

Inquisition Reborn

If you were in a position of some status, prestige and power and your personality required that you be in such a position, you would want to choose an effective means of deterring anyone who would question your policies or procedures. If the trait in your personality which necessitated a position of power were the inability to defeat the rebel through reason and rational thinking, this means would have to be more physical and of course foreboding. You, therefore, resort to what probably has been recurrently in history the most effective psychology used in keeping a people or group subservient, subdued and unquestioning. You would have to live up to Thoreau's observation on the relationship between the state or government or administration and the questioning or rebellious individual. You would have to lay down the law or policy and hold up what seems to be an exceedingly harsh, unfair punishment to all of those who would sidestep your divine word. Your tone would have to be unrelenting and impersonal in order to be effective.

If you were a college administrator at Elon you would be comparable to a bishop of the medieval church. This institution employed this psychology to the fullest. It encouraged you to educate yourself, to use reason, to contemplate, and to meditate, as long as your conclusions always came back to what the church believed and taught. If your thinking led you elsewhere you were a heretic and suffered death at the stake.

Although it has been some time since we've had a witch burning on campus, we do see examples periodically, that this kind of psychology is employed here. And the most recent communication from the abbey is the complete embodiment of all said here. This notice regarded chapel attendance. If you haven't paid any attention to it, I urge you to reread it carefully. Note the tone of relentlessness and impersonality. "This policy will be followed without exception." Observe the gestapo-like language of "Failure to accumulate a total of 30 points by the end of the spring semester will present a student with a serious problem."

This is indisputably threatening language -- something Colonel Klink of Hogan's Heroes might say. "I advise all students to take this communication seriously." We are presented with no reason or rationale for this policy and the tendency is to comply with such technicalities just to avoid suspension. It is here that we plainly see the effectiveness of this psychology of making the student believe that his success or failure depends upon whether or not he will kneel before the divine word. We obey because it is an official announcement from the office of the President and to save our own necks not because we agree that it is a reasonable system which we should be subjected to.

The present chapel system is discriminatory. The College chooses which functions will yield points and which will not. Only by attending College-sponsored functions can students receive points. This re-emphasizes the lack of rationale behind the system.

As thinking students, we should feel confident that if the student

(Continued on Page 4)



Publicus

By EARLE WHITE

In the words of one political pundit Lyndon Johnson was a good man who might have been great. Therein lies the irony of the Johnson Presidency. He was a strong man, a dynamic man with boundless energy. This was his strength. But he was also a tragic figure. Tragic because of the Vietnam war which was based on the premise of an international Communist conspiracy that seemed less and less valid as time went on. The tragedy of the Vietnam war may deprive his Presidency of history's greatness.

To understand the Johnson Presidency one must understand the complicated character of Lyndon Johnson. A man of boundless energy, great physical proportion, he was indeed a President who got things done. Lyndon Johnson's was a world of striving and denials and triumphs and compromises, there is no such thing as an all-good man or an all-bad man. In every saint Johnson can find a hidden sinner; in every villain Johnson can detect a native good.

It must be said also that Johnson was a prisoner of the past. It was his undoing to apply solutions formulated in the New Deal at the very time when many people question as to whether they are still applicable. The political assumptions in which he was schooled were not effective in dealing with the nation's problems. Thus the Great Society expanded its bureaucracies when critics were calling for more decentralization. It provided money in order to cure social ills but this latter day form of the New Deal was not solving problems.

Not only were problems not solved, in the Johnson Presidency, they were compounded by his apparent deviousness. Was he honest and forthright to the American people? Was his methods devious or masterful. It goes without saying that the deviousness of Mr. Johnson stood out a little more prominently than anything else. These public suspicions undermined his legislative programs.

Mr. Johnson's involvement in the Vietnam war funneled funds that could have been used to solve domestic ills. As Arthur Schlesinger Jr. stated, "his highly promising Great Society program became a casualty of his increasing obsession with the futile and ghastly war in Vietnam." Even though Vietnam was a major stumbling block history may vindicate the wisdom of the U.S. policy in Vietnam over the past five years. Clinton Rossiter's assessment of Johnson was that, "Vietnam is not our biggest problem but it is the one that destroyed this man."

As one commendator stated Lyndon Johnson was "the most militant civil-rights advocate ever to occupy the White House, reviled by Negro militants; a Southerner scorned by Southerners as a turncoat; a liberal despised by liberals despite the fact he achieved most of what they sought for over 30 years. . . a power-hungry partisan politician who, in the end, shunned power and partisanship to achieve national unity."

In a speech on March 15, 1965 Johnson said this of his presidency: "I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who prompted love among the people of all races and all regions and all parties." He did not end hatred among men or wars among countries but who can say he did not try?

Culture High

By DAVID SPICER

Today in America popular music has reached a point where there are many types of it. With so many different kinds of popular music on the commercial market today, there must be different kinds of classifications or labels attached to them. For example, the best known types of music are "popular (the Andy Williams-Frank Sinatra brand), "Jazz," "folk music" (slowly dying of a complex cancer that would take too much space to discuss here) "bubble gum rock" (the Monkees, 1910 Fruitgum Company, Lemon Pipers sing this type for teeny and teeny boppers), psychedelic rock (progressive music influenced by mind-expanding drips), and "soul" music. This last label has been so damned misconceived by so many people (especially Southerners) that I think it's about time to discuss just what "soul" is.

Soul is not the finger-snapping, rump wiggling, handclapping crap that is seen at most Elon Concerts. Soul does not include those groups that just let a sweet-sounding noise float from their mouths and pierce the audiences' ear with its nauseating shrieks and ahhhhh uptight out-of-sight garbage. The groups that belong to this mislabeled brand of music are the Temptations, the Supremes, the Miracles, the Four Tops, the Tams, the In-Men Limited, and many others. Perhaps this type of music should be labeled (as much as I dislike labels) the "Mottown sound" but it definitely is not "soul".

"Soul" is a difficult term to define. It evolves from the Negro heritage. It expresses a feeling deep within the heart--that feeling is of suffering. It is a sincere feeling--a feeling that is evident by the way a person acts, talks, and, in this case sings. Although a "soul" singer does tell you of his suffering, his harrowing experiences and his blues, he still has enough "balance" in him to laugh and sing about it. Another thing a soul singer does is express that feeling so well--through his projection--that the audience knows just what he is talking about and identifies with him. For example, Janis Joplin or Aretha Franklin swaggers out on stage, like a lush whore, grabs the mike with feeling, writhes her body a little, and then yells out a moaning, pleading blues from her Southern Comfort saturated throat. And by the time she's half way finished singing, writhing, and emitting, every person (especially males) in the audience wants to go up there on the stage and make love to her, because she gave them her soul, her self, and her body while singing, and she's going to do it fifteen or twenty more times.

Who are some other singers that have "soul"? There are many: Mahalia Jackson, Bobby Bland, B.B. King, Ray Charles and James Brown and the late Billie Holiday, Bessie Smith, and Otis Redding did, too.

Dear Beverly Axelrod

By RALPH MOORE

The question has often been brought up concerning the strength of white support in the "new" Black movement. Many feel that those whites now involved will leave the Black Revolution when enough outside pressure is exerted upon them; pressure in the form of those forces, whether social, political or economic, conspiring against the Black Movement.

To best deal with this question one might well observe two important facts. First, those white persons now involved are of a "hard-core" select group. Second, those individuals, or groups thereof, who do not concern themselves with the universal Black Liberation movement, as a primary objective, have been asked to leave the movement. The "new" Blacks have grown sick and tired of "liberals" who claim to be of a benevolent nature to the movement when in earnest wish only to satisfy some psychological deficiency of their own.

For the sake of simplicity I have divided these persons into five classifications. There are those persons who feel they perpetually must be involved in some conflict on the side of the underdog. These I call the "do-gooders." To suppress their own guilt complexes they hide within the Black movement, or any other which might allow them to feel psychologically satisfied. There too, is another group involved only with individuals. These are in the movement simply because they might share a single interpersonal relationship with a single member of the Black race. Included here are those persons who might be dependent upon, or share some essential form of life with, a single member of the Black race. Of course there are those persons who do not have any positive affiliation with the Black race, but might have developed a negative existence with, and resulting in their being alienated from, the white race. These persons have entered the Black movement only as a means of gaining revenge at a society which rejected them. Next is that group which claims to be authorities on Black relationships and Black thinking, simply because they have "lived with Black people all their lives." It must be remembered it is one thing to live with Black men, and very much another to live as one. Finally we come to the potentially most dangerous group of all, the conformist. That group which sits and waits to see which way the "tide is turning." If the national trend is leaning toward conservatism they lean in that direction, or the other whenever it dominates the social and political scene of the nation. They have entered the Black movement simply because everyone else seems to be doing it.

These persons have all been asked to make sure that the Black movement is of primary importance to them, and that it is a part of them and not just they a part of it. We realize in the event of any pressure being applied here, these persons might find that their loyalty might have faded.

We then have left ourselves with what I have called and by no means is this any literary cre-

(Continued on Page 4)

Veritas
editorial staff

co-editors
barton c. shaw
randall s. spencer
sports editor
charles t. butler
associate editors
david spicer
earle white
contributing editor
ralph moore
advertising manager
linda l. long

reportorial staff
richard beam
tom harris
cheryl hopkins
kathy mangum
denny mcquire
edward mcginis
john mconnell
carol mckinney
morrow miller
ann patterson
bea skipsey
bruce washburn
barbara waugh
linsey wyatt

photographer

jay fisher

publisher

s.g.a.

Letters To The Editor

Editors:

First let me commend you on your fine paper, VERITAS. I have enjoyed reading the articles, but I have found one with which I disagree.

I cannot agree with the points brought up against the Honor Court in the December 18 issue, by Miss Linda Long. Concerning a speedy trial, she must realize that sometimes there are circumstances beyond the control of the Honor Court, which do not permit a speedy trial. Sometimes it may be, but then again it is not always the fault of the Honor Court itself that a trial was not held immediately.

She also feels that the Honor Court works on the concept that a person is "guilty until proven innocent." This I do not agree with either. The Honor Court is made up of three students and three faculty members. If a member of the court feels biased, they take themselves off the case. The three faculty members do not hear all the "dorm gossip" and have only the evidence presented at the trial on which to base their decision. The student members do not bring this gossip up in the trial either. They may have an opinion before the trial begins; but all of them are open-minded, fair, and not heartless when the time comes to make a decision. I am sure Miss Long does not know the agony these six people go through to be sure they have enough evidence to prove someone guilty and to be sure they are making the right decision.

Lois Matheny