

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.

Moore, On Higher Education

Higher education got a shot in the arm Thursday when Governor Dan Moore finally made public statements on the speaker ban and reorganization of the Board of Higher Education.

The effects of the statements may be felt for some time to come.

There is nothing agreeable about the speaker ban law, but it is comforting to at last hear an admission from the state government that our schools are indeed in danger of losing their accreditation from the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.

Educators have been saying it since the law was passed, but now that the governor has spoken the "smokescreen" charges raised in the General Assembly should not carry much weight.

The threat to accreditation is real and the governor admits his concern.

"It does appear that the academic accreditation of the University and of our colleges is being threatened by the Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association. I shall withhold any further comment on this matter until I have had time to consult with others who are concerned with it. It is time for calm and judicial consideration of this problem," Moore said.

It was time for "calm and judicial consideration of this problem" long ago, but now is certainly better than never. It is impossible to tell yet whether this latest development will affect the chances for amendment of the speaker ban law. Moore is the key to any change that might come about. He has made it plain that he does not want the law repealed, but if he puts his influence behind an amendment, the chances are that it could be passed.

The loss of accreditation could mean that graduates of North Carolina schools might not be accepted by other colleges and universities for graduate work. It is not easy to attract faculty members to an unaccredited school. Professional associations might not accept North Carolina graduates as members. And the loss of prestige would be a bitter pill for this proud University and the other schools of the state.

Moore's other major statement of the day was in support of a reorganized Board of Higher Education. The changes he has in mind will not make the board perfect, but they will provide some needed changes and are certainly better than abolishing the board—which some legislators want.

The board has been bogging itself down with budgetary business and has not been providing a really coordinated higher education system.

The changes are designed to strengthen, rather than weaken the board, and they reaffirm some important points—such as reserving for the University the right of awarding the doctor's degree.

Moore's statements sound good in Chapel Hill. Let's hope the General Assembly is listening receptively too.

DTH Awards Of The Week

Most Interesting Fact of the Week: A kangaroo can jump at speeds up to 30 miles an hour, with leaps as much as 10 and one-half feet high.

Concerned Citizen of the Week: Mario Savio, 22-year-old leader of Berkeley demonstrations for "rights of students to engage in political action." During testimony in the trial of 155 sit-inners he said he did not vote in last November's election.

Class of the Week: Swimming class at a Hollywood, Florida, high school. It was delayed one morning this week until two four-foot alligators could be removed from the pool.

White Man of the Week: The Ku Klux Klansman who is going to be married at a Farmville rally tonight. His bride will not have to worry about a wedding gown because they will be married in Klan robes. It is the first Klan wedding since 1926.

Loser of the Week: Wade, the frog who lost the jumping contest in Raleigh Wednesday—even though he has three legs. His leap of 7 feet 9 and one-half inches was topped by Ray, a Johnston County frog who jumped 13 feet 4 inches.

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 Wiggan, night editor; Fred Seely, sports editor; Richard Smith, asst. sports editor; Andy Myers, John Jennerich, Mary Ellison Strother, Ernest Robl, Bob Wright, David Rothman, staff writers; Bill Lee, Pete Cross, sports writers; Jock 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.

"I don't feel responsible; I feel condemned."



In The Mailbox

Marxism, Mary Poppins

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Disgusted by the degenerate entertainment usually available to local residents, I recently sought relief in a theater where I was assured that the face would be uplifting, moral and refreshing. To my horror, I discovered it to be one of the most dangerous attacks on our way of life that I have witnessed. Why it has been allowed to play so long without someone revealing its subversive content is beyond me, yet since it is now revealed we must waste no time in correcting its influence.

It may surprise you to learn that I speak of the movie "Mary Poppins"—a children's movie indeed, but so deep in dangerous ideas that the mind reels when considering its possible influence over America's youth. The most cursory examination of the plot and subject matter of the picture will at once make it clear that it is a vicious, cynical attack on the free capitalistic system, and an indictment of the most precious values of the middle class to which we belong.

The movie deals with two children, Jane and Michael, who successfully resist the imposition of the responsibilities of citizenship on a free society through the intervention of their governess. This figure (perhaps the archetype of the primal labor organizer) leads the children in a series of episodes of a fantastic nature, whereby she indoctrinates them in the Marxist view of society. She is aided by an accomplice, a

vagrant of no obvious profession, but with a remarkably glib tongue.

First they indulge in a fantasy in which Mary Poppins and her paramour (the precise relationship between them is never clarified) pilfer several horses, with which they proceed to compete in the derby, one of Great Britain's most respectable institutions. After winning it, they mock the educational superiority of the aristocracy in a song involving the manipulation of pretentious verbiage used to overawe their social superiors. We observe that the characters and settings, excepting only Mary Poppins and her companions, are only ridiculous and vapid cartoons. The bold symbolism here needs no explanation to anyone familiar with the communist dogma about the nature of the class struggle.

Having so easily disposed of the pretensions of the aristocracy, we come to the crisis of the plot: perhaps the most dangerous attack on our way of life that has escaped the censor's hands in our generation. The father, George Banks, takes the children to study the inner workings of the basic institutions of capitalistic society, the bank. But Mary Poppins has foreseen the incident (yea, engineered it!) and prepared the children through careful indoctrination. And what is the result?

When the child decides to question the validity of the capitalistic system, and refuses to entrust his resources to it, behold the critical phase of the Marxist dialectic. Through his simple refusal to invest his tuppence, the entire financial system suddenly collapses. Frightening and horrifying in its implications, yet if further clarification is needed, note that the motivation for the child's withholding his money is a feverish desire to give it away! Why? To feed the birds!

Pounding and insidious, the refrain echoes in the background: "Feed the birds . . . feed the birds!" Yes, money is for throwing away, government and business are for squares, responsibility is for . . . for what? For the birds! Oh youth of America, I shudder for your future.

Yet this is not all. The final, culminating stage of the Marxist eschatology is now to be portrayed in a violent orgy of exhibitionism. After retreating from the frantic wrath of their toppling capitalist masters, the children seek refuge with their proletarian "protector," and witness one of the strangest exhibitions staged this side of the Iron Curtain. Presided over by their patron goddess, Mary Poppins, the local union of chimney sweeps performs a primitive, mocking dance—over the rooftops of the respectable middle class homes below.

Finally they are dispersed by the decrepit Admiral Boomer (senile imperialism in league with capitalism), yet they rejoice in the futility of his fulminations. They race out into the street, still monotonously chanting their motif of totalitarian collectivism: "step in time, step in time, step in time . . ."

The motion picture ends in a fashion subtly calculated to attach the sympathies of the ignorant, the innocent, and the frivolous. George Banks is converted to the socialist ideology, and in a finale, the entire population of London flows out into the streets to fly kites. Search the literature of Marxism, and find a more vivid picture of the classless society than this one.

I trust that I have said enough to give you the same sickening feeling I experienced. Now that the nature of this dangerous piece of propaganda has been revealed, I am sure that all serious citizens will join me in urging the authorities, especially our state legislature, to act in the fullness of their power to ban this most dangerous motion picture. Who knows how many young minds have already been corrupted?

William Sanders
Graduate Student
Department of History

Protests Fizzle Out

A Very Quiet Ending To A Very Dull Year

By MIKE YOPP
DTH Associate Editor

This is the way the year ends,
This is the way the year ends,
This is the way the year ends,
Not with a bang, but a whimper.

The proliferation of student activism which reached a peak two weeks ago threatened to spill over into exams and provide an exciting finish to a relatively quiet year at UNC.

But, alas, the activists have quieted themselves, and the final week of May will slip quietly into June, and the passage will be marked only by the end of another school year.

The past year, say observers of the nation's campuses, has been one marked by student protest and an increasing concern on the part of collegians as to their part in the policy making decisions of the nation, the state, the community and the university.

And it has been such a year; at least on some campuses. It was such a year at Berkeley where the Free Speech Movement and the Free Student Union drew thous-

ands to their rallies and student demands struck at the very foundations of the multi-versity.

It was such a year at the University of Colorado where dissension over bringing a communist speaker to campus raised the ire of students and the eyebrows of the state.

It was such a year at Antioch where 70 per cent of the student body participated in a teach-in, not a teach-in which spanned an evening or a day, but one which lasted three days.

But to say it has been such a year at UNC would require a stretch of the activist imagination.

To be sure, there were attempts at arousing the campus to a cause. Probably the best remembered was the "Y Court Rally" called by part time English instructor James Gardner before students had really settled down to the second semester grind.

The rally was sparked by insults allegedly hurled at a Liberian visitor, but Gardner used it as a springboard to include other issues such as the speaker ban law and the refusal of the Carolina Forum to sponsor a talk by national CORE director James Farmer.

The high noon Y Court rally drew the year's largest crowd of its kind (about 1,200), but the response was hardly favorable. Plagued by a bad microphone, jeers, Mickey Mouse chants and "Dixie," Gardner later admitted the whole affair was a fiasco.

The Gardner rally started the protest ball rolling here, but nobody bothered to immediately pick it up. There was no local discrimination to protest. After the 1963-64 demonstrations and the passage of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964, Chapel Hill had become a relatively open town. And the campus racial scene became serene after Chancellor Paul Sharp and student government leaders moved so quickly first semester to eliminate discriminatory housing regulations that prospective protestors didn't even have time to paint signs and rehearse freedom songs.

So the protest ball rolled around campus, kicked periodically by the Student Peace Union when it protested U. S. policy in Viet Nam by a peace march or a telegram sent to President Johnson.

So it was up to a handful of students disturbed by the dismissal of a Department of English lecturer to pick up the ball for an attempt at a 99-yard touchdown run. They were stopped somewhere around their own 40.

But the William Goodykoontz case was the spark that ignited student reaction. Hundreds ran to the Students For Teachers fold to form an anti-publish or perish force. But they were met head-on by Students For Learning which supported University policy.

So while this controversy raged, UNC hooked up to the nationwide Viet Nam teach-in last Saturday, and Student Peace Union and would be Students for a Democratic Society members bemoaned the killings in Southeast Asia. But a pro-U. S. policy group, Students for Victory in Viet Nam, sprang up to counter the SPU and SDS.

And during all this, rumors flew across campus about efforts to recall the editor of the Daily Tar Heel, and Carl Braden was refused a campus forum, bringing NAACP protest and YAF applause.

But the action cooled last weekend when thoughts of finals, the beach and party raids turned student interest away from protesting.

So throughout the year protests have come and gone, mostly gone. No one issue or series of issues has provided sufficient impetus to protests such as local discrimination did to last year's civil rights demonstrations.

Maybe the campus was tired of protests after the long winter of 1963. Maybe most students were really happy with the status quo. Or maybe they just didn't care.

And most students didn't. As liberal leaders here have pointed up, no one seems interested in questioning the political, social and educational establishments.

But whatever the reasons, it's been a relatively calm year on campus, and the infrequent voices raised against complacency have been quelled. It would be a weak claim made by any students here who might want UNC included in the list of institutions whose students comprise the protest generation.



CAMPUS PROTESTS

Whispers In The Wind

Strict Silence And Dirty Rush

By JOHN GREENBACKER
DTH News Editor

Last week the Interfraternity Council failed to pass a program which would relieve absolute "strict silence" in the fall, and it seems that the woeful inadequacies of the old plan will continue to plague the fraternity system this year.

The most popular substitute plan offered would allow fraternity men the privilege of speaking to prospective freshman rushees during the hours of 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. during the fall semester, but it failed to achieve the necessary two-thirds majority needed for enactment.

What motivated the crucial minority to oppose the substitute plan may never be fully known, and the opposing representatives certainly made no attempt to explain their position to the group.

They offered no compromise measure, and it can only be concluded that they felt the old plan was better.

If there was one thing which last year's deferred rush made clear, it was that absolute strict silence is not feasible.

To say that no fraternity man may speak to a prospective freshman rushee, or do him any favors, would mean that a tremendous amount of self restraint would have to be exercised.

As much of the fraternity system well knew last year, no house in close competition with several others during a crucial year is going to obey such an agreement.

A gentleman's agreement is precisely what strict silence is, because it is almost impossible to police.

Unfortunately, it must be said that many fraternities knew this, but voted for strict silence knowing they intended to break it.

Glaring evidence of this fact occurred during formal rush period early this semester.

Two fraternity presidents whose houses were in close competition met one night after it became known that one house intended to press charges for "dirty rush" against the other.

When the two officials compared notes and threats they found that each house had caught members of the other engaged in "dirty rush" on between 25 and 30 different occasions.

The house which was thinking of pressing charges decided not to, and both presidents departed in relative peace.

The blatant hypocrisy which was evident throughout last year's strict silence must have bothered many in the IFC, but no move was made to reverse the decision to continue strict silence this fall until two weeks ago.

Just over a third of the body was able to safeguard continuance of the hypocrisy this fall.

Dirty rush has been going on for a long time on this campus, but never have the rules been so openly flaunted.

Until such time as the IFC decides to reinstate controlling power to its conscience, it can expect to have its dirty linen washed in public.

The damage has been done, and the tragic error once more committed.

The truly pathetic aspect of this situation arises when a reasonably conscientious house is forced to either follow its principles and the dictates of supposed common will, or do as many of its fellow houses are doing.

In this instance, compliance with the right brings only honorable disaster, and continued survival only is possible through illegality.

The choice this fall is not likely to be a difficult one.

Buchwald Would Be Proud

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Although I have never been in complete agreement with Armistead Maupin's philosophy, I have never had occasion to question his ability as a writer. His Sunday "Aunt Jemina" satire was one of the most entertaining contributions to the DTH edit page I've read in a long time. Both Buchwald and Buckley would be proud.

Stuart Ball
Hi-Fi Lodge