

1-22-1965

## Kenyon Collegian - January 22, 1965

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.kenyon.edu/collegian>

---

### Recommended Citation

"Kenyon Collegian - January 22, 1965" (1965). *The Kenyon Collegian*. 2207.  
<https://digital.kenyon.edu/collegian/2207>

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College Archives at Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Kenyon Collegian by an authorized administrator of Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [noltj@kenyon.edu](mailto:noltj@kenyon.edu).

# SPECIAL EDITION The Kenyon Collegian

A Journal of Student Opinion

"Wine and Women,  
Mirth and Laughter . . .

Sermons and  
Soda Water  
The Day After."  
— Byron  
Don Juan

Vol. LXXXI, No. 9 Gambier, Ohio 43022 — January 22, 1965 FOR TWO CENTS PLAIN

## Solons Change Liquor Laws



### Questionnaire Results Uncover Dissatisfaction

The following are the answers to the student opinion poll conducted by the COLLEGIAN, along with explanations of the questions. Four hundred and thirty-two questionnaires were tallied.

1. **DO YOU UNCONDITIONALLY APPROVE** of the Campus Senate's proposal on liquor in its present form?

YES: 24% NO: 76%

This is not a "loaded" question. If one does not "unconditionally" agree with the Senate proposal then he feels it must be changed in some manner. By this question it can be determined how many students would be satisfied with the new regulations—as proposed and without change.

2. **IN VIEW OF** the Senate's unanimous vote on the above proposal, do you feel that the three student representatives elected at large (Kenneth Klug, Richard Wortman and Paul Zuydhok) clearly reflected the opinions of their constituents?

YES: 18% NO: 82%

The Campus Senate is supposed to be a representative body; i.e., students on the Senate should represent student opinion. By the answers received it can be determined if students feel that their opinions were accurately reflected in their representatives' unanimous vote.

3. **DO YOU KNOW OF ANY ATTEMPT** by these student representatives to determine the opinions of their constituents?

YES: 8% NO: 92%

4. **BEFORE COMING TO KENYON**, had you ever been exposed to intoxicating beverages?

YES: 96% NO: 4%

If you answered yes, what sort of intoxicating beverages?

BEER BELOW 3.2%: 37%

BEER ABOVE 3.2%: 80%

WINE AND/OR LIQUOR: 94%

This question contradicts the assertion that the majority of Kenyon's students did not drink before coming to the college, and that college's drinking policies might have been detrimental to them.

Analysis on page 3, col. 3

Four Members of the Campus Senate admire the syntax of the Senate's resolution, handed down before a student assembly on Monday afternoon. From left to right: Warren Iwasa, student co-author of the proposals; Dean Haywood, and Reverend McCallum, Senate members; Senator Tom Edwards, who assisted in simplifying the issue for the students' benefit.

A Campus Senate resolution designed to bring the College regulations governing alcoholic consumption more in phase with the state laws on that matter was made public before a student assembly on Monday of this week.

In his prefatory comments, President Lund noted with some amusement the overwhelming attendance at the meeting. He then set about denying all rumors to the effect that the College was considering prohibition or finalizing its plans to erect a women's college in the vicinity. The resolution at hand, said Lund, "In the words of my nephew . . . is no big thing." The President went into a broad discussion of the collegiate condition, stating at one point that "we maintain here a minimum basic respect for law and morality," and, "we are addressing ourselves here to a purely legal issue."

Mr. Lund revealed that the issue in question was that widely discussed legal point of institutional responsibility. The Senate, he said, had considered two alternatives. The first, inviting State officials to patrol the campus on the lookout for violations of the alcoholic code, would militate against individual liberty. The second, which the Campus Senate rested on, involves removing the responsibility in such cases resulting from the misuse of alcohol from the institution, now acting

in loco parentis, and placing it on the individual student and the fraternity divisions. President Lund concluded his remarks by citing the real issue, which he posed as, "How do you preserve personal freedom while insisting on individual responsibility?"

Mr. Lund yielded to Mr. Franklin Miller, Professor of physics and Chairman of the Campus Senate. Chairman Miller said that he would go into "details and process" of the issue. While the Chase Society distributed copies of the Senate's proposals, Miller said that final action on the resolution is forthcoming — probably in the space of two or three weeks.

The resolution, entitled "Regulations Governing Alcoholic Beverages at Kenyon" expressed in cautious and convoluted terms the will of the Campus Senate — the removal of present privileges from any student under the age of twenty-one. It expanded Mr. Lund's comments by saying, "The Senate considers the moral issue to be of the same magnitude as the legal one."

Professor Miller, speaking in hurried and often levitous tones, said, "We derive our action from the pre-existing philosophy of campus government," and continued, "I think that many students feel that these are desirable changes." Miller's remarks

Turn to page 4, col. 1

### Senate Members Discuss Revisions

In order to clarify some of the vaguer aspects of this issue, the Collegian posed a set of questions to the members of the Campus Senate. Following are the answers of President Lund, Dean Haywood and Edwards, Professors Hettlinger, Miller, and McCulloh, Mr. McCallum; and student members Hamilton, Iwasa, Klug, Wortman, and Zuydhok. The interviews were conducted separately.

Comments by Dean Haywood, Dean Edwards, and Rev. McCallum in answer to questions posed by the Collegian.

Are you satisfied with the Campus Senate's proposals?

DEAN HAYWOOD:

Yes, and under the circumstances I think that they are the minimum.

DEAN EDWARDS:

It seems to me that the question is not whether I am satisfied but that the College is satisfied by the change in regulations to conform with the State code. It seems highly probable that the Senate needs to restudy those parts in its proposal that appear to be impractical and unenforceable. Despite the existing faults, however, I do believe that what is being offered is a unique and unusual opportunity for students to accept individual and corporate responsibility for their own decisions and actions. Many students want to reject this precarious position in favor of one that gives them protection from accolading the law, and yet holds others liable for their actions and behavior.

MR. MCCALLUM:

It is difficult for a person who is here for only a year to make a proper judgement on this ques-

tion. I have no basis for knowing until they've been given a try.

How would you define "persistent or flagrant?"

DEAN HAYWOOD:

That I think must be defined by the Dean of Students.

DEAN EDWARDS:

Certainly here is one of the areas that needs further study. I would also like to know what is really meant by the phrase before I assume the responsibility of enforcing the new regulations.

So as not to avoid the question, however, I do see an analogy between the management of a tavern and a fraternity party. Should a tavern gain the reputation of

Turn to page 4, col. 1

### A Letter from the Editor

The Campus Senate's proposals concerning alcohol on this campus represent no tyrannous act. It is merely a proposal, not a law. The Senate has solicited comment, and this newspaper has endeavored to fulfill its function by discussing the issues involved at length.

The Campus Senate is not intentionally trying to impose the will of eleven men on us all. The willingness of its individual members — faculty, students, and administration — to cooperate with the staff of this newspaper is evidence of that. They seem most willing to consider alternate proposals. But these proposals must be specific and practical. Categorical opposition is "shadow boxing." It is not constructive. It helps in no way to determine whether a superior proposal is possible.

The policy of this newspaper is to try to stimulate an analysis of all the implications and ramifications of this proposal.

It is this editor's opinion that what is needed is the best possible expression of the college's intention. If a mistake is made, the blame rests with us all, unless we all attempt to approach this problem rationally with a view to determining the best possible solution.

Barry M. Bergh

### Committee Formed; Combats Resolution

An ad hoc committee has been formed with the purpose of drafting an alternative alcohol proposal to that of the Campus Senate. It is headed by John Gable and Henry Webster and includes members of all divisions, classes, and sections of the College.

Webster emphasized that the committee's purposes were constructive. "We intend to embody the spirit and desires of the Campus Senate's proposals, but to avoid any unnecessary infringements on student freedom."

The committee plans rapid action, with its organizational meet-

ing set for today, Friday. Gable noted that the fourteen day interim period before the formal Senate vote was insufficient. He stated, "The very least the Campus Senate can do is consent of its own free will to extend the period."

Furthermore, Gable expressed considerable dismay over the "railroading" of this bill. "It seems," he commented, "that the Campus Senate has consulted lawyers, deans, and many self-appointed authorities on morality, but one group — the students — has been forgotten."



# The Kenyon Collegian

A JOURNAL OF STUDENT OPINION

Box 308, Gambier, Ohio 43022

Telephone (614) 427-4911; 427-4611, Ext. 289



THE KENYON COLLEGIAN is published every other week, except during vacation periods, by the students of Kenyon College during the regular academic year. Entered at the Post Office in Gambier, Ohio. Printed by Printing Arts Press, Mt. Vernon, Ohio. THE COLLEGIAN maintains regular hours daily from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at its editorial and business offices located in Chase Tower of Peirce Hall. Subscriptions are available at \$6.00 postpaid; in Gambier and Mt. Vernon, \$5.00. Advertising rates upon request.

Barry M. Bergh	Editor	Charles Verral	Assistant Editor
John C. Cocks	Advisory Editor	Walter R. Butt	Political Editor
Carl Mankowitz	Advisory Editor	Richard H. Levey	Assist. to the Editor
Jerome P. Yurch	Executive Editor	Wayne Beveridge	Business Manager
Richard Freeman	Associate Editor	Alan Ryan	Circulation Manager
James Ceaser	News Editor	David Land	Advertising Manager
C. Johnson Taggart	Features Editor	Michael J. Pohk	Photographer
Richard Shapiro	Managing Editor	James Schmid	Typist
Howard Price	Sports Editor	D. David Long	Consultant to the Editor
A. Denis Baly	Faculty Advisor		

The Collegian utilizes the resources of the College News Bureau.

"... were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." — Thomas Jefferson.

## Student Comment

### Gable Underscores Way of Life

To the Editor:

When I was a freshman, I listened to a number of speeches during Orientation Week. They told of a college where student freedom was emphasized, rather than tolerated or denigrated. They told of a college with a heritage of respect for the individual's rights to make as much or as little of his life intellectually, socially, and morally as he chose, within the bounds of respect for others' rights to do the same. I must admit that this philosophy did not appeal to me much at the time. Coming from the background of a strict New England church school, I had very definite ideas about what was right and what was wrong. I still do, and

I cherish and laud my experience in preparatory school, but I came to believe that it was the individual's God-given right to choose whatever path he wished. Kenyon's official attitude largely convinced me of this. But since my freshman year, there it seems that there has been a gradual retreat from this ideal.

The "pajama parade" seems a good example of this. I was never a proponent of this Victorian outlet for boyish high spirits, but since any freshman or sophomore could easily avoid participation, why should it not have continued? Trouble could have resulted from this venerable custom, it could have gotten "out of hand", somebody could have gotten hurt, so

rather than deal with problems always concurrent with freedom, rather than cope with freedom, we suppress it or reject it. This surely a thesis with wide support among historians, sociologists, psychologists. Men so often make the wrong choice when they make choices, or they fear the freedom to make choices itself, and so preclude or limit the possibility of making choices. I believe I am my brother's keeper in biblical sense, for instance, current trends seek to institutionalize this.

The demise of the "pajama game" is no longer an issue; this is a good example of what has been going on at Kenyon in the last few years. The abolition of the freshman-sophomore "tag-war" over the Kokosing, the abolition of "raids" on the freshman dorms, the infringements and deductions placed on "hell week" and the ever-growing list of rules are others. The rules change so much from year to year that last year's handbook each September begins to be as much a part of the past as Phil Chase's wardrobe. This has stopped, and it has got to stop. If the proposed changes in drinking rules are adopted without considerable revision both to content and implication, Kenyon College I have been "oriented" to will no longer be. Perhaps the vision of social freedom imparted to me by the Kenyon of September, 1961, was a mirage from the beginning. I don't think so. I refuse to believe it.

This is a short letter meant to express concern over the present demise of Kenyon traditions. I am fully aware of the problems involved in the Senate proposals. The intrusion of the State of Ohio in the campus culture is another question, for example, although it has never been demonstrated to my satisfaction that the State has, or even tends to intrude into campus social life. There are certainly many issues involved, but at least of them is the destruction of the Kenyon College of which we have been proud to be a Kenyon man, however, need not despair, because surely students and faculty must and will, with the bodies of campus government in avoiding this terrible aberration in Kenyon's social and moral traditions.

John A. Gable

To the Editor:

The proposed drinking rules have two implications. The first absolves the College of all responsibility for acts committed by students who by the laws of Ohio are illegally under the influence of alcohol. This is, for one, do not want to see a jail cell with Dean Edwards more than he wants to share with me.

The second, "which according to legal advice, is not the duty of the College," empowers the College to act "as an enforcement agency of the State in relation to individual or group violations." If the Dean can keep "ass" out of student drinking fairs, he can keep his nose too. The apartment raids, doorknob sniffing of all too recent memory are evidence of objectionable enforcement measures condoned by the Dean. These along with carding at

Turn to page 3, col. 5

## The Language of Law

Four questions are on the minds of all students this week:

1. Do the student representatives on the Campus Senate adequately represent opinion on this campus?
2. Are the recent proposals on drinking really the product of democratic process, or are they administration fiat in disguise?
3. Are these proposals the minimal steps that must be taken by the college to absolve itself of responsibility?
4. If they are, how rigorously will the College enforce them?

I

Professor Franklin Miller, Chairman of the Campus Senate, declared last Monday: "The Campus Senate is a democratic organization that represents all shades of opinion on the campus." We doubt this. Remember that two of the five members of the Senate are not popularly elected, but appointed by a three man executive committee of the Student Council. It is the overwhelming opinion of the student body that the student representatives on the Senate have not "clearly expressed the opinion of their constituents." Accordingly, we make the following proposal: That four of the five student members of the Campus Senate be elected from the student body by school-wide election; that the fifth be the President of the Council, but that it also be mandatory—and not optional, as it is now—that he be elected to his office by school-wide election. This is a proposed constitutional amendment and shall be petitioned for under the regulations governing such petitions as specified in the constitution.

II

The fact that these proposals concerning campus drinking were voted upon does not imply that they were the product of democratic process. These proposals were initiated by the administration to protect itself legally (and this is certainly justifiable); they were formulated in order that they absolve the college of responsibility. They are not administration fiat in disguise. They are the product of the administration's efforts to work within the constitutional framework of government at this college. It is possible that the proposals are less at fault than the procedure by which they were arrived at.

III *Chadron, H. (1950)*

Judge Harter and William Schodane, both of Columbus, have given the college its legal advice on this matter. Certainly, we are ill-equipped to discuss legal issues with Judge Harter and Attorney Schodane, but this campus is not convinced that the proposals represent the minimum step the college must take to absolve itself of the responsibility. Indeed, such vague wording is suspicious. . . . Students favor the college's self-protection, but we want also as much student freedom as possible. The students strongly suspect that these proposals, maladroitness expressed as they are, allow the college not only to protect itself, but also to use the law as a guise for sharply curtailing the consumption of alcohol on this campus. We urge that the college confront the student body face to face with its legal counsel. Therefore, the Senate should postpone a vote of these proposals until the situation has been more clearly explained to the students.

IV

The convoluted construction of these proposals leaves their interpretation too open. The implications of these proposals must be clearly understood. If the proposals are not clarified, then either the Judicial Board or the Dean of Students will clarify them through test cases. This will turn individual cases

into instances; the student will be made to feel that he is being punished so that he might serve as an example. If the proposals are passed as they now stand, the only effective regulation will be our fear of their interpretation.

The Campus Senate has paid lip service long enough to vague notions of corporate and individual responsibility. The Campus Senate's action concerning alcohol regulations is their most spectacular example of irresponsible behavior this year.

One of the Senate's primary functions is to serve as an organ of communication between the component parts of the college: administration, faculty, and students. The deliberations concerning alcohol consumption were foolishly carried on in a "cloak and dagger" fashion. In essence, only eleven men participated in this communication.

The Senate has clearly neglected its responsibility. The manner in which this problem has been handled has served only to increase student apprehension concerning their conclusions. This apprehension reached near panic proportions prior to the assembly. If the assembly is an example of how well the Campus Senate can "communicate," then they are incapable of fulfilling their constitutionally intended purpose.

We urge the following steps: 1. That the student opinion polls influence the Campus Senate and convince it of the necessity of serious introspection. 2. That ratification be delayed to promote sensible discussion, more legal advice be obtained, and possible alternate proposals be drafted. 3. If these proposals must be passed, that they specify exactly how stringently they will be enforced. This is perhaps the most important point. Anyone except the most naive will realize this is necessary. 4. That the proposed amendment concerning student representation on the Senate be enacted in time for this April's election.

## Fraternities Snub Measure; Psi U., Delta Phi Unanimous

Six out of ten fraternities opposed the proposed drinking regulations passed at recent meetings. Psi U. was "categorically opposed" to any change; Alpha Delta Phi and Delta Phi took strong exception to the proposals; and Delta Tau Delta instructed its IFC and Council representatives to voice the fraternity's disapproval of the proposed Senate legislation. D. K. E. and A. L. O. also opposed the measures.

Middle Kenyon Association urged the retention of the sentence containing the words "persistent" and "flagrant." Other fraternities postponed action, or refused official comment.

The following is the Psi Upsilon resolution.

### A RESOLUTION

The Iota Chapter of Psi Upsilon Fraternity assembled hereby goes on record as categorically opposed to the misleading and unsatisfactory changes in the rules of the College, as contained in the document "Regulations Governing Alcoholic Beverages at Kenyon." Not only would these changes be

detrimental to the social life of the College, but they bode ill for student freedom and the exercise of the right of free choice. These changes would almost certainly work against the fraternity system as we know it today. The Campus Senate must find some way in which to ascertain student opinion on this matter, if there is to be any pretense of democratic student rule at Kenyon.

Psi Upsilon's representatives on the Student Council and the I.F.C. are hereby instructed and bound to vigorously oppose in every way the proposed changes in the rules and traditions of Kenyon. Copies of this resolution are being sent to the Campus Senate, the Student Council, the I.F.C., the COLLEGIAN, the leaders of the Alumni of the Iota, and President Lund.

Voted by acclamation

Attest,

Floyd Sanford Linton,  
President, Iota of Psi Upsilon  
Richard Henry Lee,  
Corresponding Secretary



# Present and Proposed Regulations Compared

These proposals were handed out at the Assembly last Monday.

## Introduction

In accordance with the Constitution of the Campus Government of Kenyon College, the Campus Senate is charged with the obligation to "... legislate rules necessary for the regulation of student life and extracurricular affairs." In 1964, the Senate promulgated a statement on "Principles and Rules of Behavior" in which "imposed conformity" is rejected in favor of "a substantial area of personal freedom for the student." Responsible behavior is set forth as "a personal challenge and opportunity." This statement was adopted on May 13, 1964, and appears on pp. 15-16 of the *Student Handbook*.

Throughout the first semester, 1964-65, the Senate has considered the regulation of alcoholic beverages on the campus, believing this to be the topic which most urgently requires study at this time. Three considerations weighed heavily in the Senate's thinking:

- (1) Concern among the public about the steady increase in drunkenness among minors, and driving and other accidents arising therefrom has raised the question with a new urgency.
- (2) There is evidence of a definite trend towards stricter enforcement of the existing laws on the part of State authorities which might, if not anticipated by interior action, result in vigorous enforcement on college campuses.
- (3) No institution of higher learning which allows widespread disregard of laws of the land on its campus and among its students can hope to maintain its place of leadership in society, not can it hereby inculcate a responsible attitude toward law and order among its graduates.

The problem is thus both a legal one and a moral one; the Senate considers the moral issue to be of the same order of magnitude as the legal one, although perhaps less susceptible of ready solution.

**I. Revised Rule on Alcoholic Beverages Relative to Individuals**  
The following new legislation is hereby formally proposed to replace Rule II D (p. 17 of the *Student Handbook*):

### ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

The College calls the attention of all students to Section 4301.63-2 of the Revised Code of the State of Ohio which prohibits the acquisition or consumption of beer (of less than 3.2% alcoholic content) by any person under 18, and of intoxicating liquor (including beer above 3.2% alcoholic content) by those under 21, except under the supervision of a physician, parent or legal guardian. Section 4301.69, with the same exceptions, provides that any person selling or furnishing beer (of less than 3.2% alcoholic content) to a person under 18, or intoxicating liquor (including beer above 3.2% alcoholic content) to a person under 21, is subject to prosecution by State authorities.

The College expects all its members to abide by these laws and in no way condones violations. Student funds administered through College accounts will not be used for the purchase of intoxicating liquor (including beer above 3.2% alcoholic content).

Immoderate use of alcohol which renders any student incapable of looking after himself, or which results in offensive behavior or disorderly conduct, is unacceptable and will be penalized.

Drinking shall be confined to the immediate vicinity of student residences and lodges. No drinking is permitted at intramural or intercollegiate athletic events.

Kenyon students visiting other schools are subject to the regulations of these institutions.

### PRESENT RULE: ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

The College does not prohibit the moderate use of alcoholic beverages in dormitories and divisions, but does require orderly and socially responsible conduct at all times and under all conditions. Drinking shall be confined to the immediate area of the divisions and lodges. Bars are not permitted in divisions or other college buildings.

No drinking is permitted at intramural or intercollegiate athletic events.

Kenyon students visiting other schools are subject to the regulations concerning drinking at those institutions.

### Interpretation of Revised Rule

The Senate has rejected three distinctly different approaches: (a) to impose total prohibition on the campus—which would substantially violate the personal freedom of students; (b) to set up the College as an enforcement agency of the State in relation to individual or group actions—which, according to legal advice, is not the obligation of the College; or (c) to consider enforcement of State liquor laws a matter solely between student and State—which would leave the impression that the College is indifferent to the observance of law. Careful study of the new rule will reveal that the College expects that individuals will observe the law and requires individuals to accept responsible standards. Only in certain cases (use of funds administered through College accounts; rushing parties which are College functions—see below) does the College, as such, enforce the law because it is officially involved.

### II. Revised Rules on Alcoholic Beverages Relative to Fraternities

The Senate recognizes that liquor regulations will have considerable impact upon fraternity life. The actions of individual fraternity members are covered adequately by the general regulation (see above). Two additional rules are hereby formally proposed, dealing specifically with fraternities corporately.

The following rule replaces Rule 1 C under Rushing Rules (p. 56 of the *Student Handbook*):

C. At all of these scheduled activities nonalcoholic beverages must be available, and no fraternity may at any time serve beer of less than 3.2% alcoholic content) to any person under 18 or serve intoxicating liquor (including beer above 3.2% alcoholic content) to any person who is under 21. Failure on the part of a fraternity to observe this rule may lead to the denial of rushing privileges.

### PRESENT RULE:

At all of those scheduled activities nonalcoholic beverages must be available. Nothing stronger than beer may be served by the fraternity to the rushers during any of the parties but that of Saturday, October 7. No alcoholic beverages may be served by the fraternity to the freshmen except at scheduled rushing activities. Fraternities and the rushes are responsible for seeing that the use of alcoholic beverages is not abused.

It is possible, of course, that fraternities might choose not to serve liquor at rushing parties because of the difficulty of avoiding infractions. If there is disregard for the law the College may have to forbid the serving of any alcoholic beverage at rushing parties.

The following revision of item 7, page 54 of the *Student Handbook* section on Fraternity Responsibilities is hereby formally proposed:

7. Drinking: Fraternities are expected to abide by Section 4301.69 of the Revised Code of the State of Ohio which forbids the sale or provision of beer (of less than 3.2% alcoholic content) to any person under 18 or of intoxicating liquor (including beer above 3.2% alcoholic content) to anyone under 21 except by a physician, parent, or legal guardian. Fraternities breaking this law are liable to prosecution by State authorities, and lodges or lodges used in violation of the law are liable to be padlocked under Section 4301.73. Any persistent or flagrant violation of the law by a fraternity will result in action by the College, even if State authorities are not involved.

A fraternity is further held responsible for any corporate activity which encourages any of its members to drink immoderately, or which results in an injury to persons or damage to property. Isolated individual failures in restraint are not chargeable to the fraternity. However, any fraternity or social group is liable to disciplinary measures if it condones violations by individual members or fails to show active concern for those who are chronically unable to drink without injury to themselves or offense to society.

### PRESENT RULE:

7. Drinking: any fraternity which actively or passively allows its members to injure or seriously affect themselves as a result of alcohol will be punished. More positively, it is expected that a fraternity will express an active concern for any of its members who are liable to cause injury to themselves as a result of alcohol. This is necessary if moral, social, and academic decorum is to be maintained. Once again it is not a question of single incidents, but rather of the tone of the division.

In the first paragraph of item 7 above, of proposal, fraternities are expected to observe the law and are warned about legal consequences. In the second paragraph of item 7, fraternities are required by the College to exercise responsibility.

Every college community enjoys special privileges and must assume special responsibilities. The Campus Senate has proposed these regulations only after serious study, in the expectation that individuals and fraternities will make sincere efforts to retain the privilege of determining their own conduct within limits set by decency and by law. To this end, the Senate earnestly seeks the understanding and cooperation of all members of the campus community.

See Results on First Page

## Poll Evidences Opposition

The results of the Collegian poll are dealt with best in reverse order. Admittedly, the overwhelming affirmative response to the last question bespeaks of a certain amount of adolescent vanity. Students fear that confessing to previous intestinal virginity will seriously malign their maturity. This fact is particularly apparent when the selection of spirits fermenti is categorized. The body of students (94%) revealed that their previous experience had been with either wine or hard liquor. If the poll concerned their amorous careers, and would be similarly departmentalized, these same students would probably admit that they had undergone heated affairs with Russian countesses before orientation week.

There remains no doubt about the truth of the other three responses. It is indeed surprising that the Campus Senate solicited the opinion of only 8% of its constituents before passing its case. That 92% of us were left in the dark indicates a weak understanding of democratic procedure on the part of our student representatives.

Nevertheless, the figure drops from 92% to 82% when the students are asked if the decision rendered actually reflects their opinion. All this points to is the existence of a swing group, consisting of 10% of the student body, that didn't care to have its opinion solicited, but felt that the student representatives acted unconsciously in accord with their views.

In sum, the main quarrel seems to be with the manner in which the legislation was enacted and not profoundly with the issue itself. (Note the 24% approval of the bill.) The number of those who disagree with the Campus Senate's mode of operations (82%) seems to amount to a sharp repudiation of the resolution of the grounds of legislative malfeasance.

## Council Blasts Regulations

On Monday night Warren M. Iwasa presented the topics of discussion during the last Senate meeting. There were five areas of discussion, but the only one discussed by the Council was the first, the new rules on drinking.

Immediately after Iwasa's report, Cocks read a statement by the president of Psi Upsilon, Floyd S. Linton, and moved that this statement be included in the Student Council's minutes. The statement "categorically rejected" the Senate's proposals. The motion was passed.

This statement was followed by a petition which Cocks also asked to be included in the minutes. The petition "categorically rejected" the Senate's proposed changes in the drinking regulations. It had been signed, said Cocks, by 123 students in the space of approximately one and one half hours. After some discussion this motion was passed also.

William T. Wright, Jr., brought up the question of vagueness in the proposed drinking regulations. Bergh also expressed concern over this vagueness. Specifically, Bergh was "concerned with the intentions of the College," and wondered just "how much should the students trust the administration" to interpret and enforce these rules.

Bergh then made a motion to suggest a "more explicit statement of what follow up will be made of this enactment."

At this point Iwasa broke in and explained that since the students live in college dorms, the college is legally responsible for their actions and would be liable in case of accidents resulting from drinking. Iwasa went on to add that the changes are inevitable and "will probably change the situation radically."

But Bergh and Cocks were not convinced that the school's awkward legal problems should be solved at the expense of the students' freedom. During the ensuing discussion, they brought out several points to substantiate their opposing position: (1) the students are not in agreement with the Senate as indicated by the petition against drinking changes, (2) there is, inherent in the proposed rules, the false implication that if one is moderate in drinking, he can break the law, (3) the fact that the administration is moving into an area of legislating morals—a philosophy in direct opposition with the historical concepts of Kenyon, and (4) the deliberate vagueness of the drinking legislation which places the responsibility for enforcement in the hands of Dean Edwards.

Concerning Dean Edwards' ability to enforce these rules, Cocks further said, "I don't trust him, and I don't think anyone else on this campus trusts him..." If clarification is not made, the Dean will be able to make any penalty according to his discretion."

Lawrence F. Leventon concurred in this opinion. His reason being that after talking with the Dean and discussing the problem of enforcement with him, Leventon came away with the impression that these regulations, if passed, would be enforced "to the letter of the law."

After defeating a motion by Burton J. Hurwitz to postpone discussion, Bergh's motion to ask for clarification by the Senate was passed, and the meeting was adjourned.



## Liquor, from page 1

were occasionally interrupted by strident hisses and boos from several quarters of the auditorium. Mr. Miller appeared to draw the most violent reaction with the following statement: "Unfortunately, we cannot legislate morals." The students responded to this statement with booing and catcalls.

Professor Miller then introduced Mr. William Hamilton, President of the Student Council. Hamilton spoke with quiet self-assurance on the role of the fraternities in connection with the new proposal. His remarks drew the same unfavorable reaction as Professor Miller's. Professor Miller then called for questions.

The first question was concerned with the possibility of a student referendum on the issue. Miller replied with a smiling, "No". He qualified by saying that such a referendum would be unconstitutional. Mr. Hamilton stepped up to announce that all discussion of the problem will take place in the representative channels of student government. He advised anyone with complaints or questions to refer them to his student council representative. The next question was "What possible effect could a discussion in Council have on this legislation?" A wave of applause followed this question, which was posed by a member of the Student Council. Mr. Hamilton answered by explaining that discussion in Student Council leads to final resolution in the Campus Senate.

Many questions followed demanding clarification of certain passages of the resolution. In answer to these, President Lund admitted that the whole statement was "deliberately vague." The sentence that came under considerable fire was the revision of item 7, page 54 of the Student Handbook which, if enacted, will state, "Any persistent or flagrant violation of the law by a fraternity will result in action by the College, even if State authorities are not involved." Professor Miller attempted to answer all questions by saying that the final definition of this, as well as all questionable extracts of the resolution, is in the hands of the Judicial Board.

The last to speak was Dean Edwards, who straightforwardly declared that the changes in regulations lifts the responsibility in these matters from his shoulders. Said he, "I just want to make it clear that it's not my ass that they're going to get."



## Pictures at an Exhibition



## Letters, from page 2

ties and routine roomchecks must be avoided.

With the following ground rules, I believe the Dean can clearly and easily enforce the College's and State's rules to everyone's satisfaction.

1. Do not interfere with the eating and consumption of alcohol in the immediate vicinity of student residences and lodges.
2. Let the responsible parties (sent (chaperones, proctors, fraternity officers) determine if a student is incapable of looking after himself and when his behavior is offensive or disorderly and let them handle the individual.
3. Make the Campus Security Department's job one of assisting when requested by the responsible parties rather than one of judgment.
4. Since drunken driving presents the biggest threat to the individual's and the College's safety, prohibit driving on the Hill during those hours (e.g., 10 to 11 p.m. Dance Weekends) when a large number of students who have been drinking will be walking in the streets. If a student must use a car, the not-too-long walk off the Hill to it should help sober him.
5. Enforce the State laws when a violation occurs outside the College, i.e., somewhere other than on the Hill, on Middle Road or in the vicinity of the lodges and student residences. Thus, an underage drinker will be held responsible only if it leads to some violation of a law other than Section 4301.63-2 (Ohio Code Revised).

There is no reason for the College to go out of its way to protect itself a toady of the State Law Board.

Sincerely,

Robin F. Goldsmith

To the Editor:

For those interested in the Campus Senate, and its new proposals, let me make a few suggestions. Do not receive of the Senate or the College community as democratic.

Students should not think their opinions must have weight in determining College policy; rather students should be aware that the administration thinks it wise to listen to student opinion on non-academic issues.

Faculty (notably Professor Miller) and administration there must not pretend that students have a real say. Because if they do, then students, who fully

Turn to page 6, col. 1

## Campus Senate Interviews, Continued

willfully ignoring the Ohio Code it will become subject to authority and due process. Similarly, should a fraternity openly and deliberately service minors, with no regard for College rules, then it will be subject to College authority. Every opportunity will be given to the fraternity to assume its responsibility to comply with the state laws.

**MR. McCALLUM:**

Definitions of the law are usually filled out by precedents which follow the administration of the law rather than by complete and precise definition beforehand.

What precipitated these changes?

**DEAN HAYWOOD:**

We had one communication from an official on the State Liquor Board asking what we were doing about the "teenage drinking

problem." Where this started, of course, was in the self-study, which created the Campus Senate and gave it this problem to deal with. The fact is, we had already started to explore this topic before that communication from the State was received.

**DEAN EDWARDS:**

This has been adequately answered in the paper given to students at Monday's assembly.

**MR. McCALLUM:**

The reasons are stated in the introduction to the paper distributed at the assembly by the Campus Senate.

Will the new rules encourage surreptitious drinking?

**DEAN HAYWOOD:**

No. The only change that I see here is the attempt to make the student aware of his responsibility.

**DEAN EDWARDS:**

Perhaps it might, but the College is making quite clear to all persons exactly what the Ohio Code says. Just because there are violations of a law does not justify the law being disregarded. Nor should a college campus become a sanctuary where state laws are ignored. Kenyon students should be exposed to the same laws, no better no worse, than any other resident in Ohio. We are constantly being reminded, however, that most colleges choose not to place any confidence in their students when campus drinking is considered.

**MR. McCALLUM:**

The success or failure of the new regulations will depend almost entirely on the sense of responsibility which individual students bring to bear on their own personal conduct in relation to the law of the land and on the good

will of the fraternities toward their own responsibilities to their members. The rules themselves will not necessarily encourage surreptitious drinking; it will be the students and fraternities themselves who will make that decision.

How will these new regulations be enforced?

**DEAN HAYWOOD:**

Kenyon does not intend to deny its students their rights under the law. I don't think any student has anything to fear that is moderate and modest.

**DEAN EDWARDS:**

I can answer this better after I have further consultations with the Campus Senate. I, too, have some questions to ask.

**MR. McCALLUM:**

(Mr. McCallum declined to answer, saying that he is not sufficiently familiar with the intricacies of the Constitution.)

Was this done in the democratic way possible?

**DEAN HAYWOOD:**

Yes. I can think of no way that could have given students a greater hand in determining legislation.

**DEAN EDWARDS:**

For the most part yes, but we also face the fact that colleges are not run by democratic procedures. In this instance it should be considered that a change in the drinking rules has been made by administrative fiat. What is being done is in accord with the Campus Constitution. The Campus Senate, composed of students, faculty, and administrators conceived and proposed the legislation and submitted it to the student body for comment and constructive suggestions.

Turn to page 5, col. 1

from page 4

## Further Comments, Alibis, By Campus Senate Members

Democratic government does not necessarily mean that all issues will be resolved by popular vote. If the question of drinking were put to popular vote there is little doubt that most students would favor no-holds-barred drinking rules.

The courts have said, and they have been very clear on this point, that the college must accept fiduciary responsibilities. If our old rules remain, we could be avoiding that responsibility, and could be legally liable. We could state our policy as total prohibition—a dry campus. But we have chosen to put confidence and responsibility in students.

### REV. McCALLUM:

Yes. The Campus Senate is as representative of the students as any body of its kind could be, judging from the way in which the student representatives have participated in the discussions.

Deans Haywood and Edwards and Rev. McCallum represent the administration on the Campus Senate.

Comments by William Hamilton and Warren Iwasa in answer to questions posed by the Collegian.

Are you satisfied with the Campus Senate's proposals?

### HAMILTON:

Yes, because I've been working at it since its inception. I think it's a sensible, sane approach.

### IWASA:

Yes. I prefer it to a dry campus.

How would you define "persistent or flagrant?"

### HAMILTON:

Persistent, moderate or not, means more than once. Flagrant? Well, if a fraternity gets drunk, runs in town, and busts up the Keg, I would consider that flagrant. That is, if a fraternity does not pay obeisance to the code.

### IWASA:

Persistent if a violation has occurred more than once. A flagrant violation is one that might be blatantly obvious to perhaps the Mount Vernon community or the Gambier community. One flagrant violation, I should think, should result in disciplinary action. That would be something the judicial board will handle.

What precipitated these changes?

### HAMILTON:

The first work has done in March of last year when Dean Edwards proposed his seventeen questions to the Student Council. These were the basis for the projected revision in the rules of conduct contained in section two, items A through E of the student code. A, B, C, and E are next to be revised. These are on the agenda now, but drinking was thought the most pressing issue, especially after all the articles in The Cleveland Plain Dealer, and

TIME, to mention two publications that have played up the nationwide problem of drinking among the underaged. Now, never has there been any direct state confrontation here. The general idea of the rule change came in March. This fall there were these things about drinking nationwide and we took immediate action. We derived another reason from the letter that Dean Edwards had received this summer from the Ohio State Liquor Board requesting specifications on the liquor



problem at Kenyon. That's one indication that the state is showing increased interest.

### IWASA:

I believe that the immediate cause for the Campus Senate proposals were the incident at Darien, Connecticut and the drying up of Trinity College. These incidents affected the public view as to undergraduate drinking and made it clear that changes in Kenyon's code had to be effected. When the Campus Senate adjourned last Spring, they agreed to consider in the Fall the question of drinking at parties. What made it quite clear that what we're doing was important was the case involving a Kenyon student's buying beer for several Mt. Vernon minors.

How will these new regulations be enforced?

### HAMILTON:

I don't know. In my personal opinion Dean Edwards laid it open at Monday's meeting. Certainly enforcement will be on a middle ground between staring down someone's drink and ignoring the thing altogether. But Edwards will be the immediate enforcer. I think Professor Miller was mistaken when he referred all cases to the Judicial Board. However, this will require a test case, which would be handled by the Dean.

### IWASA:

By the Dean of Student's office and its agents, e.g. the Security Department and Mr. Cass. Also, I should think that the fraternities, their officers, and faculty chaperones will help in the enforcement of these regulations.

Was this done in the "most democratic way possible?"

### HAMILTON:

Yes, it was done in an excellent manner. Most student reaction has been favorable with some reservations. I'm even more convinced from the petitions that were circulated and gained only some hundred or so names that the reaction was indeed favorable.

### IWASA:

(asked that the question be phrased more explicitly. We complied with the following) Did you before and/or after the action was taken, have behind you the approval of the majority of the students?

### IWASA:

No. I don't think a representative is really morally obligated to heed the opinion of his constituents in every instance. In this case, it seems that I am at variance with the majority opinion.

Will the new rules encourage surreptitious violation?

### HAMILTON:

Not really. It will in the sense that any individual can get by with a violation. But this certainly isn't the intent or the spirit of the document. There's a real vagueness and openness about it that leaves a real determination of individual responsibility. If any individual doesn't accept it he's making himself liable to the State and the College.

### IWASA:

I couldn't say. But I hope not.

It should be noted that Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Iwasa represent two-thirds of the team that actually drafted the document. The third member is Mr. Hettlinger. Furthermore, Mr. Hamilton acted in his capacity as President of the Student Council. He has been on the Campus Senate since last Spring. Mr. Iwasa was appointed to the Campus Senate by Mr. Hamilton with the consent of the Council.

Comment by Mr. McCulloh, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Hettlinger in answer to questions posed by The Collegian.

Are you satisfied with the Campus Senate's proposals?

### McCULLOH:

Not completely satisfied. It is only a couple of sentences that I would like to see added or altered.

### MILLER:

The present proposal represents our best thinking up to now, but it is still subject to some clarification. There are a few minor changes desirable.

### HETTLINGER:

The proposals are reasonable and, on the whole, satisfying for the present situation.

How would you define "persistent or flagrant?"

### McCULLOH:

In my opinion, a flagrant violation is the deliberate serving of minors at a party; a persistent violation, repeated instances of careless serving of minors. However, I would like to see the Senate agree on what it means.

### MILLER:

Webster's Dictionary offers a pretty good definition of the words flagrant and persistent. However, remember that the proposals are not the final word. They have yet to be enacted as law by the Senate. The Senate will solicit student as well as faculty opinion during the two

week minimum waiting period. The legislation finally adopted will mean what it says and say what it means.

### HETTLINGER:

Persistent violation I would define as the situation in which a fraternity makes no effort to regulate the drinking of minors. The flagrant violation is that which clearly indicates an intention to disregard the law. The extent to which a fraternity must go to make clear this indication can only be made specific through cases which arise in the first few months of the ruling.

What precipitated these changes?

### McCULLOH:

I imagine it was the Connecticut events.

### MILLER:

Nothing external, no outside force precipitated the action taken by the Senate. It was entirely internal—a heavy feeling of possible state intervention hanging in the air brought the College and Senate to consider the problem and offer the proposals.

### HETTLINGER:

The changes were not precipitated by any action on the part of the student body, but grew from the purpose of the Campus Senate, which is to revise and clarify existing regulations. The question was given special emphasis as a result of the problem of where responsibility actually lay.

Will these rules encourage surreptitious drinking?

### McCULLOH:

Yes.

### MILLER:

It probably will, if you mean that a student will sneak off campus with his hip flask or bottle to drink in some field. However, I fail to see why students should take this kind of attitude when we are in effect condoning drinking in the rooms and private parties in the room... as long as they don't impinge on the rights of others.

### HETTLINGER:

No, I do not think that the rules will encourage surreptitious drinking; but I do think that drinking will be done in small groups as compared to fraternity parties.

How will these new regulations be enforced?

### McCULLOH:

I suppose the man behind the bar is going to have to make

sure that the person he serves is of legal age.

### MILLER:

They will probably be enforced by the Dean of Students. Somewhere, through the actions of the Senate, the Judicial Board, and the Dean of Students, a white paper with specific punishment for specific violations will be drawn up to act as a guideline for student behavior and official enforcement.

### HETTLINGER:

As for enforcement, the College will make no attempt to put a constant check on the student body in the form of an expanded campus security system or extended College supervision. Occasional visits by the present force who will file reports on what, in their estimation constitutes flagrant and obvious violation of the regulations, will form the basis for punitive action, while consultation between the Dean and fraternity officers will allow a precautionary basis of agreement. I would compare the situation to that of a speed limit: whereas there is a posted limit which the State has found to be safe, its ruling is enforced only by the passing of an occasional patrolman. These who choose to go beyond this limit do so with full knowledge that it may become his responsibility if he is caught, even though he may very well get away with it. The State's policies concerning alcohol may be best compared to a road that is under an unyielding electronic check. Kenyon chose to take the first solution so to preserve the freedom of choice while making clear the College's recognition of existing State regulations.

Was this done in the "most democratic way possible?"

### McCULLOH:

No, and it shouldn't have been. I favor opportunity for free discussion, but free discussion alone is not democracy. If each student owned stock in the College and were equally responsible under the law for the acts of the College, then a real democracy would be possible.

### MILLER:

Yes, I think so. The Senate fairly represents the students through its communication with the Student Council. Student opinion will certainly be sought before the final revision of the proposal will be enacted.

### HETTLINGER:

Yes, I feel that the proposal was handled as democratically as on any campus; I attribute dissatisfaction with the system to a lack of communication between the Senate and the student body.

Are you satisfied with the Campus Senate's proposals?

### WORTMAN:

This is the best we've come up with. We are open to other suggestions, but we have spent a good deal of time and we couldn't find anything more practical than what we have.

### KLUG:

By definition of fraternity responsibilities and individual responsibilities, I am. I am very confident that the fraternity system will cope with the situation. I think most people will cooperate...

### ZUYDHOEK:

I think they were designed to protect the college, and I think they will.

Turn to page 6, col. 3





Rosse Hall festivities command standing room only

From page 5

## Senate Attempts to Cut Through Verbiage

How would you define "flagrant or persistent?"

**WORTMAN:**

For fraternity functions, flagrant to me means an absolute disregard of the State law — no attempt to abide with it. Persistent violation signifies that some attempt was made to enforce the law, but that it wasn't at all effective. If, after being brought to the attention of the Dean or the Judicial Board, and after consultation with the fraternity involved, the law continues to be disregarded—that would be a persistent violation.

**KLUG:**

Well, I suppose we could use Webster's Dictionary. The rules are somewhat vague and meant to be this way.

**ZUYDHOEK:**

Drinking in immoderation, losing control of yourself, becoming irresponsible for your date and yourself.

What precipitated these changes?

**WORTMAN:**

We first considered it in the Senate last year. Finding a change in the present system necessary, the Senate found that fraternities were the social basis of the college. This brought about the "fraternity responsibility" clause.

But this has not been a sudden decision. I think it has been in the minds of the administration for many years but they've lacked the equipment to carry it out. Students may feel that this is a gradual process to year-by-year take privileges away from the stu-

dents. But this has never been suggested in the Senate.

We wouldn't want to dry up the campus, only to have drinking anyway. That would be hypocritical. Hopefully we can work under the present proposals, but a lot depends on the responsibility displayed by the fraternities. If the law is disregarded changes will have to be made.

**KLUG:**

Several points were brought out in the rules as they were handed out. I think its just more concern over minors drinking. The Senate is well aware of the problems . . . it's a body that can go over these problems and work them out rationally.

**ZUYDHOEK:**

As it states in the rules, the College's concern over the increase of drinking and the disregard for the laws of Ohio.

Will the new rules encourage surreptitious drinking?

**WORTMAN:**

There probably might be more cases of students having liquor in their rooms—and more room parties—they might choose to do that. But I don't consider this to be surreptitious drinking, only the continuation and extension of a present practice.

**KLUG:**

Well, its hard to say "encourage." Obviously more will go on on the sly.

**ZUYDHOEK:**

It could happen, yes.

How will these new regulations be enforced?

**WORTMAN:**

I don't know.

**KLUG:**

Initially, the Dean will handle it. Persistent cases will go to the Judicial Board.

**ZUYDHOEK:**

Hopefully, the fraternities will be the overall judge. If they do not assume their responsibilities, it will go to higher authorities. It will then follow the standard procedure.

Was this done in the "most democratic way possible?"

**WORTMAN:**

We could have asked for a student referendum, but everybody is aware that the students don't want a change. That would be unrealistic—it wouldn't prove a thing. The student members of the Senate are very much aware of student opinion, but as representatives we don't think we should stand by that, necessarily. We were chosen because of our ability to look objectively at pertinent questions.

I might add that the Student Council shouldn't only object to

prosecution as long as students, fraternities, and administration co-operate to maintain the purpose set down in the Student Handbook and in most of the Senate's Jan. 18 statement. Further, co-operation has always been evident in instances where State and local authorities seek to impose discipline on offending students.

But the above-quoted sentence of the proposed item 7 contravenes the spirit of student-administration agreement on alcoholic beverages. I therefore submit that the afore mentioned sentence should be deleted from the final legislation.

Mark Houser '65

**KLUG:**

The Senate is a very representative body. Its definitely democratic. The students made a take when they voted if it

**ZUYDHOEK:**

Yes, no doubt about that. Senate solicits the opinion of IFC and the Council. I don't know how anyone could possibly consider it non-democratic.

Messrs. Wortman, Klug, Zuydhoek are the popularly elected student representatives of the Campus Senate.

Comments by President in answer to questions posed by the Collegian.

Are you satisfied with the Campus Senate's proposals?

**LUND:**

Yes, I am and I think the present the minimum change our regulation that is under the law.

How would you define "flagrant or persistent?"

**LUND:**

Let's recognize candidly both refer to drunkenness abuse. In determining abuse must consider the mores and traditions of the school. It is able to define in legal terms can be no sudden wrench our system. Definition of the be by the Judicial Board. don't expect the Judicial Board to discontinue its previous practice of distinguishing the isolation fence from the habitual offense.

What precipitated these changes?

**LUND:**

Growing uneasiness on the part of the administration for the two years. It had not been assumed that the College was growing national sensitive to this problem led us to seek advice. Alumni, friends of the College, and faculty were easy about this.

How will these new regulations be enforced?

**LUND:**

As far as I know, there are changes other than those listed in the Campus Senate statement. There will be checks to see if a person is minor or not. There will be crackdown in the sense of down. I am not aware of any more penalties. Maybe more can be turned in that were considered "borderline" before.

Was this done in the most democratic way possible?

**LUND:**

Yes, I don't know any other way to do it. We operate under a system of representative government with a constitution. The process proceeded with careful consultation and deliberation. Law has not been arbitrarily handed down by the administration. The Student Council and Campus Senate operate under a delegated authority given me by the Trustees and passed on through a constitution.

Does this encourage surreptitious violation?

**LUND:**

The attitude of the College is permissive. Individuals and organizations have the responsibility instead of the whole community. We hope to protect this

## More Letters; Sant, Houser, Oppose Changes

pect their word to count, are antipathetic when they discover that their word does not count, when the administration so deems. The administration after all, is running Kenyon.

The administration is eager to avoid the debacle at Trinity, where student morale sagged because of a Kafka-esque decree from on high. But in so avoiding that extreme, they should avoid the other, which is to pretend that we are one big happy democratic family (community) in which everyone has a vote. The administration ought not to conceal the fact that they are running the show; they ought to stress it. This is an autocracy, to be sure; the administration ought to stress the fact that they are a benevolent autocracy. This would avoid lots of confusion among students about their role here; it would dissipate distrust (for after all, you don't distrust an autocrat, you hope he treats you fairly.)

Students are here to learn, faculty to teach, administration to run the show. Let us not pretend otherwise. Insofar as the administration asks our opinion, we should be careful that those we elect to give it truly represent our opinion.

Carl Mankowitz '66

To the Editor:

I think it is safe to say an overwhelming majority of social activity at Kenyon is centered about our eleven fraternities. The existing system is as strong as it is because most fraternities welcome people from the entire student body to every party, giving the whole campus a genuinely friendly atmosphere. There is not the degree of exclusiveness among fraternities here that is found at neighboring campuses.

Most everyone, students, administrators, and faculty alike, seems to be in favor of our system.

Those who have backed the new alcoholic beverage proposals, as far as I can see, are undermining just the things that are so favorable in the Kenyon fraternity set-up. No longer will individual fraternities want to take responsibility for members of other groups, simply because of the complexity involved with members. Since it will much easier keep track of a fraternity's own members at a party, it will follow that parties will be closed. Individual fraternities will become exclusive, and the beauty of the Kenyon social system will have disappeared. I would hate to see one of Kenyon's last good "things" disappear. That is why I am opposed to "Regulations Governing Alcoholic Beverages at Kenyon."

Thomas R. Sant '65

To the Editor:

In the Student Handbook both the statement adopted by the Senate on May 13, 1964 and the subsequent sections on Conduct and on Alcohol clearly indicate a unity of purpose. This purpose is declared incompatible with "imposed conformity" but is recognized as in accordance with promoting "basic standards of gentlemanly behavior", "moderate use of alcoholic beverages", and "socially responsible conduct."

In most aspects this purpose is affirmed by the Senate's Jan. 18, 1965 statement on Alcoholic Beverages. That the fraternities and members of the College should discipline themselves, and that the administration and Judicial Board should intervene in absence of such discipline is beyond question.

I call your attention to the last sentence of the first paragraph of the proposed item 7:

"Any persistent or flagrant violation of the law by a fraternity will result in action by the College, even if State authorities are not involved."

This sentence speaks not of moderation nor of gentlemanly conduct. Rather, it addresses itself to Ohio State Law and admits that the administration will assume a police function. It requires that the administration adopt "imposed conformity". The above sentence, if adopted, could have the following consequences:

1. At all social functions save Rush parties, fraternities may serve only 3.2 beer to those members under 21, but may serve liquor to members over 21. Not only would such a ruling lead to fraternity dissension, but it may endanger the existence of fraternities at Kenyon.
2. Since fraternities are composed largely of members under 21, actual "acquisition" of liquor may be punished by the administration.
3. In violation of Kenyon tradition and spirit, the administration could prohibit open parties or "going around the Hill" unless non-alcoholic beverages only were served. At a party serving liquor, the bartender, if one could be obtained, could not be expected to know the ages of people outside the immediate fraternity. The many independents could incur great social restrictions.

Now, as in the past, Kenyon College has enjoyed favorable relations with the state authorities. Unless definitely and specifically told otherwise, we have no reason to expect state intervention and