

For The Love of "Rambo"

by Kim Ormand

One thing I can do is give credit where credit is due. The recent October withdrawal from the World Court is what Mr. Reagan has been teaching the American people about foreign policy since he became president-and even before, as a candidate.

We live in a world of enemies so we must be cruel and heartless. We mustn't be bothered with trivialities or niceties such as the law or other commitments. Others use terrorism so we must use the same thing. America won't take it anymore.

These have been Reagan's themes and for the most part have matched the national mood. Americans were tired of complexity and frustration. As usual, they longed for the easy way out-the simple frontier myth, in which a man tough enough could set things right on his own. They longed for "Rambo."

But of course this is a myth. No one man can shape world events as he wishes-a world where the religions, the superpowers, and the economic dependency of the various countries are intermixed. Basically the president has managed to face some reality; he dealt pragmatically with the TWA hostage-takers. But in terms of the World Court-he has not come down to earth.

The International Court of Justice (World Court) is an integral part of the United Nations whose purpose is to serve as the principal judicial sections of the U.N. It is to provide advisory opinions of legal issues requested of it by the various sanctions. It has served as a purposeful institution for the U.S. for the past 40 years in terms of trying to build a court and a system of international law.

Why then did the United States walk away? The World Court decided an issue against the American position. It held that it has the jurisdiction to hear out Nicaragua's complaint about U.S. sponsored terrorism. According to the State Department it "would endanger our vital national interests" to remain in the Court. And so we walked out.

This action strikes out at an institution that has stood for all America supposedly believes in: law. How sad that fear, anger, and the ever-increasing "Rambo" doctrine will allow such damage to be done to the ideals and ultimately to the American people.

To the Editor,

There are a few students who make Brevard College a dangerous place. These irresponsible individuals believe that tampering with fire alarms and fire extinguishers is somehow amusing. However, short-sightedness and stupidity prevent them from realizing just how dangerous this really is.

The fire alarms on campus are activated so frequently that no one is apt to heed their warning. Also, the unwarranted use of a fire alarm is immature and by all rights, a crime. The shocking thing is that if there was indeed a fire, the fire department is liable to hesitate in making the trip from fear of finding a false alarm.

Let's say for example that there is a fire on your dorm floor. First, you quickly activate your hall's alarm, but there will be no firemen rushing to the rescue.

You then race valiantly to the nearest fire extinguisher. Alas, someone has discharged the flame retardant material in the name of fun. Yippie!

Later, the dorm is damaged, if not completely destroyed by the flames. Some residents lose all of their personal belongings and perhaps even their lives. Is that funny? Laugh it up. It could be you!

Sincerely yours,

Chris Crowder

Dear Editor,

The writing of this letter is to give the students of Brevard College the Student Government Association's feelings about the "No visitation" policy which was imposed in the dorms from October 23-30. Although the personal opinions vary, the SGA as a whole felt it may have taken the same action. However, the SGA was not asked its opinion of the matter. The SGA feels it should have had some input on the decision, even if that input was ignored.

The SGA feels responsible for all aspects of student life. If we are to represent the students fairly, the opinion of SGA should be received by the faculty and administration on such matters like closing the dorms. SGA hopes that the visitation has served its purpose and that the students have realized the responsibility they have for themselves as well as others here at B.C.

Sincerely,

Linda Davis

A RT's View

by Nancy Williams

Undoubtedly one of the most talked about issues on campus is this business of rights and rules. Too frequently, we all think in terms of two sides: "their" side and the right side. I think we owe

Do Students Have Rights?

by Elizabeth Oliver

Many people have asked me, in the process of writing this article, exactly what rights we as students have. It seems to be about the most controversial and two-sided issue on campus.

While going to different dorms and visiting with other students, I got many responses and complaints about how minimal our rights are here at the college.

Students feel that many of the restrictions placed on them give them less freedom than at home. Some people feel inhibited by the constant reminder that Security or the Resident Tutors can enter their rooms at any time and legally go through your belongings.

While talking to Nancy Williams, the RT in West Beam, I realized several things which are of interest to the student body. First, private schools are under a law called "en locale parentus" which means that the administration is legally seen as the students' "parents." This gives the school the authority to go into the belongings of a student and search for anything, even without apparent cause.

Next, the administration has the right to appoint anyone they wish to search the students' belongings. This includes security, maintenance, or for instance, the janitorial workers. Also in discussing students' rights, I found that each RT has a different personality and, therefore, creates a different atmosphere in his or her dormitory. Some dorms are stricter than others, and the students feel they have fewer or more rights according to which dorm they live in.

Students have come up with the question, "Do we have a right to complain about something an RT does if we feel it is wrong?" Yes, as students of BC, we do. Yet who will the administration believe, an RT who is an adult and has been hired to look out for the students, or a student who has been reprimanded? Most students feel that the administration would stay on the side of the RT or Security.

It is to each other to stop and try to put things into perspective. Below are some of my thoughts as an R.T. about students' rights and rules.

Let me start out by saying that I believe in the goals and purpose of Brevard College. Derwin and I chose Brevard because we attended a school not unlike BC and both had a very positive experience there. We believe in the value of a small college, church-related, liberal arts education. We believe that students have more rights and opportunities than they would have at a school without rules. The choices here are many more than at a place where everything is permitted.

Rules. Who likes them? No rules would mean less work for the R.T.s. I think the lack of order that would result from no guidelines for behavior would be a lot more of an imposition than the guidelines are. Yet you can't talk about student rights without talking about responsibilities. Being irresponsible disrupts community living and may result in the altering of privileges.

Derwin and I try to create an atmosphere of mutual respect in the dorm. The better the residents accept the responsibility of living in a dorm, the greater the sense of trust, sense of community, and privileges. The more our "dormites" assume responsibility for operating the dorm within limits, the less I have to. The students have just as many rights as they will be responsible for.

I know that legally school officials could do things that would tamper with the privileges of students such as entering a student's room with little or no cause. But fortunately that is not what Brevard College does. School officials do not enter students' rooms with no cause. Is the school to blame for the law?

And there are guidelines. It seems there is security in knowing what is expected from you. I think there would be less stress in my life if every area of it had some guidelines. I wouldn't have to figure so many things out.

Although I didn't write the guidelines, I feel certain that they are intended to and do allow for a lot of fun. College days are memory-making days and I think everyone should have a good time. Most of the fun comes from the fun of getting by with it. Some of the things we do, we wouldn't ordinarily consider if it were allowed.

I think the objective of the guidelines is to promote an atmosphere of community. It just so happens that when about a hundred people live together in close quarters, there has to be some sort of guidelines. Everyone will not ever agree on exactly what the guidelines should be, but I think everyone would agree there has to be some and that someone has to be responsible for seeing that the guidelines are followed.

About R.T.'s. First of all, none of us applied for jobs just to give out points. We didn't call up and say, "Hey, I'd like to give out points. Do you have any jobs available making people mad at me? Oh, and I suppose I could teach or coach on the side." No. That's not the way it happened. Most all of the R.T.'s are trained in helping professions. A top priority value is that of helping others. None of us enjoy assigning points or any other forms of discipline. It's no fun giving points to a student you've tried really hard to reach out to. And the toughest times I've had at Brevard so far were the times I

◆◆cont. on page 3◆◆

Letters To The Editor

Dear Editor,

Hey! What is it that people think about surfing and surfers? People think we're insane party animals who are always into drugs. I know you've heard this before, but we've got an undeserving bad image.

I know this is true because many of the students at Brevard College are from a terrific surfing state-Florida. Why do surfers get such a reputation? Many surfers I know around North Carolina are clean-cut, hardcore surfers who would rather get tubed rather than get drunk or stoned. This "party image" is really getting on my nerves. Surfers are just like all the other athletes around the world. Instead of jogging in the snow, surfers paddle out into the line-up with full wetsuits on in 40 degree water-freezing cold water that eats through every bone in our bodies.

I have been surfing for about

two years and most everyone I talk to has no clue about surfing and tend to believe that all surfers are stereo-typed into "Jeff Spicoli." This is pure rubbish. I don't care what anyone says-nobody can really surf in top form when they're drunk or stoned. No one can do that. They might try, but I would guess that they would end up getting nosed by a board or drowned.

I have to admit it. Surfers are hardcore and unique. Surfers are one of few athletes who would pry themselves out of a warm bed and climb into a cold, clammy wetsuit just to catch the dawn patrol at 4:00 a.m. This is not insanity; it's called dedication to a natural art. Surfers are pure athletes who are just awe stricken with the ocean. Surfers are not waste products who just need some good waves and a cool buzz. Rubbish, pure rubbish.

Buck Rowlee