

EDITORIALS

Last week's attempted demonstration in protest of the food and service in the student cafeteria was for the most part grounded on allowable premises. It is agreed that the food could be better in nutrition, quantity, and appearance. It is also agreed that there are instances in which service and sanitation leave much to be desired.

Likewise, we do not question the right to voice discontent and dissatisfaction. This is a basic right in a democracy, and we assume that we are still living in a democracy.

The question is, who was demonstrating for what, and from what motives? The avowed reason for the movement was to stir the administration toward action on matters concerning the food and service in the cafeteria. A more rash method was chosen because the demonstrators felt that more conciliatory means used in the past had not produced desired results. (It might be interesting to note here that a similar demonstration was planned last year on Dec. 3. This year's demonstration occurred on Dec. 11.) But if the sole motive behind such a proposed demonstration was to bring these noted grievances, why were those student leaders who numbered themselves among the demonstrators not willing to stand up and assume charge of, and responsibility for, the movement?

It is bad that these leaders (?) would stand aside and let the students, whom they were elected to serve, have to fight for something which they want and feel is necessary. The place for these leaders was in front of, or at the very least, beside, those few students who let themselves be positively identified with the demonstration.

We next question the true motivation behind the movement because of the secrecy with which it was planned. If the demonstrators or protestors really believed that their cause was just and their means sanctioned, why was the time, date, method and so forth not published or openly circulated? We can answer this question. The instigating forces behind the movement were not unanimous or even united in the feeling that a rash, unprecedented demonstration would bring the results hoped for.

Why, out of possibly 30 students who had grouped themselves to take part in the show, was a group of approximately eight left alone to confront vice-president Browning at the cafeteria door? If the method was such a good idea, if everyone in it was so completely assured of its success, why then did the opposition of one person cause the group to dwindle to this small number?

An ironically comic aspect of the whole affair is that, is planning the day and time for the rally, it was conceded that "if it rains we'll choose another day." Could not the fire of these passions have endured the 300-yard trek across the causeway in the rain to the L.A. building?

After the proposed march to President Moore's office had been thwarted, a few rational students turned to that democratic cure-all—the popular petition. This petition (see article—page 1) was ultimately signed by close to 600 students. We have been assured by those who circulated the petition that everyone who signed it read the text and was fully aware of what was doing.

The petition was presented, not to President Moore, the Dean of Students, the Dean of Faculty, or any other person on the St. Andrews faculty or administration, but was handed to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees. The Board is the ultimate controlling group and it is this assembly that the demonstrators hoped to reach in the first place. Assurance has been given by the Board that action will be taken and President Moore is heading an investigation. The Board was not indifferent, as has been reported. On the contrary, it was concerned and interested.

We are disgusted, however, to hear that another rash movement is in the making, even while this petition is being acted upon. The Board is not being given, it seems, a fair chance to investigate and correct the matters outlined in the petition. This brings us again to question the true motives of the element that is agitating for a demonstration. The undeniable truth is that part of the motive stems from opposition to, or professed dissatisfaction with, the Student Association, and as headed up by President Carol Brooks. One of the evils of the democratic system is that several parties or groups may exist in any situation where leaders are to be chosen, and obviously not everyone is going to be pleased in every instance.

Last spring it was shown whom the students preferred to have as their leaders, not only in the chair of presidency, but in all the other offices of the St. Andrews Student government. The burden lies on us, especially since we are professing to become educated, broad-minded, and more deep-thinking, to consent to be ruled by persons for whom we did not vote but for whom the majority did.

St. Thomas Aquinas said that to revolt is justified if the evils of the government were sufficient. It would not be stretching the point to interpret the movement for a violent food demonstration as a form of revolt toward the present SGA administration.

We only ask, where and what are the evils that justify such action?

THE LANCE The Roving I

By LONNIE MANN

Lt. Status Quo McCarthy, U.S. Army Ants Retd., peeking over the rim of his ant hill one day happened to recollect, as he often did, the good old days on the battle field when he was really some "somebody," there wasn't a more able warrior on the general staff. Those were the times that tried his antsoul while controlling his L.M.D. (large mahogany desk). This day, more than ever before, the thought struck him that somehow he was losing out, he thought: "I must do something, I must seize some opportunity to uphold the old traditions, those things I fought so valently for at my L.M.D. in the manner of my grandfather who was a top drummer boy ant at the battle of Cricket Run." "If there were only a war, but since there's not, I must find something here in Antburg." "Things never change much here, our way of doing things has worked well for two hundred years 'til"

He remembered the first time he came into contact with those strange outsiders who had upset social equilibrium. For years in the Ant Army and here in Antburg he and his friends had always carried things on their right side. When he asked the new creatures why they, to his dismay, carried things on their left side, (an unheard of custom locally) they replied "In order to retain balance. You, see, our species has been utilizing the right side for so long that it has become overdeveloped resulting in a structural disequilibrium and a consequent inability to mobilize and progress up the increasingly steep grades which we inevitably encounter in our ever changing society." He really hadn't understood and couldn't care less, he just didn't like their attitude. His thoughts flashed back to the present.

. . . til those meddling outsiders with their new fangled, foreign ideas, out there sittin' in those buildings thinkin' instead of learnin'. He crawled back into his sand hole in disgust, knowing that the sun would rise again tomorrow and that the earth would continue to turn.

And so old army ants never die, they just poke their once menacing probosci out of their ant hills, and with the vigor characteristic of all cases of the frustration of progress, hurl insults at the outside world as they search for the stagnated water of the old oaken bucket.

Makes Trip

On December 12, 1963 the Mixed Chorus under the direction of Lawrence Skinner made a trip to Gastonia, North Carolina where they sang at the First Presbyterian Church.

Their program consisted of "Hosanna, Son of David" by Gibbons; "A Boy Was Born" and "Three Kings" by Britten; Four Choruses from the "Messiah" by Handel. Soloists featured in "Messiah" were Richard Lilly and Elaine Elwell.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS



"SOME OF THESE FRESHMEN COME HERE WITH THE IDEA THAT COLLEGE IS JUST ONE GIGANTIC PARTY."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

As a responsible citizen of the St. Andrews Presbyterian College community, I should like to confer my compliments upon the leaders of this institution's student government.

At the supper hour on Wednesday, December 11, 1963, dedicated members of the student cabinet, the student senate, and other such revered and astute personages succeeded in completely thwarting an effort, on the part of certain concerned members of the student body and even of colleagues of the student government leaders, to undertake a graphic protest against the food conditions at St. Andrews.

While it is true that student government action regarding this problem has been going on for more than two years, only token satisfaction, even if that much, has been delivered from the administration and the Prophet (the spelling is quite correct) Food Company. It is evident that student government has tried, and it is even more evident that they have not succeeded.

Let the fault lie where it may. The situation exists, however active or suppressed the student leaders may be in their efforts. It is not significant who or how many persons instigated the abortive attempt at action and it is not significant that the situation did occur. What is significant is that it had to occur. If proper positive action had been taken initially, student reaction would not have been necessary.

Since this campus is blessed with a Food Committee, the proper and positive action should begin with this group. If they be not able to solve the evident problems of their office, by what means can the problem be solved? Food committees notwithstanding, personal contacts with the representative student leaders will perhaps prove to them that the students are dissatisfied. They, in turn, should have the responsibility, as elected officers of the Student Association, to use whatever means in their power to alleviate the situation.

The students are not striving for gourmandy; they are demanding decency.

Milton B. Bigger

Editor of the Lance:

After reading Gill Rock's columns for several months now, I believe he should reassess the principles which he believes comprise, in his words, a "constitutional government."

It is ultra-conservatives such as Mr. Rock who write off any piece of progressive legislation with the remark that we are headed "down the road of socialism." This radical right, which constantly brands politicians as Communist dupes and sees any left-of-center legislation as Communist inspired, fails to note the Facist element in their own thinking. Fascism, disguised as "Americanism," "Conservatism," and "Patriotism," is on the move in America just as Communism is on the move.

The lunatic fringe, disciples of hatred and bitterness who would deny Negroes equal opportunity because of the color of their skin and label the action as "conservative government" are a threat to America just as Communist infiltration is a threat.

Sidney J. Harris put it forthrightly in a recent column of his: "It would be the supreme irony if, in rejecting the blandishments of Communism, we fell hysterically into the arms of Fascism, disguised (as always) as 'Defender of Faith.'"

Robert M. Ham

N.Y. Seminar

For the second year during Spring Holidays there will be a seminar on the arts in New York. The seminar is open to all students, but a maximum number is thirty.

The tour will include a flight nonstop up and back from Raleigh to New York, a stay at the Hotel Great Northern, a ballet at Radio City Center, Musical Comedy, a Broadway play, a Broadway play, trip through a museum of art, a concert at the Lincoln Center, and dinner at a fashionable restaurant. Students will have some free time for further development of interest.

The cost will be \$130.00, this is more than last year because of the flights up and back and more planned activities. Deposits of \$50.00 must be made by February first in the Vardell Building. For any added information contact Professors Hoskins, McDonald, or West. Students who went last year had a ball and same is expected for this year.

**Merry Christmas
and
Happy New Year**

(The Lance Staff)