

# Maroon And Gold

Dedicated to the best interest of Elon College and its students and faculty, the Maroon and Gold is published semi-monthly during the college year at Elon College, N.C. (Zip Code 27244), publication being in cooperation with the journalism department.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Mike Wyingarden Editor-in-Chief  
 Richard Hutchens Assistant Editor  
 William Bradham Assistant Editor  
 Tom Jeffery Dramatics Editor  
 Jack DeVito Sports Editor  
 Carol Popowski Girl Sports  
 H. Reid Alumni Editor  
 Luther N. Byrd Faculty Advisor  
 Jimmy Pollack Staff Photographer

### TECHNICAL STAFF

Louis Jones Linotype Operator  
 Carl Owen Linotype Operator  
 Perry Williams Press Operator

### REPORTORIAL STAFF

Thomas Anderson Dennis Howie  
 Charles Avila Howard Johnson  
 William Barker Tim Kempson  
 Marta Barnhart Charles Kernodle  
 John Bennett Donald King  
 Mary Benson William Macey  
 Martha Broda William Moore  
 James Brower Philip Pagliarulo  
 Eileen Cobb Elaine Phelps  
 John Crook David Potter  
 Roger Crook Larry Rayfield  
 Ted Crutchfield Comar Shields  
 Leon Dickerson Owen Shields  
 Ferrel Edmondson Stephen Sink  
 Kenneth Faw Wayne Smith  
 Daniel Fuller David Speight  
 Ronald George Thomas St. Clair  
 James Graham William Stiles  
 Daphne Hilliard Stanley Switzer  
 Judith Hillers George Weber  
 Ray Wilson

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

### CAMPUS INFLUENCES

When one reads in the papers or views on television the widespread unrest that seems prevalent on the campuses of many American universities and colleges from the Atlantic on the east to the Pacific on the west, one wonders about the underlying causes of so much upheaval. The following message from J. Edgar Hoover, which appeared in a recent FBI bulletin, appears worth reading. The message follows:

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "New Left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of common sense.

Fortunately a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hard-working, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hardcore fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the anarchistic and seditious ring of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive — a much publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented communist W. E. B. DeBois Clubs of America. Therefore the communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flare-ups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the New Left are part of the 100,000 "state of mind" members Gus Hall, the Party's General Secretary, refers to when he talks of Party strength. He recently stated the Party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "one to two thousand" increase in membership last year.

For the first time since 1959, the Party plans a national convention this spring. We

(Continued On Page Four)



## a glorious feast

By

RICHARD HUTCHENS

### Get Rich With God

There has come to the attention of this editor another element of our society that needs investigation and a thorough re-appraisal. Perhaps the need is even for a deliberate, almost venomous attack on the subject at hand.

Having hopefully aroused the reader to the point of frantic speculation let us see just what is this enemy to reason, this cause for disenchantment. It is not the war in Southeast Asia, it is not free love, and it is not the fallacies of the honor council. It is funerals.

Does this seem a bit disrespectful? Does one cringe at the thought of anyone being so presumptuous as to think that he should criticize such a sacred and enduring institution? If the subject is offensive then read no further.

How many funerals have you ever witnessed. They are sad, poignant, but they are done with the survivors' interest at heart and in very "good taste". What the visitors seem to either overlook or misunderstand is the trauma and heartache actually forced upon the family of the deceased by those who would make a funeral into a social event complete with the survivors' interest and "good taste". As a matter of fact, the only good that the modern method of burying someone seems to do is to allow self-made martyrs to weep a little longer and to put more money into the local economy by making the undertakers so wealthy. Just what are some of the side effects of these mournful occasions?

First let us consider the family in a situation that requires a burial for an immediate relative. No sooner than rigor-mortis sets in, a representative from the funeral parlor is in the home asking all kinds of impersonal questions that are so consoling; such as how long has he had multiple sclerosis, when did he last see the family, or even what will be done now that he is dead.

Not only has the representative come to annoy and distress but he has brought him with chairs (at least thirty) to seat the guests who will soon be arriving to ask similar questions and sit around with sorrowful, yet smug expressions on their faces. Finally, as the "coordinator" leaves, just to make sure that the memory lingers, he places a guest book at the door to be signed by all present and to be kept by the bereaved one.

In addition to the mental strain put on those involved in the burial of a loved one, the strain on the pocketbook is almost beyond belief. Of course one wouldn't want to put their loved one in a wooden coffin, a bronze one is waterproof and looks so much nicer in the chapel while the service is being carried out. Naturally one wouldn't want a funeral without flowers either, it is the least one can do to put a veritable blanket of roses atop the casket (presumably to keep the deceased warm). As the style for a person's final rites become more and more elaborate the prices grow higher and higher until a thousand dollar burial is a relatively cheap funeral! Perhaps we will progress to the state of re-innovating the tradition of the pyramid and the mummy.

The friends of surviving members of families are also victimized by this corruption of decency. They are obligated to visit them at the risk of being socially improper or losing the respect of others who really don't want to be there either. Upon arrival one smiles and says "nice to see you" or better yet, "hi". After this embarrassing and incongruous greeting the visitor stands face to face with a person distraught with grief and he finds himself strangely at a loss for words. There is, however, an out for the visitor: he simply mutters "if 'eres sum'n I c'n do, lemme know" then dashes out the door as if someone had told him that he really wasn't going to the electric chair.

Can anyone really be held responsible for this abomination? Not really, for our society seems to demand such sensationalism to replace the slaughter in the Roman arenas and the public hangings of seventeenth century England (with boxing apparently on the way out, funerals will probably get even more spectacular and more morbid than they have to date). The undertakers have to make a living and they are certainly answering the call of the consumer so a scapegoat can't be found here.

In all seriousness there is a principle of the Salvation Army that could work to the benefit of mankind in this dilemma. This being that man should praise and

(Continued on Page Four)

## AMONG THOSE APPEARING IN MUSICAL SHOW



JO WARNER  
As Daisy Mae



PROF. AL HASSELL  
As Scamper Phogbound



MRS. JEANNE BRIDGEWATER  
As A Dogpatch Wife



BEN BAYOL  
As Pappy Yokum



PAM LITTLE  
As Stupefying Jones



TOM JEFFERY  
As Earthquake McGoon

Among the Elon students and faculty members who will be members of the cast for the Elon Player production of "Li'l Abner" when the musical is presented in mid-March are those pictured above. Others to be seen in the picture, for whom pictures were not available at this printing, include Dale Ward, as Li'l Abner; Tom Warner, as Marrying Sam; Patsy Bailey, as Mammy Yokum; Duly Winkley, as General Bullmose; Bill Tyson, as Evil Eye Fleagle; Linda Sipila, as Apasionata Von Climax.

## Elon Players Will Present 'Li'l Abner'

(Continued From Page One)

Character actor of Evil Eye Fleagle, desperado and terror man for General Bullmose.

Several persons will be making debuts in principal roles on the Elon stage. Pam Little of Gibsonville, will play the part of Stupefying Jones, who lives up to her name by stupefying any man who looks at her.

Tom Jeffery, a senior from Bethesda, Md., who has been instrumental in the technical aspects of Player productions for the past two years, will be seen as Earthquake McGoon, frustrated suitor of Daisy Mae, and titled the "World's Dirtiest Wrestler."



## A Sleeveless Errand

By WILLIAM BRADHAM

though it is required for a liberal arts degree. I like others, feel that such a course is a waste of time, and yet I know that I must take it in order to graduate.

Hence, only a minimum effort do I make. Whose fault it is, I would not attempt to say. Would a curriculum change be desirable? Maybe so! Maybe not! Possibly the above situation is the sole fault of the student. Maybe not!

There is, however, I feel another reason for the classroom being turned into a silent battleground. It is the professor. He fails in many cases to show us the way and fails to aid us in our search for some sort of answer. As a result we have been forced to fight with those whose job it is to help us; due to a considerable degree in some instances to their apathetic attitude about their profession.

Other professors, however, want to do their best, and they do try; many succeed and many fail. I sometimes seriously doubt whether there have ever been very many actual teachers. Teaching is difficult and self-sacrificing, and very few people possess such needed traits.

I remind you teachers that this is a student's attitude. I may be wrong. However, my experience

and impressions tell me otherwise. For instance, is there any excuse for a teacher to sit up in front of a class and lecture, or shall we say "ramble," with no apparent goal evident to the student and then, when it is time for a test, the student receives a so-called standardized test with questions that have never been referred to previously by the professor and cannot be found in the textbook.

In instances here, I have heard members of an entire class say that the professor was unable to answer a given question from a standardized test without looking into his reference or teacher's manual. Is this fair to the student? Of course not.

I feel that a test should cover material referred to in the classroom, along with supplemental material from the text. Also, it should be the teacher's duty to compile any test which he gives. Or at least, if he is pressed, he should understand any standardized test that he gives. Failing to do this, the teacher fails to fulfill his academic contract with the student.

We are here to learn, and the professor should make it his business to help us. After all, teaching is his profession, and who pays part of his salary?

## a few blasts and bravos

By

MIKE WYNGARDEN



### On Athletics

The last column discussed the place of athletics within the college community, especially in the large state-supported colleges. This column deals with athletics in the small college.

In the small college anytime athletics becomes more important than academics, anytime an athlete's life is devoted to playing basketball and going to class, or anytime a basketball player or a baseball player is forced to practice throughout the school year; then it is an obvious and indeed pathetic fact that the realm of athletics has expanded much too far. After all, the purpose of coming to college is to learn the liberal arts and not to devote the entire four years to the winning of athletic events. Athletics is not that important.

At some small colleges, in which a powerful athletic committee dictates athletic policy, athletics becomes over-emphasized because of the coaches control over their athletes. That is to say, some colleges employ a policy which allows the coach who recruited an athlete to have complete control over that athlete.

Such a ridiculous policy as this is detrimental to the mental growth of the athlete, who is supposed to be, above all a student and not some athletic puppet. This type of policy stunts mental growth because it substitutes winning games for winning grades. It de-emphasizes extra-curricular activities for the athlete; it opens the door for professors handing good grades to athletes, thus allowing the athlete the knowledge that he doesn't have to work for his grades.

Furthermore, this policy of allowing the coach to control his players is a direct repudiation of student academic freedom. Athletes controlled by their coaches may be denied participation in student government, student groups and committees. They cannot participate in these activities because they may have to devote all their time to the winning of games.

This type of coach, if he deserves that title, may also demand that his athlete practice whenever he desires, even if it means yanking the athlete out of some other sport. When you figure, for instance, that a basketball team practices for the entire school year and therefore controls all athletic facilities available, then this amounts to a very small fraction of the student body monopolizing the gymnasium.

Now there are other effects arising from such over-emphasis on athletics. Usually in the small college, and many times in the larger universities, there exists friction between the athletic committee, composed usually of members of the faculty and administration, and the coaches and athletic director. These committees think at times that they are some guiding light.

A small Michigan college with which I am familiar has an athletic committee composed of dignified men and women of the college. They are brilliant in their respective fields of academic discipline; they know little or nothing of the administration of athletics. They mean well, but their thoughts are rather shallow; it is academics that come first, and then and only then is it time for football, basketball and baseball. It is obvious that these people are unaware of the proper administration of college athletics; otherwise, they would never formulate such a policy as the one which allows the coach to have supreme control over the athlete he has recruited.

Now, why should any coach have this power. It would be fine if the coach did as much for their athletes when it comes to academics as they do when it comes to athletics.

This sort of policy is, obviously, most inconsistent with the majority of college philosophies of education, which hire a man first as a professor and second as a coach. This is true, especially of small colleges in which the athletic department, and physical education department are united into one major department under direction of one man.

From all of the above, it is obvious that the policy of coach control is highly out of touch with the very essence of athletics. The very core of athletics is intrinsic; the sport is played for itself, not because some coach demands that his players participate in only one sport and practice five days a week eight months a year and deny him the right of participation in campus activities. Such a practice constitutes professionalism and has no place in the academic community.