

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 W yngarden	Editor-in-Chief
Richard Hutchens	Assistant Editor
William Bradham	Assistant Editor
Tom Jeffery	Dramatics Editor
Jack DeVito	Sports Editor
Carole 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 Crooks	Larry Rayfield
Ted Cutchfield	Comar Shields
Leon Ditcherson	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, MARCH 4, 1966

IS CHIVALRY DEAD?

This was the topic of a recent and highly interesting discussion on the editorial page of another college newspaper, with the discussion triggered by a declaration of a coed at that college that "Chivalry on the part of man or men is apparently a dying art."

For hundreds of years chivalry has been deemed an ideal characteristic among men, and the other college publication began the discussion with the question of the real definition of the word, quoting from the New American Dictionary to define chivalry as "the ideal qualifications of a knight, such as courtesy, generosity, valor and dexterity of arms."

It was pointed out that modern chivalry could be accepted on the basis of courtesy, generosity and valor, but the statement was made that the days are long gone when dexterity of arms was needed to ward off ugly dragons from his lady fair; so the point-black question of the meaning of modern chivalry was asked of the complaining coed, seeking to find her own idea of what chivalry comprises today.

"Well," replied the coed, "a man who opens doors for women, lights their cigarettes, buys them cokes and other courtesies and services comprises modern chivalry."

Further discussion of the modern lack of chivalry, brought out the fact that there are few Sir Walter Raleighs who would lay their cloak or coat over a mud-puddle for his lady fair, partially perhaps because there are fewer mud puddles to make such courtesies necessary.

But perhaps the most interesting angle on the presence or lack of chivalry in modern life was the rebuttal voiced by men students on this neighboring campus, who voiced the idea that when modern women demanded equality in politics and economic life they gave up the very dependence which was the feminine quality that inspired chivalric treatment.

TO GOOD STUDENTS

Every campus has its varied student types, including the thinkers, the talkers and the doers, and there are editorials which harangue the non-conformist and prodding the apathetic, but all too few editorials that praise the every-day "good students."

Who is the good student? He is the true student; the student who is seeking understanding and knowledge. He is honestly seeking to learn. There is no one common characteristic that will identify all good students for there is a great deal of individual personality about each of them.

There is also a variety in habitat. In class the good student is first attentive. He has read his assignment and perhaps done some outside research and reading. Able to offer comment on the topic of discussion he has an insight and understanding into the core of the problem.

His questions are sincere and his answers concise and informative. His work is conscientious and complete.

The good student is also active in extracurricular activities. His outstanding characteristic in this area is his devotion to

(Continued on Page Four)



a glorious feast

By

RICHARD HUTCHENS

AN ANACHRONISM

According to Webster's "New Collegiate Dictionary", an anachronism constitutes "anything incongruous in point of time with its surroundings". To give an example, the term could be applied to a spinsterish schoolmarm teaching at Harvard University.

In view of the introduction, perhaps the reader has discerned that this editorial is concerned with such an incongruity. If this is the case then the reader is correct! What is this displaced object of consideration? It is the Honor System of Elon College (or any other college for that matter). The system is anachronistic, because the truly honorable man does not exist. The last such human to inhabit the earth was Brutus.

Let us now attempt to make a precise assessment of this institution and draw some intelligible conclusions.

First, one should take note that all the so-called best schools in the country are abandoning this "noble experiment" in favor of the proctor system. Harvard and Princeton are two splendid examples.

As the two universities mentioned are considered to be leaders in the field of education, it might not be an understatement to say that those progressive educators who advocate the honor system are, at best, Nineteenth Century progressives. Of course, just because the Ivy League schools are discarding the concept of putting the students on their honor while taking a test, many will say that this doesn't give a strong enough premise to the argument against the system. The people who take this stand are sound in their logic, but the reasons for the negative attitude taken on this stranger of higher education by such institutions do give adequate support to the argument.

Primarily, the honor system has been rejected as being much too presumptuous. This attitude is completely justified. What motivation does a student have to be honest during his college career? None! His future depends more and more on the grades he obtains in his course work. He is in competition with those who want the same job with the same company to which he has applied. It could become rather frustrating to see a classmate get a position that you yourself coveted because he had a 3.6 and you had a 3.4, the irony being that while you were being self-righteously honest he cheated on the exam that made the crucial difference.

With this element of severe competition in mind it would almost seem that a student has to cheat to survive! It is true that a proctor cannot remedy the prevalent social conditions in America, but he can give more of the student a more equal chance more of the time.

That often forgotten element of the college community, the professors, also have a side in the matter. Suppose an instructor has a class in Alamance but his office is in South: Where does he go after he leaves the room as is required? Not only does he have to spend half the period looking for a chair in which to sit, but he also is bound to "look in" on those taking the test at frequent intervals thus rendering it impossible for him to accomplish anything requiring a minimum amount of concentration. It is really pathetic to see a Ph. D. wandering around in the halls of Elon with no place to go.

Another serious malady of the honor system is that of the student's responsibility to see that his fellow student don't cheat. Not only is this unrealistic, but it is also a definite impediment to one who is taking a test. No matter how the subject of honor is broached to the members of a class, the student who tells on a classmate is almost without exception placed in an exclusive caste — for finks.

As for taking a test, the student who wishes merely to tend to his own business is compelled to focus his eyes rigidly on the center of his blue book, for if he looks momentarily and sees another student simply perusing the end of his toe then he can't honestly sign the pledge (the pupil might have had some notes under his half-sole).

It seems that the value of some form of authority being in the room during a test would now be obvious. Wouldn't it be much easier on you who take the tests to be concerned only for yourself and not thirty or forty other students? Wouldn't it be much more convenient to have the instructor present in order that you wouldn't have run all over the campus trying to find him if a question was in your mind?

Let us at least hope that Elon College will set the example for the other schools of North Carolina and innovate a realistic and practical policy concerning the integrity of the students when they take a test.

ROSTER OF PHI PSI CLI EDITORS SINCE 1913

Following is a complete list of the editors who have directed the publication of the Phi Psi Cli through the more than half century since it was founded in 1913, with latest known information concerning their present whereabouts if they are still living. They are listed following the year of publication of the annual they edited.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1913—Charles Titus Rand, deceased. | 1936—Rebecca Smith, now Mrs. William F. Wild, of Albion, Mich. | of Burlington, and Sylvia Jones, last address at Pink Hill. |
| 1914—Marvin Stanford Revell, now of Kenly. | 1937—Dan Watts, now of Morgantown, W. Va. | 1956—(CO-EDITORS) — Marie Weldon, now Mrs. Charles Mason, of Henderson, and Lois Scott, now Mrs. James Luke, of Waverly, Va. |
| 1915—Isaac James Kellam, now of Jacksonville, N. C. | 1938—Harold Hilburn, now of Albemarle. | 1957—(CO-EDITORS) — Shirley Womack, now Mrs. Joseph Holmes, of Cary, and Jeannie Keck, now Mrs. Ed Davidson, of Wexford, Pa. |
| 1916—Paul Virgil Parks, deceased. | 1939—Frank X. Donovan, deceased. | 1958—(CO-EDITORS) — Patricia Coghill, now Mrs. Grant Burns, of Garner, and Nancy Lemmons, now Mrs. Thomas Elmore, of Charlotte. |
| 1917—J. L. Crumpton, now of Durham. | 1940—June Leath, now Mrs. Charlton E. Huntley, of Richmond, Va. | 1959—(CO-EDITORS) — Martha Langley, now Mrs. Paul Shelby, of Annapolis, Md., and Linda Simpson, now Mrs. Richard Lashley, of Burlington. |
| 1918—No annual published. | 1941—Dorothy Edwards, now Mrs. David L. Spaulding, of Anandale, Va. | 1960—(CO-EDITORS) — Hannah Wise Griffin, now Mrs. Hannah W. Holland, of Windsor, Va., and Marion Glasgow, now of Burlington. |
| 1919—No annual published. | 1942—June Murphy, now Mrs. William Looney, of Rocky Mount. | 1961—(CO-EDITORS) — Teddy Standley, now Mrs. Frederick Farham, of Mattapoisett, Mass., and Ruth Lemmons, now Mrs. William Cordes, of Burlington. |
| 1920—Roy J. Morton, now of Rockwood, Tenn. | 1943—John Pollard, now of Greensboro. | 1962—Doris Faircloth, now of Fayetteville. |
| 1921—Claude Marcus Cannon, deceased. | 1944—Virginia Jeffreys, now Mrs. James F. Darden, of Suffolk, Va. | 1963—Eleanor Smith, now of Winston-Salem. |
| 1922—Ira Otis Hauser, deceased. | 1945—Eliza Boyd, now of Henderson. | 1964—Sallie McDuffie, now attending graduate school at Appalachian. |
| 1923—Edward Carl White, deceased. | 1946—Edwin Daniel, now of the Elon College faculty. | 1965—Lea Mitchell, now of Fayetteville. |
| 1924—Paul Dalton Rudd, now of Denton. | 1947—Mary Cox, now Mrs. George Bullock, of Durham. | 1966—Alex Oliver, who has just concluded preparation of the 1966 annual. |
| 1925—Sheffield H. Abell, now of Yanceyville. | 1948—Daniel B. Harrell, now of Concord. | |
| 1926—George Chapman White, deceased. | 1949—Jeanne Meredith, now of Greensboro. | |
| 1927—Howard R. Richardson, now of the Elon College faculty. | 1950—Ira Cutrell, now of Windsor. | |
| 1928—Clarence Homer Slaughter, deceased. | 1951—Wilburn Tolley, now of Foxboro, Mass. | |
| 1929—Hoyle Efirid, now of Gastonia. | 1952—Page Painter, now of Luray, Va. | |
| 1930—Delos Elder, now of Burlington. | 1953—David R. Crowle, now of Prospect Park, Pa. | |
| 1931—William Lester Register, deceased. | 1954—Roger Phelps, now of Talma, Calif. | |
| 1932—No annual published. | 1955—(CO-EDITORS)—Mary Sue Colclough, now Mrs. Phillip Mue | |
| 1933—Emmett L. Moffett, Jr., deceased. | | |
| 1934—Frank Orva Perkins, now of Fayetteville. | | |
| 1935—Benjamin Thomas Holden, now of Charlotte. | | |

College Yearbook Ready For Printers

(Continued From Page One)

Claire Webb, of Suffolk, Va.; Judy Hillers, of Silver Springs, Md.; Vickie Riley, of Burlington; Lydia Ferrell, of Pittsboro; and Sharon Smith, of Merrick, N.Y.

This group of workers carried on in great style the work that was started back in 1913, when Charles Titus Rand, now deceased, directed the first yearbook staff. The business manager of that first annual back in 1913 was Alonzo Lohr Hook, now dean of the faculty of Elon College, who has served the college in many posts of responsibility in the intervening half century and more.

Only three times since 1913 has an Elon College yearbook failed to appear. There were no editions published in 1918 and 1919 due to

the World War I restrictions and responsibilities, and again in 1932 in the very bottom of the Great Depression financial difficulties prevented issuance of the Phi Psi Cli for that year.

It is interesting indeed to peruse the fifty editions of the Phi Psi Cli, which recall in word and picture the life of Elon College students through the years. The staffs have used various and unusual themes and varied format during the years, but always the annual was a credit to the students of Elon College who prepared it.

Advance information about the campus is that the forthcoming 1966 edition of Phi Psi Cli could prove to be one of the best of all. With the copy and collection of pictures complete, it is now in the

hands of the Delmar Company in Charlotte. It is whispered that the 1966 annual will be entered in the national competition conducted under the auspices of Columbia Universities.

A complete roster of the editors of the Phi Psi Cli since its beginning in 1913 is offered along with this brief sketch, and it is interesting to note that two of the former editors have come back to Elon and are now members of the faculty, the two being Dr. Howard Richardson and Prof. Edwin Daniel. Perhaps it is indicative of the rugged work necessary to prepare the annual that no less than ten of the former editors have died, but their names live on in these printed records of Elon College in years long gone.

a few blasts and bravos

By

MIKE WYNGARDEN



CHARACTERISTICS OF REVOLUTION

A brief but concentrated study involving any one of the major world revolutions will show that they possess similar characteristics, although they do not necessarily follow the same patterns. These characteristics are lingering grievances, the granting of half-hearted concessions, the desertion of the intellectuals, and, finally, the collapse of the established order.

The antagonism generated by lingering grievances is perhaps the clearest characteristic of revolution. A few scattered grievances do not seem to cause a large amount of ill feeling toward the established order. However, when these grievances become abundant, when they are repeated with alarming frequency and severity, then an attitude of hostility begins to grow.

Nevertheless, reaction to the grievances does not make itself felt immediately because of the moderation of those on whom the grievances fall. In other words, revolution may not break out immediately because certain intellectual leaders possess a strong feeling for the very system or institutions from which the grievances flow. It is, then, only as a last result that the next phase of revolution begins—the initial violence.

The initial violence is the first spontaneous act of revolution. It is usually done at some symbol of the regime or by some person of high stature. In the French Revolution, the initial violence was the storming of the Bastille; the American Revolution it was Lexington and Concord; and in smaller revolutions it was the repudiation of the system by some important official.

In the revolutions of lesser scope, the ones which involve fewer people, the act of repudiation by a person of high importance tends to set a precedent. Soon thereafter feelings of loyalty and dedication are set aside, and practicality and living with oneself assume places of highest concern. The system did not respond adequately; rather it fallaciously gave the impression of doing an about face, assuming the air of tolerance.

This brings about the next step characteristic of revolution, the granting of half-hearted concessions by the system against which the reaction has started. Usually these attempts at reconciliation and reform are too late, too ineffective and too few. This attempt at piece-meal reform usually boils down to the system seeking to ingratiate itself with the leaders of the revolution. It is usually seen through and causes even more resentment.

Nevertheless, the system usually composed of a conservative element intoxicated with their delight of their own powers, still does not seem to perceive that trouble is brewing. Rather than to give in to the demands of the enlightened few, they continue to hold to the idea that they are omniscient divinities, who because of their "goodness" allow the revolutionists the "privilege" of the system.

The next step in the revolution is the desertion of the intellectuals, and it is the most important step in the revolution. The desertion of the intellectuals is the most important step, because these intellectuals form the very heart of the system. They are the most educated, the most enlightened, and above all, the people with the highest principles. They are the representatives of the system, and they are the reflections to the outside world.

In smaller revolutions, in which the intelligentsia form the corps of knowledge, it does not take a great amount of this desertion before the system begins to crack. Replacements of equal calibre are not only hard to find, but they may dissent from entering into any such system which forces its members to evacuate.

It is obvious to see that the next step is the collapse of the system. The persistence of lingering abuses, coupled with the desertion of the intellectuals cuts off the very life roots of the system. The people who cause the revolution are the ones we read about in history books. They are the ones who are motivated by certain principles and ideals which are not understood by those who compose the system.

Wishful Thinking

The pastor was rejoicing with a little old lady over one of her elderly relatives who had finally joined the church after a lifetime of riotous living.

When she wondered if the oldster's carryings on would be forgiven, the pastor assured her: "Yes, indeed. The greater the sinner, the greater the saint."

"Oh," she mused, "I wish I had learned that 40 years ago."



A Sleeveless Errand

By WILLIAM BRADHAM

failure of the system will be brought about.

Lately much has been brought forth regarding a change or revision in the system. Many ideas and reasons for its change come up, all of them valid. One reason seems to me to rise above the others, that the question of ethics. If a student break a rule, drinking, cheating, plagiarism and other offenses, should he be allowed to stay or made to leave on the basis of the rule in the handbook? What I'm attempting to say is "Does the punishment justify the crime?"

In many cases it doesn't. We are dealing here with human beings, youth to be exact, those prone to make more mistakes than others. Granted the laws passed regarding all the honor offenses were effected by their peers, but maybe they were a more responsible assemblage of young people.

Hard and fast rules, I feel, cannot work. A better system is needed, a system which considers the reasons for the student's actions, his motives and lack of knowledge for his infractions of school rules. The fact that the student is as good as he makes himself and as good as the school tries to help him to be. This is one of the purposes of a school; to help the student in all facets of academic and personal life.

The problem is "many-folded,"

the student's duty to himself and his peers and the school, the system as it stands and the need to help the present system work or to find another that will work.

This leads me to a final point. It has been suggested that rather than a cold and impersonal court under the present system there should be a tribunal type of system composed of students and faculty who will listen to all points of every individual case.

However, here it will differ from a court jury which must honestly answer a direct question about the infraction of a rule in that the tribunal will and should consider the moral and ethical aspects of a case, in order to get at the reason for the offender's actions. It will also give that much-needed second chance. The jury is too impersonal and removed, whereas the committee under a new system may better understand the feelings of the student.

For a jury to hand down a verdict of guilty, knowing in their minds that their decision was right, but knowing also it deprives the offender of his education is a hard question to resolve. Also on this same line, the punishment rather than the one-year suspension rule can be and needs to be adjusted to fit the offense and to aid the student. It gives the student the second chance and, if properly directed, shows him his mistake at the same time.