

EDITORIALS

Steal The Communists' Thunder

Evidence that communists are making efforts to infiltrate the civil rights movement cause some people to reach the wrong conclusion.

The challenge now is not to abandon efforts to end discrimination but for good loyal American citizens to retain leadership and control of the movement and to redouble their efforts to give every citizen a fair shake so that no one will be tempted to follow subversives.

The challenge to the Congress is to approve some positive legislation, such as the civil rights bills, with reasonable modifications, so that the teeth will be drawn from subversive threats.

There is some reason to believe that the American people are accepting the challenge, despite disgust with the rable-rousing antics of civil rights extremists. A recent opinion poll shows that 64 percent of the public, including a small majority of white Southerners, wants some kind of civil rights bill passed.

Anyone conversant with Marxist ideology understands that the communists seek to destroy the American way of life. But efforts to keep 20 million Americans in a second class status because they happen to belong to a minority race should not be part of the American way of life. It certainly was not conceived by our Founding Fathers to be part of the American Dream.

The United States has two options, it seems to us: one, to solve the problem under law, granting to each citizen his full civil and constitutional rights on the basis of equal citizenship; or, two, to give up the idea of individual freedom under the law and openly pursue a racist policy.

White America can destroy the "Negro revolution" if it wishes to pay the price. Whites outnumber Negroes ten to one and enjoy every political, economic, and social advantage. If it comes to a power struggle, in which public morality plays no part, white America can win hands down, even if it means herding the Negro communities into ghettos or arriving at a "final solution" of our own.

That alternative would make us roughly three times as evil as the Nazis, who slaughtered only six million Jews, and it would clearly exact a price that no sensible person would pay; namely, the end of American democracy and freedom.

Since the second alternative is really no choice at all, we might as well make up our minds to accept some social changes in America and arrive at a formula for solution of the civil rights crisis in accordance with our great national heritage, thereby freeing our minds, our hands and our hearts for the many other national problems that cry out for attention.

(from The Cheraw Chronicle)

The "Dishonor Roll Grows Yearly

Of all the grim records of violence and death down through mankind's long history, perhaps the strangest and most tragic is the story of the automobile and its annual army of victims.

Since the first horseless carriage chugged noisily down cobblestone streets, more than 60,000,000 Americans - killed, crippled and maimed - have inscribed their names on what has been aptly referred to as "the dishonor roll." By whatever name, the yearly casualty count continues its shameful, senseless growth.

Last year was no exception. In fact 1963 claimed the dubious distinction of being the worst single year in the history of highway safety. During its twelve months, automobile accidents were responsible for more deaths than the U.S. armed forces suffered in the entire Korean War.

According to an authoritative report by The Travelers Insurance Companies, the nation's traffic death toll surged to an all-time high as a total of 42,700 men, women and children died on our streets and highways. The annual countrywide survey based on information provided by state motor vehicle departments revealed that the 1963 carnage topped the figure of nearly 40,000 persons killed in 1941 - a record high which stood for twenty years - and even surpassed the new record of 40,500 deaths established in 1962.

What is the solution to this national disgrace? Obviously, no one has found it to date. Statistics, pledges and slogans have seemingly had little effect on the American public. None of these have brought about lasting improvement in any segment of the basic problem. None of them have sparked that dead-serious personal commitment to greater care behind the wheel which is necessary if we are to reduce the spreading epidemic of traffic slaughter.

When will we succeed in bringing the scourge of needless casualties under some degree of control? Frankly, no one really knows the complete answer. . .

Perhaps no significant improvement can be expected until the great majority of us learn to look upon the problem as a PERSONAL challenge rather than one which is primarily up to the other fellow!

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF Charles Quick
BUSINESS MANAGER Roy Wilson

EDITORIAL STAFF

SPORTS EDITOR Courtney Shives
CONSERVATORY EDITOR Jeanne Smith
MAKE-UP Sara Payne, Beth Hopkins
PHOTOGRAPHER Mike Mullinnix
REPORTERS & WRITERS Mary Fisher, Carol Privette
George Davidson, Robert Perry
Ted Foy, Alan Hancock

BUSINESS STAFF

CIRCULATION Nancy Stroupe, Lucylle Crook
DISTRIBUTION Jim Keylon, Mary Ellen McLean, Meredythe Lawrence

ADVISOR Jack Abernathy

The Lance is published every second Friday except during holidays and summer vacation. Offices are on lower floor of the Student Center. Subscription \$2.00 per year.

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.

'64 - '65 RA'S Chosen

The New Residence Assistants have been appointed after careful review of all applicants by Deans Robert Hester, Gloria Blanton, and Robert Davenport.

Basically, selection was based on (1) ability and interest in working with fellow students and college officials, (2) the desire of the student to be of service to his fellow students, (3) the student's citizenship record, (4) demonstrated leadership, and (5) academic achievement. (The average grade point ratio of the women appointed is 3.5. It is only slightly lower for the men.)

Qualifications for financial aid were also taken into account. A great majority of those appointed qualify for aid on this basis although some who do not necessarily meet these qualifications were appointed because of their demonstrated usefulness to the student body and the administration.

Next year will be especially challenging for the suite leaders because an experiment in student grouping will affect all students living on campus. There will be three types of suites: (1) those housing only freshmen, (2) mixed suites divided with about half freshmen and half upper classmen, and (3) those with only upper classmen. A "freshman dormitory," as such, will be eliminated.

A number of studies will be made throughout the year to observe the academic progress of students, as well as participation in campus activities, to determine what combination is most conducive to ideal living conditions.

The following women have been appointed: Margaret Abrams, Sarah Atkins, Frances Bounous, Eleanor Brown, Rebecca Carter, Caroline Clower, Carol Cooper, Sherrie Crawford, Susan Daniels, Trudy Dawkins, Ann Deifell, Ann Ehrhardt, Mary Ellen Elmore, Mary Fisher, Kay Greene, Carol Sue Harkey, Nancy Hitt, Diana Howard, Meredythe Lawrence, Judy Lutz, Kay McClanahan, Harriett McCutchen, Sandra McLees, Helen McPhail, Lillian Phillips, Mary Lou Richardson, Alice Robbins, Evann Rowe, Carolyn Roberts, Ann Stradley, Mary Raine Sydnor, Janice Thornton, Karalee Turner, Janet Wooten.

The following are appointed to the men's dorms: Mike Artman, Ernest Badgett, Walter Barefoot, Bill Barry, Maurice Bowen, Jim Burby, Jack Callahan, Howard Chipman, Jack Cole, Nick Gordon, Phil Hamilton, Bob Hatcher, David Hendricks, Rick Johnson, James Keylon, Mike Long, Dee Luhn, David McKinney, Duncan Mills, Bob Murphy, Michael Owens, Gill Rock, David Siford, Vann Taylor, Al Thomas, Roy Wilson.

"Daddy, you forgot..."



every litter bit hurts!"

On And Off Campus

By JOE CHANDLER, JR.

OUR CAMPUS COURTS

This article is the second of two discussing our campus system of and ideas about courts.

Only two problems seem of major concern to me beyond the recognition of the reality of our situation as described last time. These two are (1) the nature of our rules and (2) fair judicial procedure.

The fundamental concept that should be recognized is that our rules regardless of their moral, religious, or social motivation, are agreements for regulating life on the campus so as to serve the best interests of the whole campus, its ideals included. They are not embodiments of any sort of superhuman code of living, adherence to which will guarantee either godliness or bring individual or social salvation. Neither are they dependent beyond the normal limitations of punishment for their enforcement. The relationship of our rules to principles of honor, morals, and religion are entirely existent in the mind as individuals and groups express to violate, disappointment, disapproval, and disgust for failure to respect rules to which individuals through just means have given consent. Honor is neither in the rules nor the rules principles of honor. Honor transcends the rules and where it may be found exists and exists even without rules.

Therefore, we should be aware that our rules are in effect experimental in nature, subject to question and change as needs dictate. These rules should not be superimposed on any omniscient code or absolute yardstick of interpretation. St. Andrews' rules are not embodiments of "The Law" of any sort.

For the maximum effectiveness of operation for our campus courts as well as security of protection for the accused, certain basic guarantees must be written into our student constitution. Equally as important, these principles of procedure must be recognized and observed by those who hold ultimate power over these and other judicial matters. These five guarantees at least must be included: (1) the right to enter a plea; (2) the right to refuse to answer questions without prejudicing oneself; (3) the right of one's representative to hear testimony of witnesses as well as the defendant and possibly to cross-examine witnesses; (4) preliminary hearing to be held to determine if there is in fact enough evidence to warrant a trial; and (5) a detailed, explicit statement of the charges against a student. It is true that the present courts, as well as previous one, notably used some of these practices in their operations. However, none of these are recognized or guaranteed in a formal document like our constitution. It would be a serious mistake if the present constitutional revision committee fails to take these ideas into serious consideration.

And what about an "Honor Code?" When one has agreed to attend this college he or she has agreed to accept the rules and regulations of the college as binding on him or her. To ask one to make an additional statement of willingness to abide by the rules seems superfluous. It might serve to make an individual more conscious of his responsibilities and pledge. However, this hardly adds a great degree to an offense, since if one breaks a rule he has agreed to uphold in registering here it is no more broken if he simultaneously breaks an additional pledge to the very same rule. Most of all, the signing of an honor code were made mandatory, or if any loss of actual privilege resulted from not voluntarily signing the pledge to the Honor Code, the code would be virtually meaningless from the outset.

Much in the two articles on the college judicial life has related deliberately to the underlying philosophy of the problems administering justice on campus. This is where I believe the real problem is. This campus has not yet effectively engaged itself solving the fundamental problems of its judicial operation. We have been too much concerned with motivations and ends rather than means. It is too easy to take advantage of our newness, even unconsciously which is perhaps most dangerous, to excuse failure. In constructive, effective, workable means we will best pursue our ends. Let us do, so by rejecting objective absolutes to which our actions must be reconciled or rejected; instead may we project a future out of subjective insight into real experiences.

