

EDITORIAL

A LOST CAUSE

By Al Weisiger

A Christian is sometimes defined as one who does not drink. The equation of Christian ethics with total abstinence is a curious hang-over from the nineteenth century temperance crusade. The claim of the legalist and pietist that drink inevitably means drunkenness is at least debatable, although staunch Presbyterians continue to urge prohibition even in Him who was credited with turning water into wine." The above passage is from Beach's *Conscience on Campus* and illustrates one reason the Student Government drinking proposal never was given serious consideration by the College President. Before this author attempts to piece together the whole matter of drinking — or the lack of permission to drink — he wants to thank the College Deans for their effort on behalf of the students, and although we were not in full agreement with each other at all times, we did agree that some change was necessary.

Early in the year, a poll was submitted to the student body concerning their views on such matters as to "Whether alcohol is a moral issue," "Whether Montreat's drinking rule is a workable one, and "Do you as a student drink?" The results were tabulated, and it was found that 71% of the students felt the present drinking rule was not working. 70% of the students said they drank. And almost unanimously, the students said that drinking should not be a moral issue.

A committee was soon set up to try and determine how a workable proposal could be submitted to the administration. While the committee was working on a preliminary report, the President released his now famous "five points" as to why drinking should play no part in Montreat's life. 1. Montreat is the center of the Presbyterian Assembly. 2. Montreat-Anderson college is owned by the church. 3. Survival of the college is dependent on the financial donations of conservative Presbyterians. 4. Montreat Anderson college faculty is opposed to drinking as a matter of principle. 5. Drinking and immorality run hand in hand.

While we do not wish to incur the wrath of any conservative Presbyterian regarding his donation to

this college, there are several issues we feel are wholly unorthodox.

The first deals with Montreat being the center of the church. Martin Luther, who was incidentally, not a Presbyterian, (and who liked to drink his beer with the boys) often spoke of the distinction between the "Sinners of the right" and the "Sinners of the Left." The latter are the Saturday night brawlers, the sign stealers, the loud drunks who call the dean in the middle of the night to tell him a dirty joke — who seek prestige in the eyes of the gang. The "Sinners of the right" are the self consciously pure, who seek prestige by the conspicuous display of virtue, in holier than thou postures. According to the Biblical and the historic christian view, drink is fine in moderation.

"Drinking and Immorality run hand in hand" should not be used as a reason against drinking, for if we are truly a Christian school we would understand that it is necessary to have self discipline and a love of our neighbor. There are exceptions, of course, but only we should judge ourselves and our actions.

Following the release of the committee's recommendations, the Administrative committee immediately tabled the matter for later consideration. When students learned what the administration had done, they felt something dramatic should be done to portray their feelings. A march soon followed, supported by the majority of the male students in this College. There was no violence, it was orderly and organized with a united purpose: To make the unaware more aware.

We are all familiar with the chapel program in which our president stated that "An angry mob besieged his home with hate in their eyes." Perhaps his speech was more emotionally oriented than realistically oriented, for the facts were a bit misrepresented.

The late President Kennedy once said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable. "We are now forbidden to further demonstrate on this campus, with a promise of being expelled if we do.

Perhaps the college does not wish us to drink. We get that impression.

SGA 1966-67

The Student Government of 1966-67 is one that the students can be mighty proud of. Each member who served under Fred Jenkins can be as equally proud of him. Each member gave Fred their sole support in the many issues that came up throughout the year.

The Student Government worked for the students this year more than any other in the past. This governing body showed the administration that young men and women are capable of being qualified leaders. This could not have been possible if the students had not co-operated as well as they did.

Fred's administration had its ups and downs, as any administration will have. When things went bad the

(Continued on Page Four)

FORCED CHURCH

It is stated in the college catalog, (1966-67), that Montreat was established to be a college in which students would "encounter God as He is revealed in Jesus Christ —" This still remains the purpose of this college, as has been stated at varying times this year by the administration. The question is: Is Montreat fulfilling its stated purpose? When students state, in effect, that they have lost part of the religion they came here with, the answer is in dispute.

On a given Wednesday night, roughly five per cent of the student body can be found at Prayer Meeting. The turn out for Vespers is usually about twelve per cent, depending on the program. These are the two non-required religious programs.

(Continued on Page Four)

THE LAST OF THE VICTORIANS

By Mike Clark

On Friday, April 28th, a statement was given concerning the drinking rule (if you can call it that) to the student body. Even before the students heard the verdict they knew what it would be. But what they heard besides this statement was shocking and revolting.

The song that began chapel on this gloomy day was hand-picked. From the words in the first line one could plainly see what was coming and come it did.

Next year's freshman class, it was implied, will put the present one to shame when it comes to academics. If this is so, one will have to be given some proof before he believes it.

The opening sentence of the speech made the men of this campus sound like something out of a horror movie. Also it implied the men were fixing to storm the house as the Mexicans did the Alamo. Then too, the men were a lynch mob waiting to hang anyone that stepped out of the house. Here was the place the speaker said that one of the men, "angrily slung me aside and there was hate in their eyes".

Moving from this quiet place, the mob moved on to assault the men staying in Assembly Inn and a teacher's home.

Later in his speech, the speaker laid the blame of what happened on the transfer students. "The students who led this demonstration belong in the middle class and they do not have the intelligence to do college work."

Concerning these students it was said, "I suggest that you voluntarily withdraw from this college before you are asked to leave.

Then the speaker read downgrading students and demonstrations a quote from the Pulitzer Prize winner in 1957.

It was also stated, "There is no great thirst here for knowledge and God, only for alcohol, and the students who were in this demonstration should apologize for their actions."

Now that the facts are turned around, let us look at what really happened on the night of April 26th and what the men were demonstrating for.

The reason the men were in such an uproar was because the issue of drinking had been tabled and not voted upon at that time. If it had been voted on, probably there would not have been a demonstration.

The "howling mob" that came "slashing its way up the drive-way" was orderly, except for the yelling. No profanity was yelled out, as you hear in a lot of mobs.

When the lady of the house appeared you could have heard a pin drop. If there was hate in their eyes, the group would not have stayed in the drive-way.

The men carrying the flag did not lay a hand on the President, in fact, it was the other way around. One of the men was grabbed around the neck and angrily shaken by the President. Here again, if there was any hate in the group, this provided them with a golden opportunity to show it.

Next, the "beastly mob" ascended through the night to "reign terror in the hearts of those staying in the Inn," or was it terror? Many of the guests thought it was funny. When the march first started, three of the gentlemen were standing in front of College Hall. One of the men suggested that the marchers go across the lake and tell the rest of the men what they were protesting about.

When the group went to the home of the professor, they did not know his wife was sick. Had they known this they would have stayed away.

No damage was done to any property and there was no violence of any sort. This may have been the first time in history that a mob as "violent" as this mob had an orderly and peaceful demonstration.

When the speech was over an entirely different picture had been painted.

Transfer students who come here are supposedly very stupid. Wonder what the other schools think about students who transfer from here?

Why should the words of a 1957 Pulitzer Prize winner apply today?

Time, customs, fashions, morals, etc. have made drastic changes since then and people should begin to realize this.

Concerning the statement about the proposed drinking rule, there was no clear reason given why it was turned down. Unless one could say it was turned down because Montreat is a church school and acceptance would hurt the Christian image here.

One thing that is evident to everyone is that it is fine for students from Davidson, Presbyterian, Wofford, and Mars Hill to come onto this campus and drink. If the students here cannot drink, then those from other schools should not be allowed to do so either. It is a known fact that even the people who come here for church conferences drink, but the students cannot, for it is wrong.

There is no way the present
(Continued on Page Four)

THE DIALETTE

MONTREAT-ANDERSON COLLEGE, MONTREAT, N. C.

Editor Mike Clark
Assistant Editor Al Weisiger

COLUMNISTS

Political Dan Bayliss
S. C. A. Carson Norton
Fine Arts Jane Maples

Staff: Deane Zitzmann, Pat Elliott, Ruth Shane, Bill Nanny, Becky Ray.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those held by Montreat-Anderson College.