

# Opinion

## Letters To The Editor

Dear Editor,

I would like to address the person(s) who thought that sabotaging the phone system by removing the speaking module was an intelligent endeavor.

This campus is small, but it is not small enough for me to yell across the lake to various people I need to get in touch with, thus I use the phone. However, what happens when someone gets the bright idea that they want to render the phones useless? One gets an extremely upset campus.

I hope that such stupidity will not happen again. The phone system is the only link to the outside world that this college has and I for one depend on that vital link. If you want to hold something for ransom, go kidnap a professor or some-

thing like that, do not pursue ignorant ends such as making the phones useless. What would happen if there was an emergency, or if someone simply had to get in touch with another party somewhere? Think, people! You are in college, you know.

The next time you decide to do something like this again, at least make your ransom demand something more substantive than the purchase of volleyball tickets. At least ask for about five to ten million dollars; otherwise, leave the phone system alone, it's in bad enough shape as it is, it does not need any assistance.

Bobby C. Simpson

## Attorney General Afraid?

The Attorney General's dialogue to the students of St. Andrews was one that attempted to explain the function and purpose of the Judiciary branch of the student government. In her dialogue, Attorney General Barbara Caras stated that the student court does not promote the adversarial system of litigation.

I can fully understand why the Attorney General wishes not to promote the adversarial system here at St. Andrews. The first reason is that the adversarial system in and of itself advocates rivalry, cut-throat tactics, some amount of theat-

### Point Blank



Bobby C. Simpson

rics, and even sometimes a total dismissal of truth and the acceptance of how the "judges" feel about an issue, not a regard for what the law actually states. The adversarial system is also seen as more or less of a side show in which the litigators perform a routine in order to sway the opinions of the judges of the court. The adversarial system truly is a non-perfect system of obtaining the truth, but it is the best one ever developed by man and one that should be adhered to at all times, whether in a college judiciary system or in a national judiciary system.

This college is supposed to be an institute of higher learning. It is supposed to educate its students on the methods that

are utilized in the real world. If this is true, and it is, then should not the St. Andrews court system establish their model exactly on the actual system used in our country? Why should there be any deference in the two systems? If a person gets charged with a crime in Laurinburg, that person will have access to the adversarial system and will more than likely use it if the circumstances surrounding the crime warrant an attorney. Why does the St. Andrews court system not advocate the adversarial system? What is the attorney general afraid of? If the officers of the court system here at St. Andrews think that there should be no winners and losers of court cases in a college judiciary system, then I must surely tell them now that they are in for an extremely rude awakening if they plan to pursue legal careers. The adversarial system does exist in the real world and it is utilized by people who will totally destroy an attorney who does not know what is going on.

There is no better way of deriving the truth than by the adversarial method. Though sometimes the system "chokes" and allows some people to be unjustly enriched, there has yet to be invented a better way of FAIRLY deriving the truth. When two people enter an adversarial system, they both realize that there is a truth. They also realize that when the trial is over the truth will be known. Therefore, those two individuals argue and move dialectically to the point of truth, thereby alleviating all other falsehoods in the trial. There can be no better way to get to the truth.

See Simpson page 12

## Mzala Speaks

South Africa: Black Christmas Again? Santa Claus has been banned in the South African townships. The gregarious-looking, bearded old man in red and white robes is known no more by our little ones. What a shame!

Every year Christmas comes and goes. Big celebrations as they are known to many civilized countries are no more. A very special characteristic clearly visible in that day is the readiness of the people to come together for rededication. They do this by organizing campaigns of mournings. Yes, mourning on Christmas Day.

Where has all the beauty associated with Christmas gone to? The graffiti on the walls by the streets supply the answer: "We have no reason to celebrate!" As you wonder what on earth the message refers to, floating pamphlets expatiate through a long list of grievances, demands, and a solemn call for a quiet observation of "Black Christmas." This type of "quiet observation of Black Christmas" is usually accompanied by a very effective Consumer Boycott. A specific period will be set aside as the days of absolute abstinence from buying anything from the city. With a consumer boycott, white businesses are crippled to a point of collapse. Many of those businesses run out of stock. It the time for demonstrating the black people's rapidly growing strength in aggregate economic power.

Thus, the black people use Christmas to send a very clear message to the government and the white community that

it is not all gold that glitters. Their message is, "As you celebrate, we mourn!" It is the loss of their uncelebrated martyrs that they mourn. It is the detention without trial of their eight-year-olds that they mourn. The continued subjugation through unwarranted network of more harsh, recently legislated draconian laws makes Christmas lose its taste.

Throughout the years Apartheid has been eroding this potentially successful country. But issues got to a boiling point when in 1976 little black children who were protesting the use of Afrikaans language in schools were met with shattering bullets. 1976! From that year on, the struggle against Apartheid was taken full force by the students. This is not to undercut the efforts of the previous generations of students. It is to point out the highlights of the present young generation which also culminated in the banning of Santa Claus, the recurrence of consumer boycotts, stay-aways and many more militantly active but non-violent forms of protests. But of course to say non-violent is merely to lend some credibility to our form of protest. If judged by the end results, it is only necessary to point out the historical pattern of confrontation which those so-called non-violent methods have produced.

The empirical evidence that shows that the arrogant South African regime always responds to peaceful protest by violence. Why then do we see the black people always hiding behind the

See Mzala page 9

The Lance  
Box 757  
St. Andrews Presbyterian College  
Laurinburg, N.C. 28352  
276-3652, Ext. 448

Buck Tredway: Editor-in-chief

The Editorial Board  
Bonnie Blackburn — Copy & Photo Editor  
Robert Fuller — Lay-out Director  
Joanne Ketch: Business Director  
Dave Snyder — Managing Editor

Section Editors  
Jon Pargas and April Walton — Quill and Ink co-editors  
Jennifer Woodward and Meg Anderson — Sports  
Jill Striklin and John Null — Arts and Entertainment

At-Large Editors:  
Deborah Kelly — Brunnenburg Desk  
Julie Norem — Senate Correspondent

Photography: Rooney Coffman and staff  
Adviser: June Milby  
Typesetting: Joann Bellavia  
Business Manager: Alison Bird  
Special thanks to the Office of Communications and Marketing  
Printed by The Laurinburg Exchange

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