

Editorial: Party Guidelines

Last week I printed a controversial editorial contesting the party guidelines. A lot of people had a lot to say about my stand and dramatic flair. That's good; it's healthy. A lot of people will have to remember, though, that the editorial column is supposed to be opinionated.

The situation on party guidelines has loosened, and things are looking better for the students. At the last Senate meeting, held shortly after the LANCE was distributed, Dean Claytor listened to the objections of the Senate. He agreed with some objections. Also, he told how the Student Life Office has been viewing this issue from their side of the fence. Plans are in the process to allow Resident Directors and Resident Assistants to authorize parties without students going through Student Life. Also, the distinction between an all-suite, all-dorm and a campus-wide party is being reviewed.

My compliments go to Dean Claytor for dealing with this issue of party guidelines in a fast no-nonsense way, and with a decision that is more than acceptable both to the Administration and the students.

Last week's edition contained a fabulous article by John (Fewell) Patton on the College's plans for land development. This article took a lot of time and effort, and served the student interest. Students should have no reason to now cry out about another Belk Tower Suprise.

We've got some more articles planned for the future that we think you'll like. The staff is trying to research articles that you are interested in, and we think you'll be pleased with the new direction of the paper. If you aren't, let us know.

Our staff membership is slowly expanding, with good solid reporters. This means that the style and behind the scenes hectic pace of the paper should improve for the better. Anyone wanting to write an article, or serial, or wanting to join the staff, drop me a line in box 257.

Meanwhile, each issue comes out on time. I hope you enjoy this edition, and look forward to the next.

Security Stops Student

To the editor:

I arrived on campus last Tuesday morning 2-27-79 around 4:30 am. After I parked and locked my car, I walked towards my room in Granville when school security stopped me by the dumpster in the parking lot. The officer called me by name, even though I had never met him before, and said he had received a tip that I was bringing in a large quantity of marijuana to distribute on campus. Apparently, according to this officer, a student had given him the tip. The officer believed me when I told him that I had none and did not search my car when I said that he could. He went on to tell me that the administration had a list of students whom they felt or had heard might be bringing quantities of marijuana on campus. And, that he was instructed to check on these persons when they entered the campus.

I have never dealt any type of illegal substance in my life, and I find it difficult to tolerate being accused of doing so, especially by the very people whom I pay to educate me. I cannot concentrate on receiving the type of education I so importantly desire when such falsely applied pressure is put upon me. This event is likely to break down the trust that I have strived to achieve with many individuals of the administration and faculty and the administration as a whole.

This breakdown in trust is detrimental to my education. I will not tolerate it.

Apparently, from my having talked with other students, this type of event has been occurring with increasing frequency as of late. I can not find any justification in it, and I am surprised that the students have allowed this kind of activity to continue. The administration is slandering individuals, the students as a population, and the school itself. No good can come of such activity.

My personal feelings consist of bitter resentment towards the administration. I demand publicly in this letter that if my name is on "Their list," that it be removed or I will look into the possibility of legal action. This is a very serious threat on my part. I further publicly demand that this list be abolished as it is an arbitrary list with no factual basis. I will personally work towards such a goal, and I hope that the students will support me. Only cooperation and trust between faculty, administration, and students can insure the proper environment needed for a good education. I have been paying a lot of money to belong to such an environment after having paid all that money, then I would have no choice but to withdraw from this school and find a better one.

Most sincerely,
Ira M. (Skipper) Hardy III

Letter To The Editor

To the editor:

The editorial in the 22-Feb-79 issue of The Lance is an excellent example of editorial irresponsibility. The editor has overstepped his power of editorialization.

First, the Administration is interested in regulating the consumption of beer on campus, so far as it applies to state and federal statutes. It is also necessary for the Administration to provide some means for recovering damages which occur at parties. It certainly makes more sense to bill those responsible for the damages instead of charging the entire campus or residence hall.

Second, the students on the Student Life Committee did not allow the Party Guidelines to slip through the Student Life Committee. Each and every member of the committee received a draft copy of the guidelines before Christmas, and was asked to review the guidelines and make recommendations concerning any changes necessary.

The guidelines were approved by the committee at the February meeting at which the students present were: Bikulege, Allen, and myself. Durham, Pretz, and Seifert were absent.

Third, the editor had the nerve to insult student representatives on all faculty committees when he said, "Like get in touch with the student body to tell them what's happening behind closed doors and to get out 'creative input.'" I personally spoke with over two dozen students concerning the guidelines before I returned the draft with my comments. While this was not a large section of the student body, it was a sample of those concerned.

I will avoid making a comment on the "creative input" clause since it makes little sense.

Fourth, if the editor had bothered to do any research at all before writing his editorial he would have observed that the current party guidelines which were approved by the Student Life Committee in September of 1977 in order that the guidelines might be clearer.

Fifth, the paragraph dealing with the purposes of the guidelines (paragraph 4) must either be a new piece of fiction by the author or it is a rumor which the editor failed to check. The ideas mentioned in that paragraph were not mentioned at any of the Student Life Committee meetings. I personally think that the administration has more important concerns than the quantity of alcoholic beverages consumed weekly.

Sixth, if apathy among the student body is not an invitation to more college regulations, I don't know what is. If we can't act like

responsible adults and police our own affairs then someone will have to do it for us.

Finally, the editor has committed an unpardonable sin. He has taken the liberty to encourage students to disobey the guidelines. The editor should realize that with the editorial freedom which he has also goes a large amount of editorial responsibility. In encouraging students to disobey the rules, the editor has defied the St. Andrews code of Responsibility. It states (on page 59 of The Saltire) that:

"The college newspaper,...., are recognized as valuable aids in establishing and maintaining an atmosphere of free and RESPONSIBLE discussion... The quality of such output is expected to reflect the kind of intellectual production normally associated with an academic community: intellectual integrity, judicious perception of the pros and cons of any position, rational argument and careful scholarship."

The editor certainly has the power to support any position on any topic which he desires, but he must realize that he does not have the prerogative to advocate breaking the rules.

Sincerely,
Michael Greene

Editor's comments:

As far as the consumption of beer within state and federal statutes is concerned the Administration doesn't need to regulate anything. By filing a form with Student Life, it would still be impossible to tell whether a person under 18 consumed beer at a party. Those students under 18 should

abide by their conscience on whether or not to consume beer. College is a place to grow and mature, and the question of beer is part of this process.

Some means already exist for recovering damages that occur at parties. Those responsible for the damage either own up like they should, or the necessary amount is taken from the dorm funds. These dorm funds were set up for this exact purpose; let them function as they were intended to do. More regulation is not necessary.

Regarding the draft copy that each member of the SLC received before Christmas, it was my understanding that the draft copy and the one that just came showed no revisions.

I do not feel that I insulted all student members of faculty committees. I have been on a faculty committee before, and most certainly have been active in other areas. I have been, and still am, a part of the problem with ineffective communication between committees and students. I think I have earned the right to criticize on these points; however, I believe every student has this right.

To say that student "creative input" makes little sense seems irrational to me. To clarify things, I was talking of students' ideas, suggestions, and opinions.

I was aware that these guidelines were revision to the 1977 guidelines.

I reviewed that "new piece of fiction" and "rumor" from Kathy Benzaquin at the February 14 meeting of the Student Senate. I agree, most strongly, that "the Administration has more important concerns than the quantity of alcoholic beverages consumed weekly." That's the whole point.

The Lance

- Steven J. Kunkle Editor
- Robert Thuss Managing Editor
- Rick Thomas Business Manager
- Chris Strong Men's Sports Editor
- Marion Bowden Layout Editor
- Staff:
- David Winslow
- Ann Caimi
- John Fewell
- Joey Sherr
- Jon Johnson
- Vivian Bikulege
- Chris Hestey
- Rick Grossi
- Pat McNealey
- Julia Kennedy
- Teresa Staley

W. W. Rolland, Advisor
Printed by The Laurinburg Exchange
Letters Welcome. Box 757, Campus Mail
Anonymous letters will not be printed.

The opinions expressed in THE LANCE are not necessarily those of St. Andrews Presbyterian College.