

The Collegiate

A NEWSPAPER OF IDEAS

Too Many Requirements

The people behind the educational philosophy of Atlantic Christian College have long held by the liberal arts tradition. They believe that the purpose of education is to broaden a young person's perspective by introducing him to things he might not be exposed to outside the learning community.

This philosophy is a valid one, but its' aim may be hindered by the set of requirements that were drawn up to accomplish it.

The 1975-76 catalog states that "a minimum of 124 semester hours is required to complete the Bachelor of Arts, the Bachelor of Science or the Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree." Out of these 124 hours, 53 hours (twenty classes) are Basic Requirements which every student must take, regardless of the major. These are the classes such as Composition and Literature, Algebra, Western Civilization, and so on. In addition to these Basic Requirements, a student is required to select a major. Each major has its' own number of required courses, usually from twelve to fifteen; this represents from 36 to 45 more required hours. When you add it all up, a student is required to take from eight-nine to ninety-nine hours; this leaves only twenty to thirty hours that are "free" hours that the student can dispose of as he likes. There is, in other words, very little room for self-direction. One has to ask if this kind of strict regulation benefits the student as a whole.

One of the ideas that circulates in the sessions which deal with educational policy is that a student must be shown what is best for him; a certain number of required hours are necessary to insure that the student does not confine himself to areas of study that interest him, while missing classes which might do him more good.

This might be a valid idea to some extent, but is it valid to the point where a student is left with only twenty to thirty hours to do with as he pleases? It is a harsh reality that many a student has wasted many an hour in classes in which he has no inclination.

Fred Claridge

The Pie Went Sour

In the last issue of the Collegiate, I wrote a short story about a new fad which had manifested itself on campus. The new fad was hitting people in the face with a pie. I knew some of the people who were throwing pies, and to listen to them talk, it seemed like a harmless enough thing to do. That is the reason I wrote the story; I thought it might get a few smiles for a new and transitory fad that was just beginning.

The consequences of my writing that story, however, turned out to be much different than I had thought they would. It seems that the fad was harmless enough at first, but that like all fads, it grew out of proportion. Many people began to throw pies, and some of the people who got hit did not enjoy it. It escalated to the point where tempers are aroused; it was no longer a game, it was a source of general bad feeling.

Perhaps the people throwing the pies should reconsider before they decide to throw another one.

The people who were disturbed about the pie-throwing need to take account of themselves, as do the pie-throwers, because it would have been so easy for a small problem to have turned into a major one.

Fred Claridge

The Collegiate

FREDERICK CLARIDGE
Editor

Associate Editor Michael Walker
Business Manager Robert Wilson
Cartoonist Darrell English
Photographers Douglas Hackney, Peter Chamness
Sports Writers Guy Hyatt, Russell Rawlings
Feature Writers Nick Glennon, Spenser Smith, Brian Hunt
Proofreaders Dale Adams, Terry Bosley
Advisor Milton Rogerson

The Collegiate is published nearly every week each regular semester by the students of Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N.C. 27893. The views expressed herein are not necessarily those of the faculty or administration.

Across The Table

Was It Wise To Vote Jimmy Carter?

Yes!

By CARL T. ROWAN

WASHINGTON — A week ago my Washington Redskins played the Dallas Cowboys before a nationwide television audience. The Skins were utterly conservative on offense, offering no imagination, no daring, no boldness except in desperation. Dallas was venturesome, especially on the crucial third-down plays.

I agonized through that game, thinking from time to time that it was a piercing commentary on the political choices before the American people.

It was imagination and boldness that won last Sunday's football brawl.

It was Jimmy Carter's promise of boldness and imagination that won Tuesday's political confrontation.

Yet, the election was so close as to demand that we Americans ask some serious questions about our society.

We have all known for many years that Ford was not presidential timber. His fellow Michiganders never assumed him a valid candidate for the Senate, let alone the White House. Ford himself disavowed any claim to the presidency when he was under consideration as a replacement for Spiro Agnew.

So why did so many people vote for Ford as President? You can cite greed on the part of big business, regional prejudice on the part of anti-Southerners, religious bigotry on the part of both Catholics and Protestants, naked party loyalty on the part of some Republicans.

But the overriding factor was the same thing that led George Allen to a devastating defeat: excessive timidity and caution.

Anybody who looked at the unemployment figures, the price of food, the other economic indicators, knew that Ford had been a failure. Anyone who looked at our foreign policy knew Carter was right when he said that Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had been functioning as President in this field. Jerry Ford knew less about foreign policy than any

President in our lifetimes.

But the Vietnam nightmare was over. We were not in war anywhere. The country had endured some grievous economic troubles, but it had not collapsed. And Ford was lucky enough to be there to reap the credit.

Millions of Americans were in no mood to gamble. They chose the lackluster but "safe" mediocrity over a Jimmy Carter they did not really know.

If these play-it-safe voters had prevailed, this country would have gone the route of last Sunday's Washington Redskins. But we are blessed that a majority of Americans opted for some of Tom Landry's boldness. They decided to gamble on Carter.

Now it is up to Carter to prove that the whole nation won because most Americans were not content to run three conservative plays and then punt on "fourth down and less than a yard to go."

No!

By MIKE WALKER

"Jimmy Carter said during his campaign he expects a healthy economy to produce a 60 billion dollar bonus in federal revenues, which then can be spent for new programs, a tax cut, and a balanced budget.

But like the "peace bonus" that never developed after the Vietnam War, Carter's bonus may be nothing but a puff of campaign smoke.

Carter must prove to a doubting business community, an army of 7.4 million unemployed, and a congress that has been known to cannibalize presidents with stronger economic backgrounds that he actually can raise employment, stimulate business, cut taxes, and balance the budget within the next four years.

Initial reaction from investors was negative.

The day after Carter was elected, the stock market plunged 17 points below its level the day before the election. Senate Finance Chairman Russell Long said before the election Carter's economic plans sound like "pulling a rabbit out of a hat."

The above was taken from a

UPI news analysis entitled "How?" published earlier this week. "How?" is a very good question. With all the campaign promises the Carter machine has spewed out at us over the past four months, it is hard to see how Mr. Carter could accomplish them all. Apparently many people have asked themselves this same question, as indicated by the above quoted stock market figures.

The Carter camp has hit the unemployment problem hard during their campaign; they have made it a major point to indicate that as president, Mr. Carter will make jobs through federal jobs and public works programs. But people fail to realize that 1.4 million people went back to work last year and that 7.5 million people cannot be put back to work at once. It takes time. Furthermore, if you create federal jobs, you must also create the money to pay for them. This nation is already in debt. When you are in debt, you do not spend more money. If you do, you are in trouble.

So, where is this money to come from? Taxes, is the answer. Wait a minute, what happened to all those tax cuts we were promised? It will be the pockets of the middle-class taxpayers that are hit the hardest. Most of us fall in that category. Also, when you create jobs you create inflation. This may not seem important to many politicians, but then they are not the ones who will have to carry their lunch in a basket if inflation continues to rise. This problem is paramount in any economic policy to be pursued in the next few years.

Mr. Carter has made a lot of promises, and I hope for the sake of the country that he can keep them. It is impossible for him to carry them all out since he has made so many. As Barry Goldwater said, "If Mr. Carter can keep just one-third of his promises, then I will attend the next Democratic Convention for the purpose of renominating him to the presidency." It is this writer's opinion that with the election of Mr. Carter, we may have put the first nail in the lid of a coffin we have been building ourselves for the past thirty years.

Forum

Dear Editor,

I remember when my high school counselor told me college would be an open door to the world, if only one would step into it. So it has been my pleasure to roam about ACC and very casually open doors. Sometimes the knobs are sticky, but that only adds to the charm of our lovely school. Overall I have had pleasurable experiences with the doors and knobs about our campus.

That is until Tuesday night, when much to my surprise, I was not able to sneak into the lecture after its start. The door to Hardy suddenly exploded with staccato bursts of creaks, squeaks, and general hell-raising type noises. Everyone who entered the lecture late was soon met with a thunderous ovation of sound from the door, which spoke very plainly in door language and said "You're late, you're late, you're late" twenty-three times before thumping shut. This created a general disruption, and pangs of em-

barrassment to certain individuals.

I enjoyed the attention when sixteen faces spasmodically spun around to see who it was making all that noise. I felt really awful though when one of those cute sorority girls walked in and was immediately assaulted by blasts of noise and

a chorus of turning heads. So wanted to die I am sure.

It would be for the general benefit of a healthier campus this radical squeak be eliminated.

Very Seriously Yours
Pahaskey Longhair

P. S. Its the door all the way to the right.

Copyrighted material removed.