

# TOUCHE'

Editor's Note: This column is reserved for letters, both pro and con, to the editor. We urge all members of the campus community to contribute.

Dear Editor:

In reading "The Speedway" in your last issue I found some glaring errors in the rationale of the writer. Mr. Andrews-Speed makes repeated remarks such as "vicious bludgeons" and "boring and syrupy lectures" and while they do add color, if you can call it that, to the article, they do not lend themselves to an intelligent appraisal of the problem.

Here at A-B the number of faculty members using the cut system is small and limited mainly to the foreign languages and introductory courses, so let us first not lump the faculty en total into the "gutless" category. It must be kept in mind that the complaint Mr. Andrews-Speed has is limited in scope to a handful of faculty members.

A second major point to consider is the difference in the maturity of a great number of students here at A-B. There are many who could cut a class a number of times and still make the mark on a test but have they really learned anything. If in cutting a class, the student would do more outside reading on material that they are "already familiar with" then I am sure the professors would not count up cuts and grade accordingly. The unfortunate truth is that there are many students, myself included, who lack the discipline to do so. Therefore, we waste our time and do a disservice to those in the class who are not familiar with the subject in not being there to aid in any discussions.

### Partial Agreement

In part I agree with Mr. Speed in regard to some upperclassmen being penalized for reading outside information while a formal class is being held, but this in no way implies that I agree the same should apply to freshmen, for it is the first year, as no other, that a discipline has to be learned and it would not be fair to a student to go to a class where the professor could not care less about him and holds no incentive to attend class. Too many students lacking in self-discipline have been ousted from this school not because the professor cut their grade for not coming to class but because the student did not learn enough because of the cuts to pass the course!

There is a problem and a legitimate gripe by a few students because of the need to attend a boring class but there will always be some boring things in life and they can not always be shunned. The thing to do is to make the best of them and learn something from them.

Sincerely,  
Randy Drupiewski

\* \* \*

Dear Editor:

Why don't you just quit? The Ridgerunner does nothing, says nothing, and is nothing. Unless you can do something constructive for the student body, why bother?

Name withheld by request

## THE RIDGERUNNER

Editor . . . . .	Nora Lauerman
Managing Editor . . . . .	Laurel Richards
Business Manager . . . . .	Lawrence Jones
Sports Editor . . . . .	Mark Lawson
Contributors . . . . .	Rena Hannan . . . . . Terry Merriman
	Chris Kline . . . . . Tony Andrews-Speed
	Don McCrimmon
Cartoonist . . . . .	Philip J. Hawkins
Photographer . . . . .	John Wert
Business Staff . . . . .	Carol Roose
Make Up . . . . .	Sheri Broome . . . . . Art Fryar
Typists . . . . .	Chris Kline . . . . . Barbara Baker
Faculty Advisor . . . . .	Michael Gillum

The Ridgerunner is printed by Groves Printing Company of Asheville.

# Editorial Residence Clause Unfair

There is a paradox existing in the dormitory regulations which state that "all new students to A-B or continuing students under 21 are required to live in the dormitory." This restriction is completely inconsistent with the basically liberal rules regulating dorm life.

The curfews, the allowing of beer in the dorms, the self-governing responsibilities given to the dorm students themselves--all are acknowledged to be extremely liberal and are appreciated by the people who have to live with the rules. However, this one restriction is out of context with the general lenient attitude which the Administration has toward the dorm residents.

When I approached the administrative official who is the final authority on this issue, he said that there was no way to escape this clause in the regulations. The reason he gave was that as a commuting student, one would not be as active on the campus as a dorm student. Is this a valid statement? I think not. In two instances in which dorm students appealed the restrictive residence clause (and were refused on the basis of the above reason), they had committed themselves to extra-curriculum activities which would not only necessitate their presence on campus, but also keep them active in school functions. Since, by tradition, commuting students are not as active on campus at any college, would it not benefit this college to have some commuters who are active on campus?

Financial needs carry no weight. The school just does not seem to realize that the reason some students live in the dorms is because there is no place else for them to live. Neither does the school seem to realize that it will lose some of its active dorm students to other colleges simply because it would be more financially feasible to go to another college where the students are allowed to live off-campus.

I have been told that the real reason that students are not allowed to live off-campus is because the dormitories are self-liquidating. This is a completely odious theory. I hope that it is not true. The idea that the school will not let anybody, no matter what the circumstances, live off-campus just because the dorms need to be paid for is so ugly and repugnant that I cannot believe it. If this theory is true, it would reduce A-B to the level of a money-grabber rather than the institute of higher learning which I believe it is. If it is true, then the school is putting dorm students, who have a legitimate reason to live off-campus but cannot because of the regulation, into a position of having to leave A-B or having to borrow money to finish their education at A-B, just so the school can pay off the cost of the dorms.

I sincerely hope that the reason the Administration has put the restrictive residence regulation on the dorm students is because they have over-looked the possibility of financial necessity and not because of the self-liquidating proposition. It is the position of this writer that in a school as small as A-B, the Administration can give each request individual attention and not apply a general rule to the masses.

L. K. R.

## Snack Shop

