

THE LANCE

St. Andrews Presbyterian College

Laurinburg, N. C. 28352

Staff

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Editor | Sara Lee |
| Associate Editor | Charlie Pratt |
| Associate Editor | Wayne Warren |
| Sports Editor | Mark Kleber |
| Business Manager | Lonnie Burrell |
| Advisor | Mr. Fowler Dugger |

This staff is committed to the guidelines set up for campus media as recorded in the Code of Responsibility calling for "Recognition on the part of authors, editors and commentators that freedom entails corollary responsibilities to be governed by the canons of responsible journalism, such as avoidance of libel, slander, impropriety, undocumented allegations, attacks on personal integrity, and the technique of harassment and innuendo." The opinions expressed by individual authors are not necessarily those of the College or the staff of the Lance. Letters to the editor and articles are welcome, subject to space limitations.

Subscription Rates \$3.00 per semester
Advertising Rates \$.90 per column inch

Challenge To Senate

The Senate has already begun to play power politics in its sandbox. In their overzealous desire to change the structures of student activities and in a wider framework, those of the college itself, members of the Inter-dormitory Senate have managed to overstep their bounds by dealing in personalities and in areas over which they have no legitimate jurisdiction supposedly. In particular, we are discussing their actions regarding the LANCE. We cannot sit by idle under attack; we must and will answer.

Currently, the Senate is considering the budget of the Student Association. Items in the budget include the College Christian Council, the Student Center Board, the Lamp and Shield, the Senate itself through dorm money, the Cairn, and the Cabinet, as well as the LANCE. No other organization here listed has yet been faced with an "investigation" such as that being conducted concerning the LANCE. We have all had to cut our budgets as far as possible. And yet the LANCE has been singled out for an "INVESTIGATION" into its internal workings and organization.

The Senate is legitimately, according to the Student Constitution, to consider "all questions of student welfare and general student interests..." to hear "recommendations from the Student Association Treasurer and" to approve "a budget for the Student Association." We do not believe that "questions of student welfare and general student interests" can or should be stretched to include examinations of and interference with the internal policies of the LANCE. The LANCE and its affairs, outside the budget, comes expressly under the jurisdiction of the Publications Board which is composed of the Editorial staffs of the LANCE and LAMP and SHIELD and under the express jurisdiction of the Student Life Committee which has student faculty and administration members and which is in part, to develop "policies and procedures necessary for a total program of student publications." May we point out that as of last spring, the Student Constitution was rewritten so as to exclude the editor of the LANCE from the Student Life Committee when before the editor was specifically a member of that committee.

Nowhere in the Constitution is it given to the Senate to examine policies and the internal working of any organization. In the case of the LANCE particularly they are acting in contradiction to the already stated powers allocated to other areas by the Constitutions. In the process they seem to be inferring that they, by virtue of some unknown power, can indicate to the LANCE staff when to publish and how to do it. The next step is student censorship.

We feel very strongly that, first, the poll being conducted by the "Committee to study the LANCE" may be used against us to determine by vote of the Senate, what the LANCE may or may not do. And that the poll is worded so to anticipate a negative response toward the LANCE.

Secondly, the LANCE is being judged in such a limited context that the results of the poll would not be valid. Most students will base their appraisal for lack of any other criterion - on the first issue we published this year with a new staff including ten freshmen, or their judgement will be swayed by the overall impression given by last year's paper which does not, in our opinion give a nearly adequate picture of the type of paper we want to be able to put out this year.

This editor is not going to back down under fire from the Senate. We reaffirm certain basic commitments of the majority of the staff: that we are going to put out a paper as long as possible under the given circumstances and budget allotted legally by the Senate; that we are not going to give in easily to attempts to end the publication of the LANCE or to control it; that we will adhere to the statements from the Code of Responsibility quoted above; and finally, that we will constantly strive to give students, faculty and administration the best possible paper that we, working together, can achieve.

Letter To The Editor

"Fantom" Attacks First LANCE Faced With Editor's Rebutal

To the Editor of the LANCE:
As a student relatively new to the St. Andrews campus I would like to comment on last week's edition of your newspaper. I must say it left me with a bad taste in my mouth as well as the smudges of ink on my hands.

Referring to the two-page picture spread entitled "Profiles In Courage" I object and say it takes no courage in lowering yourself to the crudeness of today's language. There were no laurels bestowed on you for your courage." The only response noticeable on campus was the giggles of students who acted as though they were in the fifth grade and reading a common four letter word written on the bathroom wall for the first time. Are you after respect or the giggles of a generation out to shock the world with their "openness?" Well, Madam Editor, what you got were giggles. Did you prove your point? Is the Lance fully liberated now?

If you were a self-supporting publication of independent standing with the student body and sold subscriptions to whom-ever would buy them, then you could print the type of paper that you want. But you are supported by the student body which makes you responsible to them. You are supposedly the voice of the student body. I say you are speaking for only a small faction of this campus in your first edition. You have neglected your duty to the rest of the school. We as students should not tolerate a paper which kowtows to a minute segment. As a great philosopher once said, "You may not be able to please all of the people at one time, but you sure can alienate them all at one time."

Please, from now on, consider the rest of the students who are forced to accept your paper and plan a paper that is

open and acceptable to all. There is an old story which goes, "Once a boy makes a girl pregnant, there is nothing he can do, except be more careful in the future." Well, the first edition is out, but there are more to come. Serve the student body as you are supposed to and we will be grateful.

I'll see you in print and I shall be reading the next issue with great interest.

Thanx,
THE FANTUM

P. S. Also take note: Relevance is no longer relevant, it's sickening.

Dear Fantum:

The center spread in the September 10 issue of the LANCE was an attempt to express freshman and transfer students' reactions to their first week at St. Andrews. The quotations which appeared on pages four and five were printed exactly as they had been stated to LANCE reporters in a sampling of all new students entering and leaving the College Union Building on September 8 and 9. Due to time and staff limitations, the LANCE could not reach all new students.

The LANCE attempts to act, within the space allotted to it, as a clearing house of diversified student opinion. The LANCE censors no printed material which adheres to the standards of good journalism; neither does it edit material in an attempt to conform copy to the personal viewpoints of its editors.

The LANCE encourages articles, criticisms and letters to the Editor, when written with responsibility and integrity. Responsibility and integrity are not reflected in an unsigned letter containing unqualified con-

jecture. Your implication that your views are representative of a majority of students does not include evidence of such standing.

Do not try to destroy us with idle criticism. Rather, make your presence felt through specific and constructive appraisals through which we can develop a newspaper that will bring us all together.

Recruitment: Compromise Or Conflict?

By Eric Gregory

Many colleges this year face the increasingly controversial problem of dealing with military recruiting on the campus proper.

There are several radical groups who would have this procedure banned through voice of threat or violence, but is this the correct or even the most expedient way to approach the problem? I think not. In fact, I believe that if this course of action was even attempted it would do more harm than good. You must realize that in dealing with this problem there are a few basic questions one should ask. One is that if this procedure is banned, is it conflicting with the rights of certain individuals on the campus? Without a reasonable doubt I would say that it is, because there are some individuals who would like to be able to talk with these recruiters, especially those who will be facing the draft in the near future. Another important question that must be asked is whether or not interested students have a right to be exposed to the information that can be provided. I state emphatically that they do, and that to deny them this right is a breach of individual freedom on the part of radical groups and their supporters. The radical groups contend that military recruiting on campus is a violation of their rights, but examine the facts. If the radicals do not gain their own way they seek to deny the rights of the individual. A concept that they preach is taboo. By denying those individual rights to people who wish to hear what these recruiters have to say, these radical groups open the path to conflicts. Lastly, what can we do?

The best approach to the problem as it stands is the concept of compromise. Military recruiters should be allowed on campus, but not in public places such as the College Union. It would be in the interest of all if these recruiters held their sessions at a specified time, in a specified and previously secured area such as a classroom, so those who wanted to see these people could, without disturbance. Fairly simple and workable.

It is my belief that military recruiters have a right to come on the campus and present their information. I also believe that an individual student has a right to see these people, if he so desires. I do not, however, believe that anyone has the right to deny another's individual rights by threat of violence or bodily confrontation.

(Continued to Page 3)

On Revolutions

Edited by Charlie Pratt

Luis Cabrera on "The Philosophy of the Mexican Revolution":

"When a system of work is right, but we fail to obtain results for lack of efficiency, the task of the reformer consists in improving the system. But when a system is radically wrong, we must abandon that system and find a better one. The gradual and slow reform of a system to make it suit the requirements of a man, of a business enterprise, of an institution or of a country, is called evolution. The abandonment of a system to be replaced by another, is called a revolution. The use of force is not essential to a revolution; but the revolution in the personal conduct of man, in business or in communities, implies always a considerable effort and a great amount of sacrifice."

Kate Millett of Women's Liberation:

"We demand equal pay for equal work, free abortions on demand, round-the-clock, state-supported child care centers. We call for a cultural revolution, which must necessarily involve political and economic reorganization but must go far beyond as well."

Karl Marx and George W. F. Hegel, The Communist Manifesto:

"That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which alone can be examined, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole of history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling

(Continued to Page 3)

Contributors to this issue:

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Kathy Kearney | Marshall Gravely |
| Jim Pope | Maury Edwards |
| Judy Warple | Jill Robinson |
| Paddock Smith | Chris Gilbertson |
| Photographers: | |
| Larry Street, Mike McQuown | |

| |
|--------------|
| Eric Gregory |
| The Fantum |
| Jerry Briggs |
| Jean Carr |