

# THE LANCE

## Staff

Editor .....	Jeff Neill
Associate Editor .....	Marshall Gravely
Associate Editor .....	Elaine Thomas
Assistant Editor .....	Ligon Perrow
Business Manager .....	Gordon Dixon
Circulation Manager .....	Cathy Lamont
Advisor .....	Mr. Fowler Dugger

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.

## Publications Should Remain Independent

BY MARSHALL GRAVELY

"... The publications should be under Senate Control. The publications board should be done away with, because the members of it are so closely involved that they aren't true representatives of the student body. The budget should also be under control because the publications are self-perpetuating organizations and need no money..."

This quote states the position of Rod Brown, Student Association Treasurer, about another facet of this week's budget controversy. The proposal was to come before the Student Life Committee this week, which has the final authority in such budget and procedural matters, and all this before the new budget was made public or even reviewed and approved by the Senate.

The whole question of student government control of publications runs directly against the opinion expressed by the Joint Statement On Rights and Freedoms of Students of the National Student Association, as follows:

"... Whenever possible the student newspaper should be an independent corporation financially and legally separate from the university. Where financial and legal autonomy is not possible, the institution, as the publisher of student publications, may have to bear the legal responsibility for the contents of the publications." (Saltire, page 46.)

The NSA proposal expresses the current status of the organization known as the Publications Board. If the Senate gains control over the allocation and distribution of funds for the publications, as Brown advocates, then they have control of the editorial and news policies of the publications, especially the newspaper.

All this does not exactly mean that we of the Publications Board see grave threats to freedom of the press. After all, what big issues does the newspaper grapple with? None, at this time. Still, there are reasons why the two should be separate.

An analysis of Brown's opinion will show two very fundamental reasons why. First, the members are closely involved with the publications simply because there are no other students who are involved in and/or interested enough to be members of the board. The total staffs of the newspaper and the annual must struggle to exceed fifteen students.

Secondly, the publications are not self-perpetuating. There is no way for the paper to be financially independent because of its appeal to students and because of the current situation that exists between the campus and the town.

A third reason for separation would be that the Senate has enough problems of its own. If anything around here should be taken over, they shouldn't be in charge of the operation. It often seems that they themselves should be dissolved or taken over.

Finally, the very definition of publications require the independence of the newspaper and yearbook. If the respective editors are threatened with financial insecurity and interference by uninformed, unqualified outsiders, they are not editors, they are puppets.

Separation of powers is a basic quality of all quasi-democratic institutions, and we, all opinions to the contrary, are no different. The publications have their problems, but so does the Senate. In this case, each group has only to be concerned about their own.

## Leaders Need To Realize A Definite Commitment

St. Andrews expects a certain degree of social and academic responsibility to be demonstrated by its students.

There is an area of voluntary responsibility though that each student should cope with for it is not written out for us. That is the area of responsibility each student has toward SA. It seems to us in this area the degree of responsibility is in direct proportion to what each student perceives to be his or her relationship and commitment to SA.

The necessity of student gov-

ernment leaders to define what their commitment and relationship is to the college is more pressing than for the average student for it is these students who make decisions that affect the overall welfare and future of the college as well as reflect the responsibility the student body is capable of. St. Andrews has experienced financial difficulties for the past several years. While most small private colleges have gone further into the red, SA has made steady gains toward

(Continued to Page 3)



## Yearbook Editor Answers Critics, Explains Plans

BY KAREN KENNEDY

There seems to be a raging controversy over the annual -- both last year's and this year's. I feel that this controversy is raging in spite of the facts rather than because of them, for the sole reason that the facts have not been made public yet. A poll was circulated earlier this week, as a joint effort of the Senate and the "Lamp & Shield". However, my wishes as editor of the "Lamp & Shield" were ignored. A poll was drawn up on Sunday night which was satisfactory both to Miles Weaver, president of the Senate, and myself. Between Sunday night and the time the poll was given out the wording was changed, a fact of which I was not informed. I also asked Miles Weaver to delay giving out the form until after this issue of "The Lance" so that the students could make their choices on the basis of all the facts involved. Miles told me that he felt it was a waste of time; that a "Dialogue" could be put out on Tuesday. The question here arises: If we are not to use our school newspaper to cover school controversies why do we have one? As editor of the Annual, responsible for its

## Olympic Tragedy Unmentioned Here

BY MARSHALL GRAVELY

Much has already been written about the recent events at the Munich Olympics where terrorist action and police reaction led to the deaths of 11 Israelis and 5 Palestinian terrorists. The entire world was shocked and sickened at the tragedy--except for St. Andrews. As usual, some students were concerned while the great majority were numb to whatever was happening.

This is not the place or time to begin attacking apathy, especially not by using this tragedy as a pretext for conclusions. Still, it does seem that if 17 students had been killed by troops in a campus riot, everyone would know what was going on.

Why, then, did most people fail to notice the events in Munich? It seems they are not interested in a bunch of jocks involved in nationalistic contests while covered by the mantle of sham amateurism. Not even when these sports events are used as an international forum for all types of political and military concerns.

Nothing anybody can write will bring back the dead or help ease the sorrow for their families. No amount of concern or information can lessen the problems that drove the Palestinians to violence such as this.

At SA we go them all one better. No good can be done, but it won't matter, since very few know what's happening anyway. It seems rather a sad comment on all us involved students,

publication I did not feel that waiting two or three days to allow all people interested a chance to express their views in "The Lance" would unalterably delay the progress of the annual. Therefore, I do not feel that the poll would be truly representative of the student's wishes and I withdraw the sponsorship and/or support of the "Lamp & Shield" from it. We will be putting out a poll of our own in the very near future.

In order that the students may make an intelligent response to any further poll I would like to see involved in this issue. There is a change planned in the 1973 "Lamp & Shield" format as most everyone knows by now. The change was made in order that we could make a cut of \$3,000 in our budget which could then be rechanneled into other student activities. We decided for a paperback cover because of the cut in cost, and I wish to clarify that a paperback annual is not like a paperback book. Companies who publish annuals know the function of an annual and are not going to publish anything that will immediately fall apart. The paperback we speak of is a thick, sturdy bristol board. As annuals are not in constant use I see no reason why this should not last for twenty years or more. The cut in paper was made, not only for the cost decreases, but because we felt we could cover the year adequately in the smaller amount of pages. The reason we went to this format was not to de-emphasize the importance of the annual but to cut our budget in order that the money could be spent on the other projects of the Student Association. If we are really concerned about organizations on this campus, would it not make more sense to let them have more money to be effective in their activities rather than take this money away from them in order that they could be pictured in a hardback yearbook? If we revert to a hardback at the present time, we will have to get the \$3000 back from a variety of clubs, thus cutting some vital functions they have planned for this money. I think at this point, it comes down to a question of whether we are in an organization for the good we can do and the good times we can enjoy now or whether we belong to an organization to get our picture in the yearbook, so we can have an ego-trip looking back 20 years from now. Some of these clubs will be cut to a zero budget if this money is reallocated to the annual.

Another question being raised is the fact that some people did not like last year's annual and feel they should have been asked what they would like in it. These people seem to have forgotten that a poll was given to determine the wishes of other students before that yearbook was planned. Of the more than

800 given out I received approximately 40 back. Therefore a great deal of guesswork as to what would please ensued, as we could not feel that 40 was representative of the school. I thought that I detected a change in the attitudes of students of St. Andrews and tried to alter the yearbook to suit that change. Our central theme, carried out in the introduction and on the division pages, was an attempt to let the students speak of SA as they saw it, whether positive or negative; an attempt at an honest assessment of SA by the people who make up the school, rather than having one person impose a onesided view over many people's experiences and thoughts during that year.

In response to Monday's dialogue's contention that the annual was a "... complicated collage of unrelated photos... carelessly selected without any objective in mind," I can only say that the pictures were carefully selected with definite objectives, an attempt to capture the everyday spirit of SA rather than an artificially staged and photographed moment of people standing together. It is up to you to decide which is a more "meaningful memory" to you. As to the contention that it was "easy on the annual staff," I can only say that putting out a yearbook with only a very minimal skeleton staff as has been done for at least the past three years is never easy on the staff. Perhaps one who has never worked on planning, photographing, and laying out a yearbook, as well as supervising mailing and picture taking, does not understand the difficulties and hard work involved.

Those students who do not feel that the yearbook represented what they wanted and are worried about the contents of this year's book should also keep in mind the fact that all positions on the staff were open last spring and we did not have even one application. At the present time we would be glad to have any one interested on the staff of the yearbook. There will be an organizational meeting soon.

## Johnson: We Can Find Compromise

Editor-

Everyone is shouting their opinions about the latest yearbook and the proposals for the new one. The time has come to talk about what we want, why, and how much it will cost us.

As I understand it the annual staff has sought to cut its own budget roughly \$12,000 to about \$9,000. The \$12,000 figure is about one third of all the money budgeted to student activities. (Student Center Board, Dorm Budgets, Clubs & Organizations, and etc.) A cut in the yearbook budget would release more funds for such uses.

But what kind of yearbook do you want? Until this present emotional controversy there

(Continued to Page 4)