

The firing of Jerry Cashion

Jerry C. Cashion has taught in the UNC history department for the past year after teaching in the Evening College for the past 10 years. Cashion was hired by the former chairman of the UNC history department, Dr. James Godfrey, on the recommendation of Prof. Hugh Lefler, the man Cashion was replacing, a Kenan professor and a giant in the field of North Carolina history.

Despite Cashion's lack of an M.A. or a Ph.D. degree (which he hopes to get late next fall) he was hired as an instructor in recent N.C. history. Mr. Cashion has been a graduate student for the past 11 years and has completed everything but his dissertation, entitled "Cherokee Indians and North Carolina 1754-1838."

On Friday, April 12, Cashion was invited to become one of the 75 members of the Historical Association of North Carolina.

Cashion is a very popular teacher and communicates well with students. He is known as "Pop" Cashion by many and teaches one of the heavier loads at UNC, about 600 students. Roughly a third of these are in a freshman survey course. The rest are in two sections of North Carolina History II (1835-1974), which are the only two sections of recent N.C. history taught at UNC.

Attendance is stressed in all Cashion's classes and course material covers one-half of the Lefler textbook (300 pages) plus 1,500 pages of suggested outside reading. There are two midterms and a final, all relying heavily on factual information. Cashion is flexible about arranging convenient dates for these tests.

On March 8, Cashion received a

letter from the chairman of the history department informing him his contract would not be renewed. If Cashion had been retained by the department he would have been promoted to assistant professor next year under department rules. The chairman of the history department had every right to make his decision and is under no obligation to divulge details of his decision. Cashion will probably not go back to his job at the Evening College next year.

The situation is unfortunate for several reasons. He is a popular teacher, perhaps popular enough to win a teaching award. And good teaching should be stressed far more than it is today in evaluating professors on campus (see the accompanying editorial). And if Cashion is an unworthy scholar, it is too bad the department had him teach so many students. But most important of all, it is hard for the friend of so many students to leave the University.

We support, however, the history department's decision for the following reasons and with the following reservations.

• With today's glut on the Ph.D. market it is unfair not to hire a man who has both credentials and teaching ability.

• It is the prerogative of the department chairman to make policy decisions, and while students must have a voice in the decisions, the chairman must have ultimate control of his department. In the Cashion decision, the chairman was backed by the majority of his department.

• The department's concern for teaching ability and credentials has been shown in their wise delay in hiring a replacement. More

The Daily Tar Heel

All unsigned editorials are the opinion of the editors. Letters and columns represent the opinions of individuals.

Founded February 23, 1893

Wednesday, April 17, 1974

qualified people are available for the job and the department is finding the best qualified person for the job.

• Popularity is important for a good teacher but should not be allowed to completely outweigh scholarship. Cashion's predecessor has written 15 books on N.C. history and is the outstanding authority in the field. William Powell, the history department specialist in early North Carolina history, is also an accepted authority in the field.

• The large number of students in Cashion's charge is more a function of his role in the department than his appeal as a teacher, even though he is popular. Of his 600 students one-third are freshmen (and thus have little say what division they are in) and the other two-thirds are enrolled in courses on which Mr. Cashion now has a monopoly.

• Cashion's incomplete thesis ends on the date which begins the period on which he is supposed to be expert.

• He has delayed so long in completing his degree requirements that other, faster scholars should be given the chance for his job. Cashion will not be able to meet the August deadline which had been set for him earlier.

To be completely fair, students should complain about bad teachers who are retained as well as popular ones who are fired. Cashion has

become a *cause celebre* when real (and more numerous) cases of departmental mismanagement seem to escape their notice. There is injustice both in departments which keep poor teachers (often using credentials as a justification) and in students who single out insubstantial cases to support their strong arguments for popular teachers.

In the future, we would recommend that department chairman release as much information as possible about their work, while retaining the prerogative of silence in certain cases. A complete solution for the problem is impossible to find (other than hiring perfect teachers to begin with) but the current system puts both the employer and the employee in a difficult and unfair position.

Also, perhaps there is a place for a Cashion-type history course outside the history department. While few of his students will admit that it is an easy course, no one would agree that it is terribly difficult. There are many non-history majors on campus who are from North Carolina and would like a popular course which dealt generally with recent state history. But in a history department of national stature, professors must be popular and impeccably qualified. And it is the duty of the department chairman to maintain that calibre.

Students' opinions need consideration

The decision not to renew the contract of Jerry Cashion as an instructor in the history department has raised one recurring question in the minds of many students: Where does my opinion on matters come in?

This editorial does not attempt to make any judgment on the rightness or wrongness of the Cashion decision. Although the history department did not divulge the exact reasons for the failure to re-hire, we assume that the department felt that Cashion did not meet the standards the department had in mind.

It is the history department's perfect right to come to such a decision; we do not dispute that the ultimate power of promotion and retention rests with the department.

And, what is important is not whether the editors agree with the decision of the history department. What is important is how students reacted to the decision.

What the reaction shows is this: students are most concerned that they may not be heard by those making the decisions. The Cashion affair has demonstrated this.

Students are in day-to-day contact with the professors. Whatever a professor's qualifications are on paper, the results of those qualifications show up in class. Shouldn't how students feel and what they have observed in an everyday manner be important to those making decision?

Therein lies the importance of the present pilot project on course-teacher evaluation. The Course-Teacher Evaluation Commission, a student group, has a \$15,000 grant

to carry out evaluations this spring and through the next academic year.

The departments of psychology, mathematics, chemistry, political science and English are cooperating with the Course-Teacher Evaluation Commission. Next fall, the history, zoology and sociology departments will be added to this list.

Currently, the chemistry, English and political science departments have past experience in conducting their own semester evaluations.

The results of this semester's student project will be printed up in pamphlet form and distributed free of charge early next fall. Results will be in the form of bar graphs so that good points and bad points are easy to pick out.

The Board of Trustees recently passed a resolution which requires that some student input be considered in faculty promotion and tenure decisions.

The results of the evaluations are the inputs that students must have—because the results show what a cross-section of students feel about a teacher's ability in class.

That a pilot project in course-teacher evaluation has finally started is good. However, to ensure that all the facts are available to the departments come decision-time, the pilot project must remain on as a permanent project.

Student opinion is by no means supreme. But it is valuable in broadening the perspectives and open-mindedness of decisions made by the departments about their faculty members, and must be taken into consideration.

Reid Murchison

Energy: wanton use must cease

Project Independence, Nixon's answer to the energy problem, sounds good and noble, but it is a hasty, short sighted response to the present crisis. In the long-run, Nixon's Project Independence may prove to be a destructive mess.

President Nixon's plan consists of rapidly increasing domestic energy production so that the U.S. may be independent of foreign fuel supplies by 1980. Offshore drilling and coal mining will be vastly expanded. Shale oil will be developed and the Alaskan oil fields will be tapped with the completion of the Alaskan pipeline. Nuclear energy capacity will be greatly increased.

However, long-term U.S. energy needs

will not be satisfied simply by forsaking oil imports, declaring our courageous self-reliance and then rapidly developing and consuming every conceivable source of energy in our own country. Energy independence involves staggering costs. In our drive toward self-sufficiency, we may destroy both the environment and the economy.

It is urgent that the U.S. begins to develop sound long-range energy policies. The energy crisis is not just a momentary matter of gas lines, reduced car sales, and cancelled vacations. With every additional kilowatt hour consumed the crisis becomes more critical.

Energy sources are finite; future energy demand is infinite. If future energy supplies are to meet future demand, either tremendous supply increases must be generated or future demand must be limited.

Analysis of Energy Consumption

U.S. energy consumption growth rate averaged 3.4 per cent per year between 1950 and 1972. And recent growth rates have been increasing. Even at the conservative rate of 3.4 per cent per year, energy consumption in the year 2000 will be two and one-half times present use. "Energy consumption could grow from 75 quadrillion BTU (British Thermal Units) in 1973 to about 95 in 1980, 115 in 1985 and 185 quadrillion BTU in 2,000," according to a report prepared by the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project.

To meet the spiraling demand, development of gas and oil will be escalated, coal strip mining will increase, and nuclear capacity will be multiplied 40 to 60 times by the year 2000.

Cost of Aggressive Development

A healthy environment would be expended in favor of increased supplies. Considerable air pollution would result. The character of many rural, oceanfront and sparsely populated parts of the country would be drastically changed.

Nuclear energy involves immense possible danger to human life and the environment. According to Atomic Energy Commission data, the release of one-tenth of the radioactive poison from one nuclear power plant could cause the following results: evacuation of cities, and the countryside perhaps for years, outdoor activities restricted for millions of people, food and water supplies ruined in an area as big as California, massive unemployment and economic disaster. 3,000 to 500,000 people killed by acute radiation exposure and thousands more killed years later by radiation-induced diseases.

Already, experts doubt that there will be enough uranium ore, the fuel used by nuclear reactors, to power nuclear plants long enough for utilities to regain investments. One expert maintains that even at 5 times the current cost, U.S. uranium reserves will produce no more energy than that normally obtained from coal during a five year period. The public will bear the burden of unwise development.

Energy conservation would be subordinated in favor of increased supply. For every unit of energy consumed in the

near future, there will be one unit less to consume in the more-distant future. The faster energy supplies are developed, the sooner energy supplies will run out.

Demand Must Be Limited

Energy costs must be weighed against energy benefits before the nation becomes committed to an energy policy which loses more than it gains.

Continued growth of energy consumption will be suicidal. We can not afford the price of an "abundance today—poverty tomorrow" policy. It is not worth the destruction of the environment, the shattering of the economy and the risk to human life.

Therefore, fuel must be conserved and future demand must be limited if we are to avoid self-destruction. Through a reordering of priorities and the systematic application of energy-saving technology, we can limit and supply future demand; we can escape devastating costs and we can maintain a high quality of life.

Our wanton use of energy must cease. We must adapt a wise public policy of fuel conservation.

Durability, rather than disposability must become industry's goal. The American ethic that "more is better" must give way to the ethic that "enough is best."

Through technical advances, including a systematic program to build smaller cars, increase aircraft efficiency and utilize more efficient railroads and trucks, the energy use growth rate could be substantially slowed. According to the Ford Foundation's report, "the total possible savings (the year) 200...are about 65 quadrillion BTU per year."

In addition, "really revolutionary energy-saving commitments" could be permanently stabilize energy consumption. Such commitments include redesigning entire communities, overhauling industries to maximize efficient energy use, rejuvenating city core, making mass transit a vehicle for the masses, and producing cars that last for 20 years.

Alternatives to self-destruction are available. We must rearrange our priorities and employ the technology we possess if we are to provide for our long-range energy needs.

Self-sufficiency is not worth self-annihilation. Energy at the cost of all else is energy not worth having.



Isaiah Quincy

Essence of dust

Will Shakespeare, in a mellow moment, let Prince Hamlet of Denmark ennoble man as "infinite in faculty," "express and admirable in action" and the "paragon of animals." But also mad Hamlet turns on his own praise with the declaration "Man delights me not."

That was a hasty judgment on the young prince's part. Yet it is a judgment that seems in accord with the humor of our times as well. Many feel that faculty can be measured by external standards, that man's admirable actions are lost among his unexpressible ones, and that his true relationship to animals is best seen in locker rooms.

Contemporary commentators seem to no longer delight in man. Aside from occasional "human interest" stories, he is intent on analyzing policies rather than persons, merchandise rather than men, fatality statistics rather than female's.

This orientation ought to be modified. Man (both he-man and she-man) is indeed a delightful creature to be studied by all lovers of enlightenment and the arts. Man's magnificent ascensions and fearsome flops are to be watched with a careful, kind, critical,

loving and impatient eye. Perhaps only mothers can watch mankind in this way. It is my interest, however motherly, to bring to these pages observations on the children of this frail earth.

In this attempt I draw my inspiration from my 18th century British predecessor, Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq., whose insightful "lucubrations" are often credited with the raising of his nation to the international stature it now enjoys—Empress of the North Sea and the Thames, birthplace of the Queen Elizabeth II and home of Princess Anne and of the English muffin.

My subject matter shall be the whole of human activities; the arts, labor, scholarship, genteel diversions and pleasures, affairs of state and whatever other affairs come to mind. I shall draw upon the conversations of my friends, acquaintances and self for the substance of these commentaries.

Allow me to end this introduction in order that I may begin again soon with modest observations on Will Shakespeare's "quintessence of dust."

Gary Fulton

Gone with the whim

Premiering this week at the University of North Carolina is the new hit regulation from the University Traffic Office, "What Ever Happened to Parking Permits?," the latest release from that office known for its shockers.

You've heard everyone talking about it, and now you can see for yourself the reasons why this regulation has raised a storm of controversy in every facet of University life. You'll be amazed at the unheard of proposals, the improper suggestions and the sinister inferences. Every viewer will be shocked and horrified as the helpless student body is gang-raped by a brutal Administration, and you'll sit in stunned silence while heartless officials and sadistic bureaucrats perform weird rites on the faculty and students alike.

See the heartbreak and pathos as countless love affairs between students and their cars are broken up by unfeeling clauses. See the normal life styles of untold thousands shattered by exotic quotas and perverted games of chance. Watch the terror of deprived underclassmen and the agony of commuters as they are forced to submit to cruel and unusual punishments. See large sums of money extorted for dubious "privileges."

This new extravaganza has a star-studded cast, including many of your all-time favorites. You'll see Claiborne S. Jones as a villainous administrator, forcing his evil will on innocent students. You'll see Associate Dean of Student Affairs James Cansler as a well-meaning but bumbling bureaucrat and RHA Chairman Mike O'Neal as a babbling idiot.

The supporting cast features the Board of Trustees, playing a group of submissive rubber-stamp fetishists and the Campus Governing Council as a gang of morons, with thousands of student extras for the spectacular wholesale-screwing scene.

Yes, folks, this is the one you've all been waiting for, and those who expected a script of unbelievable incompetency and stupendous stupidity will not be disappointed. It will leave you exhausted and incredulous with its profound implications and pervasive perversity.

Here are just a few comments from people who have viewed this mysterious masterpiece:

- "This one really takes you for a ride."—a student
- "It keeps you spellbound, because you never know what will happen next."—faculty member
- "It took my breath away."—a secretary
- "I threw up my lunch when I saw it."—commuter
- "Not to be believed."—staff member
- "Goes far beyond any previous effort in its class."—grad student
- "I laughed till I cried."—a professor
- "An exercise in unadulterated terror and uncensored brutality."—resident advisor

You won't want to miss "What Ever Happened to Parking Permits," destined to be the most talked about release in University history.

By the way, this release has been rated X for X-cessive, and is not recommended for the easily impressionable, the faint of heart or the weak of stomach. No one admitted after April 26.

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak
Editors
Kevin McCarthy, Managing Editor
Michael Davis, Associate Editor
Jean Swallow, Associate Editor
Ken Allen, News Editor
Harriet Sugar, Feature Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Bob Jasinkiewicz, Night Editor