no decisive loss of more conservative GOP votes; but a Republican of the Lindsay stripe will be in trouble nationally. He can expect no help from the conservative and traditionally Democratic South and will be eyed with distrust and disdain by the Old Guard Republican of the middle west and plains states. Further, conservatives will rejoice that even in New York City, their candidate could receive such an astonishing and substantial number of votes.

The net result seems to be that it will be harder than ever to reconcile the conservative and liberal factions of the party.

Yet there is no reason for the Democrats to take cheer. After all, they did lose the most important majority in the country, and lost it decisively. Their numerical superiority and party organization sputtered into defeat. In Philadelphia, with like advantages, the Democratic incumbent candidate for District Attorney was defeated by the Republican nominee, Arlen Specter. In heavily Democratic Virginia, the Democrat nominee won over a determined Republican bid only with the combined, simultaneous support of such strange bedfellows as urban Negroes, the AFL-CIO and Harry Bryd. Even at that, his victory was by plurality, as a third candidate, William J. Story, got about 13.5% of the vote.

At best, then, the election results are inconclusive, the ravings of Walter Lippman, Evans and Novak, the *New York Times* et al, to the contrary notwithstanding. Conservatives did not have the revenge some of them sought, even if not explicitly, on Lindsay for his repudiation of Goldwater. Yet it is foolish to assume that so much as a large minority of New York City conservatives voted for Buckley in preference to Lindsay. The sobering prospect of four more years of Democratic decline in city hall may well have persuaded

many of these to cast their votes for a heretical but relatively intelligent and independent Lindsay — who had a chance of defeating Beame, rather than a like-minded conservative, Buckley, who, though equally intelligent and more independent — had no chance.

The political future of John Lindsay is another matter of considerable speculation. He has issued all the usual disclaimers of higher aspirations, but it is highly doubtful that he deserted a relatively tranquil and secure seat in Congress to wrestle with the infinite problems of the city government of New York simply out of a feeling of civic duty. Certainly Nelson Rockefeller has made clear his hopes for the mayor-elect. Yet if he intends to become the Republican nominee for President in 1968 or 1972, Lindsay will have to cease his reluctance to bear the title "Republican" and attempt to make himself palatable to that prevailing body of the party which at the moment views him with suspicion. Lindsay has shown that his liberalism can win against the registration advantage of the Democrats. But it is instructive to bear strongly in mind that he has won only in New York City, long a kind of greenhouse for liberal crabgrass, both Democrat and Republican; and that Democrats have proven more likely to break party lines in local and municipal elections in off-years than in major national elections; and that Lindsay's opposition was both unattractive and inept. It is quite possible, should Lindsay run for President against Lyndon Johnson, who, attractive or not, is by no standard inept, that the Democrats will vote with their party, while disaffected conservative Republicans stay home in droves. Such an election would deal in Lindsay a defeat so stunning that Goldwater's showing might look good.

Of course, all this is merely informed conjecture, but for those of you who believe in omens — exactly one week after Lindsay's election, all the lights in New York City went off.

Mike Jennings

Trial Nearly Over For Speaker Ban

The trial's about over. There may be a hanging soon. Let's not celebrate.

The speaker ban law seems doomed to radical amendment. It may even be lynched and disposed of. In either case, the Legislature is going to be a reluctant jury. Like most of us, legislators don't cotton to backing down.

We can give the Legislature a break by keeping very, very quiet until the special session is over. Catcalling at this late date would be not only useless but ungrateful as well. Yep, I said ungrateful. The Britt Commission worked hard to help clear the University's name. If the Legislature does as well, we'll owe it a vote of thanks. There's no cause to sow the seeds of further hostility with an "it's about time" attitude.

But, somewhere on campus, there's an idiot. I can see him now, in my mind's eye. He's in his room, working on a sign. On the day the Legislature rules on the trustees should have final authority on inviting speakers, that idiot is going to march into the state house and go right into the Senate Chamber so everybody can read what's on his sign: "Guess you graybeards won't fool with UNC anymore, huh?"

Then with the gag already hung and buried, they'll exhume the motley carcass and create a Frankenstein monster.

People, we've got to great that idiot before he leaves Chapel Hill.

LETTERS

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

