

# EDITORIAL

# Letters To The Editor

## Editorial Policy

"The Dialette" is a student-operated publication published for the Montreat-Anderson College student body.

Editorial opinions, clearly identified and centrally located, represent the opinion of this publication as determined by the editor. Other opinions such as news analyses, opinionated columns, and certain features represent the views of dedicated individual members of "The Dialette" staff. Columns not by-lined represent a collective opinion of the entire staff.

Under no circumstances does an article or opinion not clearly marked as being from non-student sources represent the opinions, views or beliefs of the administration, the board of trustees, the faculty or the faculty advisor.

This newspaper has as its self-imposed editorial objective the responsible and constructive criticism of various campus and student-related areas. In addition, "The Dialette" seems to enlighten its readers as to points of view concerning various campus and student-related areas that are generally considered popular. In certain cases, "The Dialette" will utilize its editorial space to praise and commend events and persons deemed worthy of the same.

This publication, with regard to editorial opinion, is independent of any particular group, institution, or organization. A high ethical code and a strong sense of responsibility guide the entire staff in its news gathering and editorial activities.

Individual non-staff opinions will be printed in the form of letters to the editor providing the letters are signed, responsible and pertinent to Montreat-Anderson College, its students, or events of interest to the same. Names will be withheld upon request if responsible justification for such can be submitted. Under no circumstances will the name of the author be furnished without his consent.

Carl Sturgis.

## A Time For Reshaping

During Convocation on Thursday, February 15, the Student Government Association leaders announced the general failure of the S. G. A. to effectively communicate with the students of this college and as a result, the S. G. A. President Bo Lowry called upon the students to reaffirm their faith in the S. G. A. leaders, and pledged that the S. G. A. would begin working with greater unity.

Mr. Lowry reminded students of the necessity to abide by the rules of the college- to do otherwise would cause a state of mass disorganization in which no student would have his rights upheld.

Len Hull, President of the Honor Court, gave a synopsis of the progress that the Honor Court has made during its second year of existence.

## The Growth Of Montreat

On February 7, 1968, the Student Committee of 9 met with the Faculty Professional Growth and Improvement of Teaching Committee. These committees are assigned the job of determining what can be done toward improving the learning experience and academic atmosphere at Montreat. The Student Committee of 9 is the equal of the Faculty committee and it seeks to present student views on improvement problem areas.

Most students look at the committee of 9 and ask what it is and why it was organized and why it is important to them as students to be involved with it.

I ask the question whether this committee is effective or not. By effective, I mean whether these students on the Committee of 9 are reflecting the views of the rest of the student body.

The idea behind the Committee of 9 was to give the students and faculty an opportunity to express their problems and see if the problems could be feasibly solved.

If the committee is effective then the students will discuss freely, and openly about the problems which face this college community. Then the faculty would express their views about the problems and then together set about to determine the fate of the college community. One way in which the student can help this committee be more effective is for the individual students to go to the members of the committee and express their gripes and then ask committee members to bring them up at combined committee discussions.

If the committee is not effective, then we only have ourselves to blame. We can not saddle the blame on just the students on the committee or the faculty because both would be responsible for the failure of the committee. It seems in discussing school problems there is always a communication blank which keeps the faculty and students from understanding fully the problems of the campus. So this is a joint understanding or the committee will fold.

If the students want the faculty views or vice versa then we cause the committee to fail. If the committee fails it is because the student body did not talk to these committee members and tell them what their views are.

In conclusion this committee can be effective only if the two factors work together toward the good of a better environment for education.

He felt that the Honor Code was working for most students, and expressed his desire that the students remain honorable to themselves and the college.

Also presented during the assembly was a report on the effectiveness of the newly-created Interdorm Council. The Honor Court President expressed the view that the council had greatly benefited the college, and relieved the Honor Court of handling cases other than lying, cheating or stealing.

—Cont. on Page 3

Dear Editor:

When one enters an institution, whether it be a government, a religion, or a college, there is or should be, a set of rules which apply to all in that institution. This conception is not a new one and has, since the days of the "Glorious Revolution," been one of the basic principles of modern democratic thought; in short this is a rule of equality which applies to the individual and group alike.

With the coming of the new semester, there was a political turnover in the S.G.A., of two dorm presidents; as a result, Lookout Lodge and Fellowship gained new presidents: first Fellowship, by due process of election, and second, Lookout, by appointment (in accordance with handbook regulations.)

The appointment of the president for Lookout had several motivating factors; the main one was that the discipline problem was acute; this reason alone justifies the appointment. It cannot, however, justify some of the policies of the new dorm president.

With the zeal of a conquering general about to become a military governor, the new president mouted the throne and, with his hall chairmen, all recruited from New Hall to be overseers, put into effect rules which are not in accordance with the S.G.A. handbook.

The question this writer has is: When does the S.G.A. condone the use of a dorm policy contrary to the handbook? (I am sure the S.G.A. editor will come up with some answer, in his usual illogical manner.)

I wish to give two examples of the incongruities I have mentioned: Dorm policy: "Upon accumulating 10 demerits, residents will be brought before Dorm Council for further action"; handbook: does not state any action for anything under 15 demerits. Dorm policy: "Absence from dorm meeting without excuse —5 demerits"; handbook: "House meetings (2 demerits for each absence.)"

A third example is probably the most disgusting and has had a direct effect upon the second floor of Lookout. Dorm policy states that if a person does not accept responsibility for damages to property the whole floor is punished.

At the first of this semester, just as the new regime had settled in, a door was broken on second floor. The hall counselor was unable to ascertain who the culprit was, so a generous supply of demerits were handed out to everyone on the floor,

along with an 80 cent fine to fix the door. (Why did we have to pay 80 cents out of our pockets when we'd already paid a damage fee?) This, in itself, was bad, but several factors came into play which makes the situation worse. The door was broken between 9:15 and 10:15; several people were able to prove that they were not in the dorm during these hours and therefore could not have done the damage. Why should these people who can prove that they did not do the damage be punished? They are innocent until proven guilty or at least that is the way the Honor System is supposed to work.

From here on, the situation really becomes intriguing. When this writer, resident of the second floor, confronted his hall counselor with the fact that it had been proven that he was not in the dorm and therefore could not be guilty and should not be punished, the hall counselor began singing a rather flat tune. He said the second floor had received demerits for breaking the door and for not telling who broke it. What if no one on the second floor knew of the culprit? This is quite possible, for the incident occurred about five minutes before a dorm meeting when most people were in the lobby. If this is the case, and it is, the residents of second floor, Lookout, were penalized for not knowing who did the damage! It is apparent that Lookout's new occupational government does not believe in Voltaire's axiom: "It is better to risk saving a guilty man than condemn an innocent one."

When I asked hall counselor why Lookout was not governed by the same rules as the other dorms, I received this answer: "Lookout is an exception to the rule." I now present one last question: Why are we an exception?—Joseph Pothier.

Dear Editor:

How many College cars would be needed each Sunday to transport all of the students who are not Presbyterian to the churches of their choice if FREE TRANSPORTATION were available — and who would pay the bill?

The Presbyterian Church is already contributing more toward our education than we are - would it not be more reasonable to expect the churches we attend to arrange for our transportation if neither we nor our parents are able to do so?

In my opinion, and I am not a Presbyterian, we would have to go far to hear better preaching than is heard here each Sunday.

Concerned

### MONTREAT-ANDERSON COLLEGE, MONTREAT, N. C.

#### STAFF

Business Manager  
James Moore

Social Editor  
Bev Keith

Writing Staff  
Frank Parrish  
Sue Bayer  
Bill Jones  
Dan Malcolm  
Linda Ficht  
Debbie Lentz

Layout  
Susan Bostic  
Joyce Baucom

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  
CARL STURGIS

The Dialette is the official Montreat - Anderson College newspaper, published by the student body.

Subscription is on a yearly basis and may be obtained by writing: The Dialette, Subscription Service, Montreat-Anderson College, Montreat, N. C.

Charge is \$1.00 per year.

Advisors:  
Mr. and Mrs. John Ricks

Assistant Editor  
Terry Duncan

Sports Editor  
Bill Sullivan

Typists  
Carol Luckett  
Jeanie Alexander  
Betty Green

Circulation  
Carolyn Rickman  
Jane Hearn