

# Knight views

opinions — editorials

## New Alcohol Policy Brews Controversy

This summer the administration at St. Andrews passed a new policy that forbids the purchasing of any alcoholic beverages with any "college, generated fees." The resolution was passed after two Student Life Committee Task Force investigations into the possibility of alcohol abuse on campus. The first Task Force was headed by Emily Ellsworth in the spring of 1980 and the second study was headed by Professor Neil Bushoven in 1981. The administration felt that they were being inconsistent in their policy concerning alcohol abuse by allowing college generated funds to be used in buying alcoholic beverages. The new policy is listed in the supplement to the Saltire, which is the student guidebook concerning the college's rules and regulations.

By BILL LIDE

This summer, while most St. Andrews students were basking in the fun of a much needed vacation, the administrative powers, that have such an extreme effect on the student's lives, were planning to drop another bombshell to raise the students' ire when they came back to school this fall. Last

year the controversy surrounding visitation hours greeted the returning students, this year it is the new policy that states funds from any student association account can not be used in the purchasing of any alcoholic beverages. Secretly, the students have had another privilege ripped from their grasp as easily and as fairly as the American internment of the Japanese-Americans during the second World War II.

It has been understood that no money should be released from the College Union Board to pay for alcoholic beverages. This is a good rule because the CUB needs their funds to pay for the other entertainment needs that the school has. The part of the newly established policy that I strongly disagree with is that no dorm funds can be used to pay for alcohol. I believe that students being intelligent and responsible enough to attain the grades that will later establish them in the society in the future, should have the right to decide whether they want to spend their dorm money on alcohol or not. To further strengthen the point, the dorm fund is established at the beginning of the year

when the students received their room key. It is their money and no other dorm may spend it, so each dorm should be able to spend it the way they want to.

The administration has made their point now we should make ours. An interesting point to the new policy is that it does not effect the faculty at all. When the administration wants to have alcohol at a faculty party they can go to an administrative account and charge the alcohol to that account. With such a blatant double-standard it is hard to accept such a repressive policy. In a nutshell, the administration can use our tuition money to buy their alcohol, but the students can't spend their own money for their own alcohol!!!

There have been great strides made in bridging the gap between the administration and the students over the past few years. Does the administration want to burn those bridges it so carefully helped construct? We, the students, must let the administration know that we will not be coerced into accepting a policy that we have no say in. When I spoke to Dean Hannis and President Perkinson on the matter, both of them said that they were open to any recommendations or alternative plans. We need to come up with such plans, but the administration must also be willing to help in creating those plans. If any students feel as strongly as I do about this injustice, then I suggest you get in touch with your dorm's student government representatives and let them know how you feel. Remember that freedom of speech is the heart of any democratic institution, so let our opinion be heard!!

Anyone who wishes to respond to this editorial please send your response to: The Editor, P.O. Box 757 SAPC in the campus mail box. We will try to print as many responses as possible.

## DUI Seminar Brings National Dilemma to SA

By DREW HAYES & TOM WILSON

On Saturday, September 11, 1982, St. Andrews College was the site of the Scotland County DUI (Driving Under the Influence) Symposium. The purpose of the symposium was to stimulate the listeners thinking on DUI, to move his heart, and to jar his conscience. The thought on DUI was directed by the speeches of Sen. Bob Jordan, Steve Hicks, and Keith L., a reformed alcoholic. The movement of the heart was produced by the testimonies of Geannie Epting and Marilyn Suggs whose son and grandson, respectively, were killed by drunk drivers. The jarring of the conscience was touched off by demonstrations, exhibitions, and the infamous "wet run."

When one approaches a symposium, one often feels as if the subject of the symposium has been 'blown out of' proportion. It is with this view that I attended the DUI symposium. Before it started, I felt that DUI was a problem in this country, but no more important than any other problem in our society. I was soon to learn how wrong my assumption had been.

The problem of drinking drivers is very serious in our country. More people die each year in our nation due to DUI (25,000) than from all forms of homicide (20,000). Alcohol-related accidents kill well over 400 North Carolinians every year, and injure 20,000. And these figures are growing. DUI is the major factor in traffic fatalities, and the number one cause of death for young people, aged 16-19.

There is no doubt that the country has a problem with drinking and driving. This problem is evident in Scotland County where 750 people were arrested for DUI in 1981-1982. Estimates show, however that only ONE of every TWO HUNDRED drunk drivers is caught.

So, what do all these accidents and arrests amount to? What they amount to is in May of 1981 Marty Azcarte, a repeat DUI offender, was convicted of eight counts of vehicular manslaughter and four other charges. Eight people died, and a ninth was crippled for life in this crash.

Azcarte got the maximum in his state: nine years. The women who killed 11 year old Mark Suggs of Albemarle had a blood alcohol level of .12 and she admitted also taking tranquilizers. She never spent a day in jail. She was fined \$250 and lost her license for two years. Susan Vick Leviner, a 29 year old Scotland County nurse was killed on April 13, 1981 by a DUI driver. The man who killed her will be eligible for parole on June 15, 1983. The list goes on and on, but the point made here is that DUI does not result in the loss of your license, but in the loss of life.

At the symposium, the volunteers for the dry and wet runs showed the effects of alcohol on driving when after one hour of drinking, they ran their car over pylons, curbs, and grass on the track behind the LA building. Whereas one hour earlier, the volunteers ran smoothly through the course with relatively few errors. Brent Williams and Becki Kimbrell, students at St. Andrews participated in the runs with other prominent men and women in the community.

The question of what can be done to insure safety against the drunk driver does not lay with the government, it does not lay with federal commissions on crime, and it does not lay with the local enforcement agencies. The question and answer lie within you the reader. Offer a drinking friend a ride home, or a place to stay overnight. Call a law enforcement officer promptly, if you spot a DUI driver: give a description of the car, location, and license plate number. As a host, if you serve alcoholic drinks, don't push them. Don't let the bar stay open all evening. Show others by example that you believe drinking and driving is unacceptable.

As Solon stated 2500 years ago, "Justice will only be achieved when those who are not injured by crime feel as indignant as those who are." Keith L., speaking about the alcoholic driver, said, "We must press people who are alcoholics, they must be accountable for themselves." And so, we too, must press ourselves and make ourselves accountable for "the killer on the road."

## The Lance

Editor..... Bill Lide  
Layout/Copy Editor ..... Dwayne Snowden  
Sports Editor..... Rick Hanna  
Photo Editor..... Todd Heritage  
ADVISOR..... James McDuffie

The opinions expressed on this page are not necessarily those of THE LANCE, college, or student body, but are of the signed individuals. THE LANCE welcomes and encourages responses to the material in this publication, but reserves the right of editorial freedom as governed by responsible journalism.