

THE FLAT HAT

VOLUME 64, NO. 12

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1974



Athletic Director Ben Carnevale, Rector Harvey Chappell and President Thomas Graves announce decision to upgrade athletics.

Johnson Photo

Board votes to upgrade athletics

By Dwight Shurko
FLAT HAT Editor-in-Chief

Following three weeks of discussion and debate throughout the College community, the Board of Visitors voted Friday to accept President Thomas A. Graves' recommendation to upgrade the athletic program at William and Mary.

Board Rector Hector Chappell, Jr., read a statement, saying "The Board of Visitors concurs fully with the President's recommendation, and views it unanimously as a strong, positive statement for new direction in athletics."

The decision of the Board was announced Friday evening at a press conference following an all-day board meeting. As a result, the often-criticized athletic and recreation fee, which now stands at \$38 per year, will jump to \$110 beginning next year.

The \$22 increase, according to Graves, will go to cover increased support of men's and women's non-revenue sports and in the intramural program, which the president has said have not in the past been provided with sufficient support. At the same time, the amount of the student fee going to football and basketball will decrease from a present estimated \$46.50 to \$36, Graves said.

In releasing his recommendation, which the Board supported, Graves told the crowd "I believe that a strong and competitive intercollegiate athletic program... can be fully compatible with the mission of the College."

Stating that "it would be wrong" to either de-emphasize the athletic program or to move to a win-at-all-costs strategy and philosophy Graves said his proposal was "written from the point of view of what I believe William and Mary wants, and should have, as an athletic policy."

Graves emphasized that the proposal was not synonymous with "what has been popularly described as Program I or Program II," nor was it a compromise. The president said he based his recommendation upon "extensive discussions" of the athletic report, upon "a careful study" of all written communications from individuals and groups, and "upon close consultation with individuals most directly concerned with the formu-

lation and implementation of policies related to athletics at the College."

Referring to the "very broad community," to which the College provides a service, Graves said he attempted to take into account the "interests and ways we can be of maximum service to all our constituencies," without harming the educational and academic priorities of the College.

In detailing the new athletic policy, which will go into effect immediately, Graves stressed four overall points of "re-emphasis." First, the football and basketball programs will have what the president termed a "fresh opportunity to expand to a new level of excellence." In specific terms, the policy permits athletic grants-in-aid to be awarded to both men and women up to but not exceeding the NCAA and AIAW limits for each sport, as far as resources permit.

In addition, support for both men's non-revenue sport and for women's intercollegiate program will be increased. Funds for these areas will come out of the athletic and recreation fee to the tune of \$20 each beginning next year. This figure represents a 100 percent increase from the estimated \$10 that went to each of these areas this year.

Finally, Graves pointed out that the amount going to the men's and women's intramural program will receive a "very substantial" increase from \$.50 per student to \$6.00.

The guidelines for the implementation of the new athletic policy include special consideration for athletes in admission and course registration. The "special consideration" in admission's will not mean "preferential treatment," Graves said. Rather it will consist of early notification of a favorable admission decision to an applicant who has been recruited and who will receive a grant.

Graves stressed that "the established admissions policies and procedures of the College will be strictly and vigilantly adhered to in implementing athletic policy."

The new guidelines of the Board include the statement "the acceptance of such an applicant would be based upon his or her special skill in athletics, sub-

ject to the general premise and expectation that he or she should be judged capable of solid academic achievement." Whereas this early notification policy has been in effect at the College, the special consideration in registration will be a new feature of athletic policy. The new policy permits such considerations "to the extent necessary to allow them (the athletes) to attend regularly scheduled inter-collegiate team practices," to the degree that is deemed practicable by those responsible for registration within the constraints of the normal academic schedules.

In adopting the new policy the Board also voted acceptance of the College's responsibility to be responsive to the anticipated guidelines of Title IX, of the Educational Amendments Act, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

In order to make the transition from the present program, the Board approved a four year transition period during which financial self-sufficiency of the revenue producing sports will be the goal.

During this transition period, it will be necessary to continue the present practice of using part of the student fee to finance football and basketball, and grants-in-aid for non-revenue sports. In addition, Graves pointed out that "it will not be possible to utilize the student fee as fully as desirable for the benefit of the men's and women's non-revenue sports and intramural activities."

Graves expressed hope yesterday that the transition period would not last the full four years. He added that it would have been "very difficult" to eliminate the amount of the student fee which goes to men's intercollegiate sports without an initial transition period.

During the transition period, each student will be required to purchase a mandatory student ticket book, which will entitle him admission to all the home football and basketball games. The price of the ticket book will be included in the \$110 athletic and recreation fee. The Board accepted Graves' recommendation that the practice of the ticketbook should terminate no later than June 30, 1979, and that its cost shall not increase from \$36 during this period.

In order for football and basketball to achieve financial stability, it will be necessary, Graves pointed out, that the amount of money raised by the Educational Foundation and from annual gate receipts from basketball be doubled.

Once the transition period is complete, the new guidelines require that the revenue producing sports be funded only from contributions, gate receipts, radio and television rights, program advertising and sales, and stadium concessions. Furthermore, grants-in-aid for all sports must be funded from the same sources.

In addition, the guidelines stipulate that non-revenue sports and the intramural program for both men and women be supported by income from student fees and from income from the revenue producing sports when available. The guidelines specifically point out that student fees shall not be used to support any grants-in-aid. Also, only private gift and endowment income specifically by the donor for the athletics shall be used to support athletics.

Most significantly, perhaps, the new "Statement of Athletic Policy" specifically stipulates that "The (athletic) program is not permitted to operate at a deficit." Funds to make up deficits in recent years have had to come from the College's General Fund Local, the fund which contained unspecified financial gifts and bookstore profits.

In arriving at what he thought "made most sense to the College," Graves said he tried "to take into account the viewpoints of the students. I personally think the plan and policy responds in many important ways to the concerns of students."

He said the plan does not include "a two-track system of admissions," which many students feared would be the outcome of an upgrading of athletics. In addition, the president pointed out that support for non-revenue sports where there is much student participation has been increased, and student support of revenue-producing sports will be eliminated once the transition period is over. Graves said his accepted plan does not contain any reference to "national prominence in athletics."

Inspired Indians bomb Spiders, 54-12



By David Satterwhite
FLAT HAT Associate Sports Editor

Inspired by the Board of Visitors' "re-emphasized" athletic decision, William and Mary totally demolished the University of Richmond, 54-12, last Saturday at Richmond City Stadium.

In the series that dates back to 1898, the loss was the worst the Spiders have ever been dealt by the Indians. The previous highest margin of defeat came both in 1944 and 1946, when W&M beat Richmond each time 40-0. The Indian victory also snapped the Spiders' three-game winning streak over W&M.

Rated a touchdown underdog, the Tribe dominated the game from start to finish. The 10,000 fans on hand saw the visitors roll up 649 yards in total offense, which broke W&M's old record of 573 yards, set against Davidson in a 56-9 victory in 1972.

For the outclassed Spiders, the defeat was their worst since 1965 when West Virginia blitzed them 56-0. The Indian offensive output also set a new mark for Spider defensive ineptness.

"I don't think President Graves realized how quickly we would implement Program 2," quipped ecstatic W&M Coach Jim Root, whose team ended their season with a 4-7 record and 2-3 in the Southern Conference.

In fact, it didn't take long for W&M to establish their supremacy over the arch-

"We could have lost,
and I would have been
just as proud..."

--Dick Pawlewicz



rival Spiders. Upon reception of the opening kickoff, the Indians went 80 yards in five plays for a 7-0 lead. The big play in that ritual march was a 50-yard run by fullback John Gerdeman, who rushed for a total of 133 yards. But the touchdown came when quarterback Bill Deery, back to pass, could find no receiver open and scampered up the middle into the end zone.

Deery finished the game with 110 yards rushing and 146 more passing. The senior ended the season with 974 yards rushing and concluded his career with 4,594 yards total offense, 2,401 on the ground and 2,193 in the air. Said Deery after the contest, "We were pretty confident that we could move the ball on them."

Echoing his QB's sentiments, Root observed "We played relaxed and confident; all the kids had on their mind was beating Richmond. Offensively and defensively we did it all. It was the finest overall team effort we have had in my three seasons here. I just can't single out any one player. The backs, the line, everybody did the job."

But overall it was just an unbelievable performance by the Indians, who beat a team that came within a two-point conversion of the SC Championship. W&M which had a knack for scoring on their initial possession all year long, did not let up after gaining the 7-0 lead.

The next time the Tribe got the ball, they rushed 71 yards in 12 plays with Gerdeman punching over from the one for

the score. Terry Regan missed the pass, and W&M led 13-0. It became 20-0 on W&M's third possession, as the Indians went 86 yards in 10 plays. The TD came on a 24-yard pass from Deery to Mark Smith with 13:25 left in the half.

Following an exchange of punts, Richmond finally got on the scoreboard. Two long Harry Knight passes put the Spiders in position to score, and Bobby Allen ran it in from ten yards out. A bad center snap foiled the PAT conversion.

After W&M's second-and-last-punt of the game, the Spiders had a chance to get back in the game. But tight end Mike Rafferty fumbled, after gathering in a pass near midfield and Sam Patton recovered on the Spider 44 for the Tribe. The Indians proceeded to blow the game wide open.

On the third play after the bobble, Gerdeman broke into the clear off left tackle and sped 38 yards for a touchdown. Regan kicked the PAT to make it 27-6. Shortly thereafter, Knight had the ball slashed from his grasp while trying to pass and senior John Dodd fell on it for the rampaging defensive Indians at the Richmond 16 yard line.

Two plays later, with first-and-goal at the Spider two, backing fullback Scott Goodrich rushed into the end zone and the Tribe took an amazing 33-6 advantage into the halftime intermission.

The Indians increased the lead in the third quarter. Deery lofted a perfect 29-yard pass to Dick Pawlewicz

for the first score of the period and then the duo repeated the act with 40 left in the quarter when Deery connected with his favorite receiver from the Spider thirty-yard line.

Richmond ate up much of the time in touchdown. Second-string quarterback Larry Shaw lead the spiritless Spiders on a drive that took nearly nine minutes and he scored Richmond's last six points on a six-yard run.

W&M's second team responded to that by scoring still another Indian touchdown. Paul Krulis hit passes of 28 yards to Doug Gerhart and 37 yards to Eric Bahner before connecting with wide-open Randy Knight in the end zone from 12 yards out. Regan booted the point, and W&M had the final 54-12 spread.

For a team that suffered through a losing season and was distracted for the past month by the Program 1 versus Program 2 controversy, the victory could hardly have been sweeter. Pawlewicz commented afterwards, "the team really came together today. We were really fired up. We could have lost, or the score could have been 0-0, and I would have been just as proud because we played together."

For Pawlewicz, Deery, Gerdeman, and 16 other seniors, Saturday's game represented the final time they will wear W&M colors on the gridiron. But all of them will have the memory of taking part in one of William and Mary's greatest football performances ever.



John Gerdeman breaks through the Richmond line for long yardage to set up the first score in William and Mary's

romp over the Spiders last Saturday.

Johnson Photo

Crowd rallies to protest decision; Graves responds to fee inquiries

By Heather Hollowell
FLAT HAT Staff Writer

Rallying under various banners and signs, a crowd of William and Mary students gathered on the front lawn of the Wren Building Sunday to protest the recent Board of Visitors decision to upgrade the athletic program.

The rally began at 1:00 and lasted a little over an hour. The program featured several speakers and an appearance by President Thomas Graves culminated the addresses. WCWM had planned to cover the affair, but sabotage the night before took the station off the air.

In addition to Graves, the crowd contained Board of Students Affairs chairman Dave Ryan, Student Association executive vice-president Bob Ott, Student Senate speaker Dave Fedeles, and SA president Sharon Pandak. James C. Livingston, dean of the undergraduate program, looked on from the steps of Wren.

Pandak described the rally's organizers as "a group of interested students," adding that they were endorsed by major student leaders. In scanning the crowd, she observed "I think this is the silent majority we haven't heard from for the last few weeks."

From all outward appearances, the silent majority wasn't silent Sunday. The spectators milled about beneath signs proclaiming "Education, not entertainment" and "Policy II won't do," while students from the Asia House sang a self-composed protest song. In response to questioning about the rally in its early stages, Graves remarked, "What I see of it so far, I like."

Most students present expressed frustration when sounded out about their opinion on the Board's decision. One student stated that "the whole thing seems unfair," and another was overheard to remark "What gave them the right to do this to us? They just shut off everything we said."

These were the predominant attitudes of the speakers. Dave Oxenford, sophomore BSA representative, opened the assembly from the steps of the Brafferton. A banner announcing William and Mary "a college of the students and faculty by the administration for the alumni" served as a backdrop.

Oxenford cited specific points of dissatisfaction with the Board's decision. These included the raising of the student athletic fee beyond the amount specified in Program II, preferential treatment accorded athletes in registration and admissions, support of grants-in-aid by student fees, and the depend-



Crowd gathers around the Brafferton to protest the Board of Visitors' decision to upgrade athletics.

Kieffer Photos

dence of funding for non-revenue sports on money raised by revenue-producing sports.

Additional grievances concerned the possibility of students supporting the athletic program beyond four years, should outside revenue not materialize, and finally, the disregard for student and faculty input in the Board's decision.

Kevin Hoover, one of the rally's planners, spoke after Oxenford. Speaking of football players, he stated "it is doubtful these people would be here if they weren't paid to come here. In my opinion, a paid athlete is a professional athlete." He added that in lieu of supporting the football team, the students might be required to watch the NFL games on Sundays, thereby "substituting excellence for mediocrity."

Alumnus Jim Taylor presented his remarks, contending that many of the alumni did not support Policy II.

Student Jim Klage spoke out against

Thomas Graves and his hoard of visitors. Klage proposed withholding a portion of the student fee on the part of the students, suggesting that the \$440,000 raised in this fashion over the four-year period should be considered a loan. Students would be issued promissory notes and paid back with interest.

Bob Ott concluded the student speeches by issuing a challenge to Graves to answer some of the questions raised earlier. These primarily centered about alumni control over the College community, the student fee, and preferential athletic treatment.

Graves prefaced his address with a comment on the rally itself as a healthy expression of student concern entirely in keeping with the Statement of Rights and Responsibilities. He assured the assembled students that recruitment and admission of athletes would fall within the regular system of admissions.

Graves also maintained that the fee increase will fund only men's and women's non-revenue sports and the intramural program. He further insisted, that this increase will be discontinued in no more than four years.

Graves held, however, that pre-registration is a valid concession to athletes. He feels that if a student is admitted to the College because of certain skills and abilities, he should be permitted to participate in related activities, unhindered by confining class hours.

Before leaving, Graves told students if they had any further questions on the new policy, to let him know of them concluding, "We'll get the answers to you, I promise you."



Graves addresses rally.

WCWM back on air

After an absence of 39 hours, WCWM began broadcasting again yesterday afternoon at 4:00 p.m. The station had been unable to broadcast since last Saturday night when the crystal was stolen from the transmitter located in Phi Beta Kappa Hall.

The crystal was returned sometime Sunday night or Monday morning, according to station manager Rick Krizman. Krizman said the crystal's presence is vital to the station's operation, saying, "the crystal is to the station what the human heart is to the body."

Saturday's incident was the third incident of sabotage on the station's transmitter this month, all of which forced the station to leave the air for a period of time.

Krizman said the campus security force along with other outside authorities is handling the investigation. The manager explained that "tampering with airwaves is a serious federal crime, punishable by one to five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine for each offense."

Krizman also noted that prior to the last two incidents of sabotage, the station received irate phone calls from callers condemning the station as biased in its views regarding the recent athletic controversy.

A weekly newspaper published by the students of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, every Friday of the year except during holidays and examinations. Member Associated College Press and College Press Service. All rights reserved. Artwork may not be reproduced without permission. Subscription \$7.00 per year, \$4.00 per semester, prepaid. Entered as second class matter September 1916, at the post office in Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.



THE FLAT HAT

Founded, Oct. 3, 1911

Dwight Shurko.....Editor-in-Chief
 Kathy Sheppard.....Managing Editor
 Joe Wall.....Business Manager
 Jeff Green.....Advertising Manager

Editorial Page

God-fearing men

It should come as no surprise to any recent reader of this page to learn that we were indeed dismayed Friday to learn of the decision of President Graves and the Board of Visitors to "upgrade" athletics at William and Mary. To our minds, such a vote represents nothing less than a major setback for William and Mary on its road to what Graves has so often termed "excellence."

One of the important sources from which the College does draw its strength is its highly selective admissions process. With a school devoted to retaining a relatively small student body, it becomes imperative that each admissions opening be offered to a student who demonstrates a diversity of interests, a wide range of intelligence, and a willingness to develop all areas of his potential. We need students who, once they arrive at William and Mary, are willing to expand and broaden their horizons both in and out of the classroom. The last thing we need is the guy who can't see further than the goal posts of Cary Field. Unlike an Ohio State or any large state university, there is nowhere here to "hide" the athlete from view until Sat-

urday afternoon.

There is no need for us to go into further depth about our firm belief in the moral bankruptcy of any extracurricular activity which must resort to bribery to seduce athletes to attend the College. In simple terms, athletic grants-in-aid as they are presently handed out are nothing more than payment for services rendered to the delight of the paying spectator.

Nevertheless, the decision has been made. There seems nothing left for us to do except learn to live with the new athletic policy. Each member of the College community, we now believe, must act as a vigilant watchdog to ensure that any overzealous implementation of the new guidelines is ferreted out, exposed, and terminated. And, in spite of all the seemingly endless discussion of the issues involved, one important question still lingers: why is it that with the donning of the green and gold football gear, an ordinary college student is suddenly and mystically transformed into some kind of god in the eyes of those that influence and make the decisions at William and Mary?

It could have been worse

Despite the moral turpitude of the new athletic policy, it does contain some significant improvements over the disgraceful athletic policy we have been forced to endure in recent years. President Graves has done a commendable job in at least sparing us of some of the excesses that would have run rampant under a Program II upgrading.

We strongly feel that any increase in the student athletic and recreation fee is repugnant to the student body. With inflation spiraling, we wonder how those members of the athletic department can justify to any tuition-paying parent any increase in a luxury such as athletics. But then again, with all the free-ride scholarships floating around William and Mary Hall, we don't expect that they run into many parents who are paying for their sons' educations.

But unbelievably they will tell you that previously one didn't know how much was going to football and basketball, whereas under the new policy, each student knows that \$36 is going to pay for a mandatory seat at every home game. This admission does not make it right. All that's been done is to eliminate one of the biggest jokes around campus in recent years: that students get to go to all the home games for free. As it now stands, the policy, rather than trying to deceive the paying student, instead insults him to his face by telling him he has to buy the season ticket whether he goes to the games or not. What if the infirmary, for example, required everyone to pay for a hospital bed for a certain number of days every year?

In all magnanimity, Graves did have the heart to impose a four year limit on the period during which students will have to bear the indignity of paying for games they never see. Without this limitation it would seem almost

inevitable that the athletic department would seek to make the ticketbook a permanent fixture at William and Mary. It would save them the trouble of filling all those 15,000 seats in Cary Field.

Additionally, upon completion of the transition period, students will no longer have to suffer the indignity of paying for another student's grants-in-aid. Moreover, hefty increases have been deservedly awarded to men's and women's non-revenue sports, along with the intramural program. Nevertheless, we believe that the transition period could have been much shorter. As big-time athletics seems to benefit alumni more than any other segment of the College community, it should have been their responsibility to come up with the brunt of the costs in a period of time shorter than four years. As it now stands, the alumni can increase their support almost at their leisure. In the meantime, it is the students who must come up with the difference.

The key point in Graves' plan is the stipulation that the athletic program is not permitted to operate at a deficit. This requirement should finally put an end to the athletic department sticking their fingers into the General Fund Local, which has contained Bookstore profits and unrestricted gifts, and coming out with whatever they needed to make up their deficit.

Hence, despite its fundamental evil, the new athletic policy will ultimately eliminate some of the theft the athletic department has been indulging in for years. And, from the way we see it, President Graves at least deserves credit for having the wisdom to curb some of the insanity the athletic department would undoubtedly have loved to see continued.

Letter to the editor

To the Editor:

Like many other students I attended the rally protesting the Board of Visitors' decision concerning the future of the athletic program. All the points raised are important: the lack of consideration for student and faculty viewpoints, the increased student athletic fee, the disproportionate share of scholarships received by athletes, and the questionable proposition that watching paid athletes will somehow enrich our lives and contribute

significantly to our education.

There is another point that was not brought up and that I feel is an important aspect of whether we can maintain our academic integrity in the face of the Board's decision. If the College is successful in doubling alumni contributions in four years to support athletics (and it would be interesting to know what proportion of the alumni are represented by the "Educational Foundation") aren't there ways in which increased alumni donations could be better used? For in-

stance: faculty salaries, new books for the library, dorm renovation, ceasing out Crim Dell, improved security, financial aid for more students, etc.

When tight money has been used to justify inaction in many important areas, exhortations for the alumni to contribute heavily to a program involving only a few students seems downright frivolous.

Cindi Lewis
Class of 1975