

THE LANCE

Staff

Editor Jeff Neill
 Associate Editor Lani Baldwin
 Associate Editor Marshall Gravely
 Business Manager Hunter Watson
 Copy Editor Elaine Thomas
 Advisor Mr. Fowler Dugger

Staff writers: Ligon Perrow, Rod Brown, Dan Breidegam
 Susan Harris, Nancy Meator, Glenda Buck, Jackie Dove.

The Editorial staff's intent is to maintain professional standards within the guidelines put forth by the Code of Responsibility. Signed articles reflect the opinion of the author, whereas unsigned editorials and articles reflect the majority opinion of the staff. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the College. Letters to the editor and articles are welcomed though subject to space limitations.

Subscription rates \$2.50 per semester.
 Advertising rates \$.90 per column inch.
 Semester contracts, \$.80 per column inch.

Blessings . . . Pope

There is so much to write about when I realize that this is my last time before the reading public at St. Andrews.

Yet, it is difficult trying to decide what should or should not be said. Last week I turned sentimental to the surprise of a number of people.

I could take a few stabs at the cafeteria, which has not improved greatly in the past months; maintenance, which either did or did not fix my air conditioner; the business office, which is still without the spunk Peacock put into it; C & C, which is and forever will be C & C; STMS, which needs no mention; the P.E. department, which is still attempting to take itself too seriously; etc, which could mean anything, anything at all.

Or, I could write a long but humorous story on life in a suite situation, working out problems with friends, attempting to find a job, President Nixon (who is a long, but not humorous story in himself), professors who try too hard, etc.

But not this week. What I want to say is of a serious nature, and is directed to the students and indirectly to the whole St. Andrews community.

But are you the same people who are asking for peace in the world? If you are, then Richard Nixon is doing the same thing you are, only on a larger scale. Instead of throwing firecrackers at people he knows, he is bombing people he has never seen before. Is there a difference? Think about it, children.

The verbal and physical assaults on the police were irrational actions, spurred on by emotion. This action has hurt the relationship between the city and the campus.

I am not saying that the school is entirely at fault. I do not like to be threatened, and that is what I think the police were doing in the local paper last Friday. A front page spread such as that also adds injury to insult.

What should be done? Who knows? Surely I don't have the answer.

St. Andrews is now in the age of puberty. It has grown some, but it is not old enough to handle the situation.

The incident of last Wednesday, namely the bust in Mecklenburg and the behavior of the students afterward, has been talked and written about so much lately that I am certain everyone is tired of it.

Yet, I feel more needs to be said. Dr. Hart in his eloquent "Dialogue" expressed many of my feelings. It distressed me deeply to hear people laughing about what he had to say.

These are the same people who want to attack the police station downtown and talk about violence as if it were a harmless game. And these are the same people who enjoy throwing firecrackers at each other.

As a senior, I know that I am glad that I am graduating soon. I do not like the atmosphere here anymore. I see the generation gap between myself and the underclassmen.

Puberty can be a painful and confusing stage of life to exist within. If that is where St. Andrews is now, then all I can do is hope that this stage passes quickly for the sake of the school.

St. Andrews gave me what I wanted from college. It can offer the same to anyone else who is willing to take it. But you must respect the school, and love it.

Sure it has faults, but before they could be solved in a peaceful manner. Can it be done so today?

So, as I close and put the final Blessings column to bed, I want to say to the students who will be here next year: the school is yours. Do with it as you wish, but if you remain irrational, be willing to suffer the consequences. Don't kill it before it reaches adolescence.

Criticism Of Paper Seen As Improvement Over Approval

BY JEFF NEILL

In recent weeks a sudden onslaught of criticism concerning the Lance has come out into the open for the first time this year.

This is good.

Prior to this criticism all that The Lance heard after each publication was how good the paper has been this year -- as compared to other years -- and how "this issue was the best yet!" Naturally different people made basically the same statement each week which gave us the feeling The Lance was being accepted, liked, and read by the campus as a whole. Positive strokes are always good for the ego.

Yet at the same time compliments without constructive criticism can lead to complacency rather than innovation and upgrading of standards.

Perhaps the largest and most valid criticism we have heard recently is that The Lance has not investigated complaints about possible wrong doings by various community members and groups. In short, The Lance has been bland and lacking the dynamics of criticism.

We plead guilty with extenuating circumstances.

First with the obvious: major controversies do not always

Crime Proposal Contradictory

Editor:

This is not an opinion of the Student Senate. I am not writing an official statement for my dorm. This is a personal opinion.

The recent proposal concerning felonious crimes by the Committee for the Implementation of the Code was in many ways ironic. We at St. Andrews have lately been great advocators of personal right. We have thrown mud at police cars, we have called policemen cute names (peculiar to our generation), and we have reacted violently to the local newspaper article which covered the dope bust.

Our College is supposedly a liberal college, extending its privileges to any and all who will accept them. Racial discrimination? Not Sexism? Not Yet in all our tolerant facades, the ugly sickness of discrimination has found true representation in the Proposal. Granted, the majority of students did not support it and the Student Senate did not pass it. Yet it did prove, at least to me, that things at St. Andrews are not as they should be. The Proposal publicly proved that myself, along with the other members of the student body are scheming, bourgeois, condescending hypocrites. To consider myself and my fellow students otherwise is to continue an unending and hopeless game with ourselves, the administration, the faculty, and most of all, the people whom we so righteously term "undesirable" because they have committed a felonious crime.

The crime and the criminal are both products of the same rationale that prompted the Committee for Implementation of The Code to make its proposal, and the reason that four students from Kent State are now dead.

Tommy Warren

happen on the S. A. campus for The Lance to report. But be that as it may. To put together a paper on any type of a basis--daily, weekly, monthly--requires a great deal of time, energy, effort and ability. These things the staff, as a whole, lacked in sufficient quantities (for the majority of this year there were four full time staff members).

It must also be realized The Lance staff is comprised of members of the S. A. community and therefore can only reflect the S. A. community in certain ways. And the staff has in two ways: first by not being totally engaged and enthusiastic about our work. We perhaps

lacked as a group the willingness to exert the extra effort required to push The Lance from what it is to what it might have been. Second, we held the same attitude toward controversy on a large scale as most people in our community hold on the individual level; total aversion to it.

A friend of ours carried out an experiment a couple of years ago for a psychology research paper. He did not wear deodorant for a period of several weeks to see how many people would confront him or at least ask why he was not wearing deodorant. He was amazed at how few people said anything . . . even his closest friends

(Continued to Page 3)

Repeal of Abortion Law Threat To Women Here

BY GLENDA BUCK

A bill was passed yesterday by the New York House of Representatives aimed at repealing New York's abortion law. This bill must now be passed by the Senate and signed by Governor Rockefeller before it goes into effect. If this bill is passed, the effects will be both dangerous and tragic.

In the past several years the abortion counseling service at SA has remained busy, with students being referred to an excellent clinic in New York City. According to Van Joines, this is one of the best clinics in the east and is considerably less expensive than clinics in Washington, D.C. He also stated that, though he doesn't believe the bill will pass, the clinics in

Washington probably wouldn't be able to handle all the abortions due to the repeal of the New York law.

The possibility of such action makes the need for birth control on campus even more urgent. The fact is that Bob Davenport does recommend women from SA to an abortion clinic and counsels women who attempt self-abortions. This is proof that women on this campus can become pregnant and, despite all other factors, will refuse to continue pregnancy. Do we want to see these women die trying to abort children they do not feel they can bring into the world? Maybe we do. After all, killing both the mother and the child would be a very effective way of fighting overpopulation.

New Nixon Policy Means More Killing In Vietnam

BY MARSHALL GRAVELY

President Nixon's announcement Monday night and the subsequent storm of protest from students and antiwar people across the country has, in the favorite term of the Pentagon, "put us back at square one." It seems clear, however that there were actually two messages Monday night--one new proposal for peace hidden inside a belligerent move to continue and escalate the war. Nixon justifies his latest action of mining North Vietnamese ports and bombing railroads to prevent the delivery of supplies as a move to counteract the "reckless efforts of Hanoi's international bandits to impose a Communist government on 17 million South Vietnamese who are heroically resisting." Aside from the rhetoric itself, the policy of a land victory seems to be a complete reversal of the policies of Vietnamization and withdrawal. Nixon is still trying to win the war.

But there was also a peace proposal involved in the speech. The plan is now to offer complete U. S. withdrawal 4 months after a cease-fire and the scheduling of national elections open to all parties. Contingent from the withdrawal would be the return of all U.S. prisoners and a North Vietnamese guarantee for continuing the cease fire during the elections. Thus, it seems that Nixon is also

trying to end the war.

One must also consider the rhetoric of Cabinet members in trying to determine the real aims of this administration. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird began his Pentagon press conference Wednesday with an exhortation for national unity and support of the President's policies. Which ones? Laird said that this is no time for "quitters" or talks of "instant surrender," and that there would be used "every means necessary to stop the ruthless aggression by North Vietnam."

This seems close to the true tone of Nixon's speech. Furthermore, Republican leaders in Congress were highly critical of those who had criticized the speech, saying that the critics were aiding the enemy by stirring division among Americans and giving the enemy hope to continue the aggression.

In view of student protests at Wisconsin, Berkeley, Stanford, and numerous other universities, it seems obvious that there is no danger of stirring division among Americans. There is already plenty of it without provocation. What the protests are about, moreover, is the almost incredible length of the war and its tragic continuation in search of a victory that cannot and will never be won by either side. The war goes on, and the divisions at home grow deeper and deeper.

(Continued to Page 4)