



RADICAL STUDENT MOVEMENT AFOOT

I never really thought I would have to write this type of editorial because I always assumed that if the matter about which I am writing had arisen someone would have told me about it rather than my finding out on my own.

Obviously, very few students are aware of the insidious forces which are at work on our campus at this very moment. Although I have been unable to pinpoint the names of the members of this secret organization it has become apparent that many students have joined this group either through stupidity or through varying degrees of conscious effort.

This group has spoken to our faculty and administration in no uncertain terms in an attempt to coerce them into curtailing student freedom and autonomy in student government. This clique has, first off, appealed to the administration for the abolition of student government on the grounds that it saddles the student with undue and unfair responsibilities which compete with other matters. Of course, they were unable to explain why the best academic students are also the ones who are involved in both student and national politics. It is a moot question whether the afore mentioned point will weigh heavily in the final attitude of faculty and administration toward student maturity. I fear greatly that this anarchist group is more widespread than any of us realizes as it has, for some time, managed to make quite an im-

pressive noise.

Recently, moreover, this group has opposed every action of student government, particularly the bills for late permission for co-eds, and the new constitution. Also, to my surprise, I have discovered that this movement is exerting pressure for the continuance of compulsory chapel and has encountered little administrative resistance in this endeavor.

Further, this group would be in favor of the motion to require all male students to sign out for all absences from campus after seven o'clock at night. In the same manner they have expressed themselves quite loudly in opposition to off campus drinking privileges which have been in effect for the past three years.

Beware of this malignant ogre which has beset our campus. You never know if your neighbor is one of them. The code name of this inverted sect is Y.H.T. A.P.A. Does anyone know what these letters stand for? Or is it a big secret? I wonder if you are clever enough to figure out this little ANAGRAM and if, by default you are docile enough to buy the party line. Perhaps you are already a card carrying member. In any event it's the students bid now and their opportunity to join or reject the deafening silence of this quietist group. Speak to your student government representatives and join them in fighting the Y.H.T. A.P.A. as their influence is increasing while you abstain from this responsibility.

Acid Vat

By ERNEST BADGETT

In the early decades of the Twentieth Century powerful forces were at work all over Europe and the world. This force was in opposition to another force of long duration - Colonialism (sometimes spelled Imperialism) the culmination of centuries of extension and development.

The extension and development began in the late Middle Ages when the great nation states slowly grew out of Feudalism. Intense national pride and the closely related phenomenon called Nationalism expressed themselves in many ways, not the least of these being exploration and later exploitation of newly discovered lands. The thin mask of respectability and moral righteousness called "the white man's burden" worked for a good many years.

Developing alongside this phenomenon there was a growing awareness of human freedom and the concept of "natural rights." This movement came into full bloom in Europe and America first during the mid to late seven-teen hundreds and early eighteen hundreds. As long as the revolutionary movement was in Europe and the United States it was compatible with and even friendly toward the concept of the white man's burden.

In the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, however, the same forces which led to the revolutionary movements in the old country set in earnest in the colonies and protectorates. Gradually in our own century the colonial powers of Europe and the United States have granted partial (in some cases complete) independence to their old subject nations.

By now you are probably wondering what the hell I'm preaching elementary history for. You would be right in assuming I've got some hair-brained reason for it, for, in fact, I do. I have set up a historical contest against which we may better understand a very recent development on this very campus, and into which we must fit it in order that it work.

St. Andrews student government, long the cesspool, though not of its own choosing, of political Medievalism, has at long last been reached by a faint yet unmistakable ray of the light which has all this time been permenting the rest of the world.

For the benefit of those of you who are not in a position to know, I'm talking about the approval of the New Constitution! This represents a significant step in the right direction. You may say, "What has this got to do with me?" or the ever popular, "So what?" or better yet, "I don't give a rip, I came here to go to school and not to screw around with alot of petty clap-trap about student gov'ment!" The answers to these questions are simply this - plenty, to you maybe nothing, and it's part of your education. So much for that.

This break through here near the end of our century indicates a number of things other than the numerous advantages in the New Constitution itself. Probably the most important single thing of significance it indicates is that we are no longer cut off or isolated, in the area of political thought, from the events that have been going on in the mainstream of human affairs for centuries. Another of its indications is that our enduring faith (albeit shaken to the very roots at times!) that ultimately the good sense and judgment of our administra-

Why Apathy ?

By CHUCK MOSELEY

My article last time caused some stir among some of the professors here. For them political apathy only constituted a minor symptom of a much more serious problem - that of a general apathy on the part of the student body concerning matters which should be an integral part of a mature college student's life. The professors believed that the political indifference on this campus stems from a larger indifference on the part of the student concerning his work and its implications. One professor went so far as to say there was more academic interest at Flora MacDonald even if it was on a different level. The question is why? There seems to be many angles to this complex problem. It seems that no one faction on this campus is totally exempt from blame be it students, administration or faculty.

Let me add here that the Lance staff and myself invite any comment or criticism concerning anything that I or any other writer has to say. The lack of letters to the editor itself is a sign of the prevailing indifference mentioned above. I know, and I am sure that the other staff writers will concur, that our opinions are not omniscience, but judging from the lack of reaction to what has been said we have to assume that either everyone agrees with us or is so insouciant that whether or not there exists a problem does not matter.

**ACADEMIC PRESSURE
BLAMED**

Before I proceed I would like to clarify what I believe the above mentioned problem entails. This task itself is complex and cannot be fully covered in an article of this length. It is not something one can pinpoint as with political indifference. It is an attitude of which I am speaking and not just particular manifestations. One possible factor which comes to mind is that of the increasing academic pressure which is be-

tors would prevail has paid off. All of us at times have been (and probably will continue to be) guilty of thinking of "THE Administration" as being omnipotent corporate being whose sole end in life was to grind up and devour students and to impose an unbearable yoke of restrictions on faculty and students alike.

Due largely to this recent action on the part of college administrators and responsible students alike, this ruinous "myth" is being dispelled. The New Constitution will soon be presented to the student body for final approval. In the interest of those of you who are not familiar with the changes the New Constitution will make in the student life of all of us, regardless of what our attitude toward the S.G.A. may be, I shall attempt to supplement the information given on the front page.

Under the New Constitution the S.G.A. president will have a veto power. His veto will be negated within the student government only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. That Senate will be the sole legislative body, there and there alone is the law making power of the S.G.A.

All legislative power will be taken away from the infamous Student Life Committee (an organization even the most apathetic students have heard about). It will serve as an advisory committee to the Dean continued on page 9

ing brought to bear with each new year. I am sure that any student who was here the first year of the school's existence will agree with me when I say that the academic requirements are much stiffer now than they were then. Sophomore C&C is probably the prime example of this. Concomitant with this the caliber of the new student is supposed to be improving each year. Is it however? The facts do not seem to bear this ideal correlation out.

Students react in two basic ways to this type of situation. One way is that of complete negation or indifference in the face of a condition that the student is not equipped to overcome. This school has had more than an average drop-out rate. Mainly because of this factor. As a student that has been here from the beginning I can readily testify to this. I am not advocating education for the masses at the cost of certain academic standards which should be met, but I am suggesting that some body is culpable for this condition. It just didn't happen. If the students are not qualified to meet the standards who is to blame, the students or the administration (including the faculty)? Can the students be blamed for a situation that they did not create nor could have been cognizant of until it was too late?

STUDENTS "GUT" IT OUT

The second type of reaction is that of "grinding it out." Some students believe that the only way to make it through here is by forgetting all else except the "books" (as though "books" can do anything). Doing one's assignments religiously (who said that there is no religion around this place) and meeting other course requirements is all an education consists of to this type. Good grades are the only criteria for success. This attitude actually stems out of the condition mentioned above. Some students may be no better qualified to meet the standards but they are a little more "gutsy" than others that don't make it. They struggle with the system and make it through, but what have they accomplished? Is the purpose of the "liberal arts" education offered here to inculcate "guts," ambition, and "thick-skinness?" Is happiness an "A"?

I realize that there are other reasons that can be offered for the lack of what I will call "academic quality" on this campus. Reasons based on "emotional complications" for instance, but do emotional problems precede the system or are they caused by it? Maybe the fault is with the cockeyed world out there and its "values," but even if it is how is this fact going to solve the problem here?

SOME STUDENTS DISCONTENT

I will grant that some students do not try as hard as they could, but why don't they? Is it something innate in that student? Was he never meant to go to college; but if so, why is he here? I don't purport to have the answers to these questions nor do I think anyone could answer them fully, but I do think that someone around here ought to begin to do some honest deliberating in this area because it is obvious that there is and always has been much discontent among students here concerning the "grades." Indifference has been the result of this discontent in many cases and not the cause of it.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF Lonnie Mann
BUSINESS MANAGER Arthur Sickles
MANAGING EDITOR Sara Payne

EDITORIAL STAFF

SPORTS EDITOR Steve Pitt
ACADEMIC EDITOR Nancy Stroupe
SOCIAL EDITORS Lucille Crook,
Meredythe Lawrence
PHOTOGRAPHER Jeep Mullinnix
POLITICAL COLUMNISTS Chuck Moseley,
Gil Rock

STAFF WRITERS AND REPORTERS Jim Ashley,
Ernest Badgett, Eloise Barefoot, Jim Bennett,
Warren Bennett, Ed Butterworth, Cyn Carpenter,
Paul Epley, Elizabeth Finlator, Ted Foy, Jim
Furman, Howard Hadley, Alan Hancock, David
Higgins, Louise Kohl, Marnie McFarlane, Debbie
Medlin, Billy Miller, Cheryl Monroe, Rowland
Powell, Bill Shomo, Dave Sifford, Adger Smyth,
Henry Steele, Lynn Terry, Tom Tomlinson, Sally
Watkins and Jane Wright.

BUSINESS STAFF

ADVERTISING Jim Keylon, David Peake
CIRCULATION Lucille Crook,
Meredythe Lawrence

Opinions expressed in letters to the Editor and in signed columns are not necessarily those of The Lance. Letters to the Editor should be brief and must be signed. Names will be withheld upon request.