

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Tom Gooding, Editor
Friday, December 11, 1970

Grievance Committee put Nyle in his place

Nyle Frank will return to his classroom to continue teaching the courses he was suspended from last week.

Dr. John D. Martz, chairman of the political science department, reinstated Nyle Frank after the department's Grievance Committee voted unanimously in Frank's favor.

Frank was suspended because of complaints Martz said he received from students in Frank's two sections of Political Science 41.

However, Martz was never able to produce the individuals who made the alleged complaints; and Frank had almost fifty students

willing to take the stand in his defense.

Thus the case against Frank fell back on the three vague charges given by Martz when he suspended Frank.

The Grievance Committee investigated those charges and found them to be without merit. Dr. James W. Prothro, chairman of the Grievance Committee, said he did not feel "that any serious charges were substantiated."

The suspension was made by Martz "with genuine regret." We suspect Martz regrets that decision more now than when he made it.

However, the important thing is that Nyle Frank is back where he belongs—in his classroom.

Administrators should go to Poli Sci 95A class

Today's meeting of Political Science 95A will determine what direction the course should take next semester and whether there should be such a course as 95A on this campus.

The answer to the first question is unclear until the students themselves evaluate the course. The answer to the second problem is a loud, clear "yes."

It is no secret that the University administration did all it could to keep 95A from being successful this semester, and if they are given the chance they will prevent the

existence of the course next semester.

For years administrators on this campus have been talking about "academic freedom" and speaking in vague terms about the "pursuit of knowledge."

But when they were faced with a course that actually presented an atmosphere of freedom in the classroom, they objected to it.

We hope all of those administrators who worked so hard this fall to kill the idea of 95A will go to today's meeting.

They might learn something about "academic freedom."

Rick Gray

And if elected I will not serve

I have been in Chapel Hill for four years.

I am sick of the University of North Carolina.

I am tired of trying to be too many things at once—student, journalist, politico, etc.

And at the end of the first session of summer school I will gather up my belongings pick up my diploma from my dean, get in my car and drive away from here.

I have been in school for sixteen years, and, quite frankly, I am tired of being educated.

I am ready to get out of school and learn what I want to learn for a change.

There are a lot of things I haven't been able to do in my lifetime because I have always been tied to the daily routine of having a class to attend, a quiz to take or a paper to write.

For some people I have met in Chapel Hill since the fall of 1967, the life of quizzes, classes and papers is the ideal existence.

For me the academic existence has become intolerable.

At some point during each person's life he reaches a point at which he can no longer feel knowledge can be gained through following others; he begins to believe that he himself is the only teacher who knows how or what to teach.

There are many men and women who know more than I and who are quite able to teach me what they know.

I have found some of them on this campus, and I have spent the last three years trying to get in their classes.

But this year I have begun to realize that going to classes, taking notes on a lecture and trying to pass someone's quizzes is not going to teach what I want to learn.

It is only going to teach me what someone else wants me to learn.

And for too long now I have been doing what other people want me to do.

After 16 years of the American educational process I am beginning to find it quite inadequate, and I have spent much of the last six months trying to

undo all the harm uncountable teachers have done from kindergarten through my senior year in this University.

It would be nice to stop right now, leave school and get a job doing what I want for whom I want. But I cannot do that.

When I came to this school I made a commitment to a number of people who mean a lot to me. I am going to finish this semester, tolerate next semester and find the easiest courses this University offers during summer school.

I will remain Associate Editor of The Daily Tar Heel until Easter vacation, and not one minute longer. That is another commitment.

When the next editor of this paper

takes control of this office, I will never again enter it in an official capacity.

I am tired of having people tell me that I am running for editor of the Daily Tar Heel.

I am not.

That statement will not change in two weeks, nor will it change at any time in the future.

During my sophomore year on this campus I made two decisions concerning The Daily Tar Heel. One was that I could probably never be elected to the office and the other was that the job was not worth the effort the campaign requires.

I was Tom Gooding's campaign manager last spring. I am his Associate Editor now. I will remain his Associate

Editor, but I will not become his successor.

The post of Associate Editor is as close as I want to come to being Editor of The Daily Tar Heel. There are many reasons for that, and they are the concern of no one but myself.

I wrote this column not because I thought the entire student body was waiting breathlessly for me to announce my candidacy, but because it was the best method I know of to communicate these thoughts to a number of people who seem to be laboring under the false assumption that I will be in the running this spring.

I happen to write better than I can talk, and I hate to write letters.

Letter to the editor

Class size limit impossible

To the Editor:

I would like to offer some comments on the column by Mr. Harry Bryan, which appeared on the editorial page, November 19, 1970.

(1) Mr. Bryan says that he was "unlucky enough to barely qualify for advanced placement" and was taking Mathematics 31 as a first semester freshman. The Department of Mathematics regards Mathematics 31 as the normal course for a first semester freshman; it is certainly not advanced placement course work. Mathematics 15 is essentially remedial, and its appearance in this University is dictated solely by the realities of North Carolina high school mathematics teaching. Thus Mr. Bryan was what is considered a normal first semester freshman.

(2) Mr. Bryan said, "...I soon found it to be over my head," and "...I came out of the course with a C." The grade of C indicates average work, and is a

satisfactory passing grade. It indicated to me, and I would think to any faculty member, that the course was not over the head of Mr. Bryan.

(3) The class in which Mr. Bryan was registered was over 100 in number, but was not "nearly 150." Mr. Bryan indicated unhappiness with the number of students in this section. With this I heartily concur; I would be delighted to have sections of no more than 30 students. This is impossible at the moment. The permanent faculty of this Department numbers 29, and we are teaching 2400 students in Freshman courses alone; in addition, we teach a full undergraduate and graduate program for majors and perform the largest undergraduate and graduate service function of any department in the College of Arts and Sciences. My own class in Mathematics 31 numbers 83 students this term. It is as large as this because two sections are amalgamated so

that we could free a teacher for an undergraduate Seminar.

(4) Mr. Bryan's instructor was a tenured member of the Department. This Department makes a serious effort to teach as many freshmen as possible with regular faculty; last year, for every student taught by a teaching assistant two were taught by regular members of the Department. Furthermore, the problem sessions to which Mr. Bryan alludes were regularly met not only by the graders for the course but were also met by the faculty member who is supposed to have refused to answer questions in class. These sessions were scheduled in the evening, which meant that the faculty members have regularly scheduled sessions of this sort, and the reservation of classroom space for this purpose is handled by the Department in the same way as reservation for regular sessions of classes.

(5) Finally, I would like to take direct issue with the statement, "The problem was undoubtedly created by professors who either didn't really know what the students wanted out of the course or who really didn't care whether the student felt he was learning anything or not." The problem is created by the birth rate and the desire of students, in ever increasing numbers, to learn. It is not as easy to create capable new teachers as it is to create babies. I would also like to pass on a comment made to me within the past two weeks by a mathematician at a major neighboring university, a man who has experience in several other universities, including some of the most prestigious. He said that he had never seen a department with a greater devotion to the problems of teaching than the Mathematics Department at UNC.

No doubt we are not completely successful in our teaching. Certainly there are complaints about our courses and about individual faculty members and teaching assistants. Many such complaints are passed on to me every day. I assure you that efforts are made to correct the causes of complaints. I wish that all the efforts were successful. I also wish that every student in every mathematics course would earn an A. Neither of these wishes is likely to be fulfilled on this earth.

Fred B. Wright

Chairman, Department of Mathematics

The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters to the editor, provided they are typed on a 60-space line and limited to a maximum of 300 words. All letters must be signed and the address and phone number of the writer must be included.

The paper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Address letters to Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.
Mike Parnell News Editor
Rick Gray Associate Ed.
Harry Bryan Associate Ed.
Chris Cobbs Sports Editor
Frank Parrish Feature Editor
Ken Ripley National News Ed.
John Gellman Photo Editor
Terry Cheek Night Editor

Doug Jewell Business Mgr.
Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.

Good thing 'free flick' costs little

We would like to express our appreciation to the folks who brought us "The Graduate" at the Union this week.

For a change, we were able to attend a cinematic accomplishment of slightly higher caliber than "Elvis Presley Meets Tammy."

But on the other hand, we were charged seventy-five cents and had to get in line an hour early.

It's a good thing we are fee-paying students or there's no telling what the Union might have charged for their free flicks.



Dane Hartgrove

Hope you have merry Christmas, Mr. President

Dear Mr. Nixon:

I received your letter of December 1, 1970 (copies to Secretary Laird, Secretary Rogers, and J. Edgar Hoover). I am writing to inform you that your requests have been duly noted and are under consideration at the present time.

However, some portions of your letter were a bit ambiguous, in that there was some doubt that you really meant what you said. I would like you to clarify the statements that I have noted as ambiguous, in order that I may have greater guidance in considering your requests.

Since I am unable for a variety of reasons to obtain such clarifications in a personal interview or in a telephone conversation, I suppose the best way for me to reach an understanding with you is to confront you with my impressions of your statements.

At one point near the beginning of your letter, you referred to your desire of realizing the completion of the Vietnamization process in the Indochina

War. Your meaning on this point seems a bit hazy; let me give you my impression of your meaning.

I assumed by complete Vietnamization, you meant that all of Vietnam should belong to the Vietnamese, and that you intended for the Vietnamese to have complete control over their own affairs. If that was what you meant to say, I commend you for your attitude, and I give you my promise that I and all my helpers will go to work immediately to help you realize completion of this program at the earliest possible date.

Your second request also raised some questions in my mind. You asked for help in bringing the nation back to the moral principles and ideals of your forefathers. Since your forefathers were governed by many different sets of principles, I think it might be politic for me to describe to you the kind of ideals that your nation should return to.

Your forefathers placed a high value on individual freedom. They believed that

the government is best that governs least, because they wanted themselves and their children to be free from domination by an alien group of people sitting in a far-away city. Besides which, they believed in friendship, love, and Christian charity, which, as you know, are also the hallmarks of the Christmas season.

I hope that I have interpreted your ancestral sentimentality correctly, sir. If so, you may count on my support for this program all year round, not just during the Christmas season.

You also asked me to aid you in straightening out the economy of the United States. Of course, you realize that the American economy is inseparably tied to the economies of the other nations of the world.

In order to help you in your struggle with American economic problems, then, it would first be necessary to straighten out the economies of the other nations with which your country is involved. This could best be done, in my opinion, by giving every nation complete control of

its own economic affairs, and by allowing every nation to trade on an equal basis with all other nations.

Besides providing for a maximum amount of freedom in the area of economics, such an arrangement would simplify the financial problems of all nations concerned, including your own United States. Since simple things are easily understood by all people, and I like to help people with their problems, I feel that such a solution to your economic problems would be beneficial on all counts. Should this view of the matter prevail, you can count on my support in handling your nation's economy.

You asked me for support for a volunteer army. I will give it to you on one condition: that you establish compulsory insane asylums for those who volunteer to fight and die for any cause. It has been my experience that nothing is ever gained by violence but the corruption of men's minds. Your recognition that all members of a volunteer army would have to be either

proving your problems through Congress. I am perfectly willing to help you with this problem, sir, but I am sure you must have realized when you made this request that I could do nothing that might harm one human being in order to help another.

My advice to you on the problem is this: take a vacation. Turn things over to your vice-president for a month or so, and go lie on the beach in Florida or in California. A trip to Hawaii might even be nice.

In your absence, Mr. Agnew could run things admirably. Were he to address a joint session of Congress in his capacity as President Pro-Tem, he would undoubtedly create such a furor that no work at all, let alone Democratic opposition to your programs, could be carried on.

Such an action would undoubtedly confuse or mentally disturbed would earn my support in this matter.

Lastly, Mr. Nixon, you asked me to free you from the problem of coping with the leaders of the Democratic Party when

have a cathartic effect upon Congress; consequently, you would probably return in a month or so to find a calm, sober congregation of legislators, who would all be quite ready to settle down to work again. However, the first item of business might turn out to be your impeachment.

I hope that I have interpreted all your statements correctly, and that we have now made everything perfectly clear. I look forward to seeing you on the morning of December 25, 1970.

Merry Christmas,
Santa Claus

P.S. I overlooked one of your more urgent requests in my previous statements. I am sorry to inform you that I will be unable to provide you with a rubber duck of the type used by the late President Kennedy for bathtub maneuvers. Instead, I am bringing you one of our new life-size, life-like, talking Millard Fillmore dolls. Like their namesake, they do nothing. I hope this meets with your approval.

S.C.