

# The Lance



Lin Thompson ..... Editor  
Michael Greene ..... Managing Editor  
Knight Chamberlain ..... Asst. Editor/Sports  
Sheikh Jagne ..... Asst. Editor/Business  
Mark Powell ..... Advertising Manager  
Billy Howard ..... Photo Coordinator  
Ed Neely ..... Events Coordinator  
Mickey Richey ..... External Circulation  
Dr. W. J. Loftus ..... Advisor

## A Warning

The new draft of the Student Association budget submitted to the Senate this week is a disgusting attempt to play politics with student literary endeavors at St. Andrews. Under the guise of having reservations about the extent to which the student association should underwrite the costs of these publications, the proponents of the new budget have excised them altogether, sacrificing two fine outlets for students creativity to one of Madison Avenue's most cherished maxims: It's Not Creative Unless It Sells.

Certainly any member of the Senate should have the right to enquire into the possibility of reducing these publications' dependence on Student Association funds. And certainly if ways can be devised to reduce the size of the appropriation they need, such means should be implemented. But to cut them off altogether is to say to the world that we are willing to devote over one third of our budget each year to entertainment forms of the most transient nature - chiefly music and beer - but that we cannot afford two thousand dollars for the publishing the works of our writers and artists.

In the course of questioning the validity of these expenses last week, the question arising most often was, "Why should we - the Student Association - pay for these things?"

To which should come the question, "Why should we not?" Take a look at the facts.

The Cairn is the only exclusively student oriented literary publication at St. Andrews.

It exists for the purpose of publishing the works of student writers and artists, and as such it is entirely logical that Student Association funds support it. The fact that it is offered for sale should not lead to the automatic assumption that it can pay for itself. Such publications, because of their nature and the reading preferences of the population at large, start off appealing to a limited potential sales market. The number of Senators who, when asked last week, had not bought copies of the current Cairn and/or who knew little or nothing about it while questioning its funding (in spite of considerable coverage in THE LANCE throughout last year) bear witness to the fact that even this small market cannot usually be expected to queue up for copies. (An example from the real works: when William Faulkner was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature, none of his books were even in print. Is merit always discernable by sales?)

The same marketing principles apply to the Chapbooks - First, though, some background.

Chapbooks are small, roughly paperback-sized booklets whose name is a corruption of "cheap books". Their origins are English, where they were hawked by street vendors. Their contents usually were made up of reprints of more expensively bound volumes, poetry, and frequently, such things as hastily concocted memorial volumes giving "A True Account of The Life and Character" of recently deceased notables.

Alan Bunn was an immensely creative person whose time at St. Andrews was cut short by a fatal auto accident. The Alan Bunn Chapbook series was begun as a memorial to his mark at St. Andrews; two are published each year, one in poetry and one in prose. Two student authors are chosen each year - one in each category - to have a representative sample of their works published in a chapbook, of which a limited edition is produced.

With these publications we honor those among us who are talented authors and illustrators. To cut them off is to tell them their work has no value. To expect them to pay their own way is to tell them their work must have a given monetary value, and thereby to subject them to the indignities of catering to the public's fickle tastes in order to survive. The third option we have heard - to ask the College to fund them on the premise that they are good ambassadors for the College - is to reduce them to the status of a propaganda mill. These publications are ours. They print the work of our fellow students. We should be willing to support them.

To the issue at hand there can be no half measures, no equivocation. The Cairn and the chapbooks should be restored the full funding they were granted by the Senate September 8. Let no one mistake these words as mere utterances, a commentary on events. They are a statement of resolve. Let all parties take note that THE LANCE will muster every energy it can in the support of The Cairn and the chapbooks, and will carry the battle for restoration of their funds as long and as far as is necessary in their behalf. To cut them out of the budget in order to bolster a bloated slush fund for the Senate so they may force campus organizations to come begging like Oliver Twist for additional funds is a flagrant example of empire building that cannot be tolerated.

## Mackenzie Answers Critics

To The Editor:

I feel a certain obligation to the students of St. Andrews, and especially those who wrote to THE LANCE, to give my response. After several sleepless nights of worrying I seem to have reached a position from which to speak. Let me first address myself to those comments on the editorial page one at a time.

First, I am in total agreement with the fact that the Senate should appoint a parliamentarian. After the Senate meeting last Tuesday night, I discussed the matter with Mecklenburg Vice-President Steve Newton. We agreed that a parliamentarian is both necessary and essential in the running of any meeting. The parliamentarian is responsible for serving as a parliamentary advisor to the president of the Senate. I agreed that a parliamentarian "would not usurp" my rights and that he/she would be invaluable in advising me on "parliamentary questions in which I am uncertain about how to rule." The Senate will address itself to this question at the next meeting.

Second, let me say that it was never my intention to participate in the discussion of any budget item; I have that responsibility in the Cabinet. To my knowledge the only participating I did was during the Chapbook allocation and during the BSU. Let me explain further. The Chapbook allocation came to a tie which I, as President, was committed to break. I felt it my duty to explain to the Senate why I voted as I did. During the BSU debate I asked Jacob Hogue how many members were in the BSU and how much each paid in dues. Also, I did ask several questions about the discos.

Now let me move into another point. Sheila McAllister objected to the procedure of the meeting and claims that the decisions are invalid because of the manner in which they were handled. I have two responses to this. First, if she was so concerned about the two groups why didn't she decide to attend the meeting? Iona Whitaker's point is well taken. I never told several of the other people at the meeting to come but they were there. In the two day period before the meeting I had numerous people come to me and ask what was going to happen at

the meeting and I told them and encouraged them to come. I was very impressed with the concern of the BSU. There were a good number of the active members of the organization there throughout the meeting. Even though the Senate had voted to limit the participation of the visitors all members of the BSU stayed for the duration. Second, despite the fact that there was a great deal of confusion, I feel that the BSU did receive ample time to voice their opinion. The debate could be re-opened but I doubt that anything new would be added.

In a book I have been reading lately it states: "although the majority rules, it cannot be granted unlimited power. Every individual has certain personal rights, regardless of whether he happens to be in the majority or the minority. The group should welcome the free presentation of all the facts and viewpoints on any problem in open discussion, but that discussion cannot consume the entire meeting." Here Lin Thompson's point about the setting up of a time limit is well taken and will also be considered by the Senate. Another question I have is: where does Sheila intend to get the funds? Another realization I made after the meeting was that after the BSU and Farrago had been discussed there was little money left. Since none of the allocations were changed from Cabinet to Senate, Sheila should realize that this problem had been dealt with thoroughly. The cabinet spent six and a half hours working over the budget and presented to the Senate a good budget. As I stated at the meeting it was necessary for us to prioritize the groups of people wanting money. We had a constitutional obligation to handle the groups the way that we did.

None of what was said in THE LANCE was totally false, and much of it was true. The criticism was taken as constructive criticism, not negative. The only point that I would like to clear up is that there appeared a gross error on the front page. THE LANCE made no attempt whatsoever to try and reach me. This seems somewhat strange since I was either in or around the dorm the entire afternoon and all night on Wednesday. I don't object to prin-

ting the news but I do object to misrepresentation in the implication that I "could not be reached for comment. It is at this point that I would like to say that at anytime day or night if anyone has any questions about the Senate I will drop whatever I am doing and address myself to their questions.

Finally, let me say that I feel the Senate is a concerned group of people and that we are making every effort to be as strong and as effective as possible. Every Senator has the desire and interest to do the best job they can in representing their various groups of people. This does not imply that those people that did not get elected didn't have desire but to state that those now in office possess that trait. Desire pre-empt experience. Experience will come, but how can one be experienced at something they have never done before? Also, I would appreciate it if those criticisms of last Tuesday's meeting be directed toward me, not the Senate. I made the errors, not them. I want a powerful and active Senate but we need the support from the students. The thing that frightens me most is being inactive, and that we certainly are not. Let's not undermine the Senate but work behind it. The Senate will never cease to stop trying and will never give up. We were elected to do a job and we will stop short of nothing to see it done right.

Donald Mackenzie

(The Author is President of the Senate.)

## PIRG Adds Voter Info

I would like to add some information to the letter George Fouke wrote last week which concerned voter registration in Scotland County. Students wishing to vote in Scotland County will probably not be required to present evidence of residency. Although North Carolina state voter registration guidelines have for the past several years recommended that students be asked special (and thus discriminatory) questions, students have been able to register without hassle in Scotland County thanks to a group of St. Andrews students who brought a case against to the Scotland County Board of Elections and won.

Recognizing that the voter registration guidelines discriminated against students, NC PIRG filed a complaint with the State Board of Elections and has recently succeeded in having the guidelines revised. Under the new guidelines students having the who wish to vote in Scotland County should not have any trouble registering. However, if anyone tries to register and is refused or hassled please contact me or anyone else on the PIRG board.

Sharon L. McGee  
PIRG, Box 444

## Apologies

The editor wishes to make two apologies.

The author of the Wilmington women piece last week assures me that 'desirable' was not intended to be interpreted in a derogatory sense or to reduce anyone to the status of any sort of object. That a negative connotation could have been placed upon the term should have occurred to both the writer at the point of composition, and to me as the final determinant of what goes in THE LANCE. In the press of business I just skimmed it and sent it on; thus I accept responsibility for it and apologize to all parties for it. Certainly such an attitude is not that of THE LANCE or its management. Such incidents will not occur again.

Donald Mackenzie, in his letter, points out that our statement that he could not be reached for comments on Sheila McAllister's plans to challenge several Senate rulings last week could be construed as an unwillingness to speak. Such is not the case. I attempted to find Donald twice on Wednesday afternoon last, and was unable to do so. Hence the line in the article. For the unintended slap at Donald I apologize.