

Editorial

# Campus Crime Spree?

Marijuana is the subject of discussion which is currently the center of campus controversy. The crux of the entire discussion seems to have been whether to welcome marijuana use on this campus, or at least permit it. I know it is presently against the law. If I am caught using or selling marijuana by the police I will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I know this.

Oral sex and masturbation are against the law. Driving faster than 55 MPH or drinking hard alcohol before the age of 21, and beer before 18, is also against the law. People defy these laws all the time. The law is not an immovable concrete object; if enough people show their defiance, then a law will be changed.

To obey an unfair law just because it is a law is unthinking. This is equal to obeying a rule just because it is a rule. This leads to, on a larger scale than St. Andrews, such abominations as Nazi Germany and Viet Nam. I agree that most laws should be obeyed; there is usually a very good reason for the, and to disobey them all would result in a chaos no sane person wants to see.

However, if you honestly feel, deep inside your self, that a law is oppressive, damaging, unnecessary, etc., then I say break, in order to change, the law. You must, on the other hand, be prepared to suffer the consequences if you are caught. This reasoning is what I, and the proponents of marijuana, believe in. Those of us who are fighting for the legalization of marijuana are doing our lobbying in a quiet acceptable manner. We're not fire bombing the Belk Center, painting the Bell Tower, holding Bun for ransom. We're writing Dialogues, painting he wall, and talking to people on a one-to-one basis. Everywhere people are crying for open communication; we're doing everything that's peaceful, acceptable, and thought provoking. But we're having

a hard time getting intelligent responses to our ideas.

Some of the letters to the editor on this page are some examples of the "constructive communication" that has opened up among the students. Read them carefully; I think you'll be depressed. As always, we print letters as we receive them, spelling and grammatical errors intact. To date, these letters are the only responses the LANCE has received that are against marijuana. How can a line of communication be opened when one side does not have enough conviction to sign their names to hate letters sent through campus mail? (This is not a slur against the recent Dialogues. I want to make it very clear that I applaud Dialogues and distain unsigned hate letters.)

I do not want to believe that these anonymous letters are a fair representation of the anti-marijuana view. I do not want to lose respect for my opponent; it is only his view that I fight. But how can we have a mature dialogue?

I firmly believe that marijuana will be legalized within the next decade. I also believe the U.S. Government will immediately move in and tax, regulate, and control marijuana. While I personally would applaud such actions, I do not feel that the mere discussion of it should be the cause of any long-term dissention and ill-feeling on the student side of campus. We students are in this together, like it or not; we and others in our age group, are members of a generation. Our ideas, our values, will direct the nation for some years before our children continue the process. Things will change; that is inevitable. Meanwhile, as we of this generation begin to hold the reins, we must begin to act in a decisively mature and responsible manner.

# Never In My Life

To The Editor:

Never in my life have I wanted to throw up. Other students have tried to convey the utter downfall of our small community. I shall try also.

My first two years at SA were extremely enjoyable. I was part of a community based on trust and security, and the realm of a Liberal Education. This year has been plagued with constant barraging, harassment, and now destruction of our community and Liberal Education.

First came the dismissal of Jeff and David who received memos stating "Leave or be investigated." Big choice, right? I can see the administration's point, but the

administration has overlooked the fact that both were members of our community. I believe that this fact deserves merit.

Next came the party guidelines, the administration's attempt to limit the consumption of beer. The fact that parties should be registered scares the h— out of me. Simply what reasons are there for guidelines except to ascertain structure and enforce limitations? For what other possible means should guidelines be established?

Recently there has been total disorientation among the people who exist as this community. Regarding the rash of thefts, destruction and property: doesn't untrust and non-secure feelings brood this mild type of Rebellion? These

From

# A Friend Of Our Benevolent Administration

(Editor's Note: David Winslow, a staff reporter, received this note referring to his recent coverage of the CCC debates. It is reprinted below without alterations, at David's request so that he may publicly offer a rebuttal.)

David,

Concerning your recent article in that so-called propaganda spreading, journalistic fiasco, "The Lance" - I feel that you have far overstepped your bounds as an objective reporter. It is my opinion that if your literary skills are so lacking it would be in the better interests of the SA campus for you to tender a resignation immediately.

First of all, when choosing a topic to write on you should stick with that subject. It is evident from the disjointed way you write that you must be one of those spaced-out junkies. You ramble and meander all through your article with no apparent purpose at all. Your grammar and spelling is atrocious, is an abomination to me as a reader.

Secondly I cannot see how

you feel qualified to report on a debate in which you were a panelist. Is this an attempt of your controversial editor to slant the news into your biased opinions?!

I fail to see why you mentioned racism and sexism in an article on the CCC debates. I was there and know that these were not brought up. You should have mentioned the drug problem on campus. I feel this is a big concern for all of us here since those burnt-out radicals threaten my lifestyle. If you can't be satisfied with the American way of life, laws, religion then you ought to consider leaving SA.

Stop floating in the ozone layer and come down to our level, or you should seriously transfer: may I suggest Egypt?

A friend of our benevolent administration

David Winslow's reply:

Since the article was not completely objective, we should have labeled it as a "guest editorial;" because

this allows for opinions to be expressed.

That's part of what we're trying to do; that's why your anonymous letter is being printed. It expresses a particular opinion to accompany them with your name. It says in the Bible to confront someone with a problem, but you obviously aren't well versed in Scripture. This is detrimental to our community.

Furthermore, all people connected with journalism should know that double-column articles are opinionated while single column articles are objective.

I would be more than willing to compromise and leave the ozone via parachute if you will only get a tall ladder and out of your gutter. Meet me halfway please.

Finally, as a heterosexual, I must question your symbolism in referring to you don't mean our honored President? . . . Staying on the Staff, David

# Try As We May

St. Andrews News Bureau

For three months students at St. Andrews had worked and planned on the appearance March 8 of Senator Mark Hatfield, R-Oregon, to speak on "Piety, Politics, and Higher Education."

The College Christian Council had a dinner set, transportation, promotion, etc., and on the morning of the event, a call from the senator's Washington office reported him sick in bed and unable to keep his date.

"We sure are disappointed," said George Anderson, Chairman of the Prophetic Political Committee of the CCC, as he tacked up another poster announcing the cancellation.

According to the Rev. Frank Covington, college pastor, an attempt will be made to reschedule the event for next fall. It was thought earlier Hatfield would be able to appear in April, but that was abandoned.

## The Lance

Steven J. Kunkle ..... Acting Editor  
 Robert Thuss ..... Managing Editor  
 Rick Thomas ..... Business Manager  
 Chris Strong ..... Sports Editor  
 Marion Bowden ..... Layout Editor

Staff:

John Fewell  
 Joey Sherr  
 David Winslow  
 Julia Kennedy  
 Chris Hesley  
 Jon Johnson

Vivian Bikulege  
 Rick Grassi

Ann Caimi  
 Teresa Staley  
 Scott Robertson

W. W. Rolland, Advisor  
 Printed By The Laurinburg Exchange  
 Letters welcome. Box 757, Campus Mail

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

problems have not been evident since my education began, not to the degree it is now.

Why does the administration need such control over our community? Communism is supposedly to everyone's interest, but it sure as hell isn't satisfying mine. I feel there should be a cohesive atmosphere between the administration and the students, not a brick wall.

I hope that we as a community can pull together and salvage that special atmosphere that existed here in the past. I blame our apathetic attitude and the power hungry administration for our ordeal. What has happened to our community? Party limits, marijuana busts, what's next? Rick Pumphrey