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\textbf{‘We’re not going to let it happen’}

\textbf{2,000 storm Admin building during alcohol demonstration}

By DAN McCULLOUGH and THOMAS SMALL
Staff Reporters

Nearly 2,000 Notre Dame students charged through the doors of the Administration Building yesterday after a rally protesting the University's new alcohol policy erupted into near-riot conditions.

Dean of Student James Roemer attempted to address the gathering from the third floor balcony of the building's rotunda, but was drowned out by jeers and shouts of the crowd.

The crowd began to assemble in front of the building at about noon, chanting slogans such as “We are not dry.” “Where is Ted?”, and “Less filling, tastes great.” Student government leaders appeared 10 minutes later and spoke to the assembly.

Student Body President Rob Bertino began, “I hope you guys are all fired up and ready to say what we feel about this alcohol policy. I’ve got it right here,” he said waving a copy of the 28-page report.

“I tell me what you guys think about it.” The crowd replied with boos and shouts.

Bertino introduced Cathy David, student body vice president. David said, “This is really something. When so many students can come together with one voice people have to listen.” She continued, “The students are tired of being talked down to. It’s time for the University to start treating us fairly.”

In her speech, David emphasized unity as the key to student action on the issue.

Next, Bertino presented Dave McAvoy, former student senator. In his speech, McAvoy said, “Today the eyes of America are now upon us. Many say we are a generation in search of a cause. I say to you we have found the cause.”

McAvoy accused the administration of slowly taking away the capacity of students to make decisions. “The administration is taking away our responsibility and with that goes our freedom,” he continued. He concluded his speech by saying, “I say we take action now.”

Chris Tayback, president of the University Senate, spoke after McAvoy. “Last night as I was walking back from D-6 (parking lot) I heard a lot of noise. So I went over to Corby Hall and I saw 1,500 students screaming. And I was glad.” He continued, “If we ever had a reason to fight, this is it.”

Tayback concluded, “Just remember, we are Notre Dame.”

Bertino took the podium next. In his speech he outlined a four-point plan for protesting the report’s recommendations. The plan calls for:

- Banners to be hung from every room on campus.
- "We want you to tell how you feel about this alcohol policy on that banner," he said.
- Petitions and letters to be sent out for signature by every student on campus. "We’re not going to just sit back and let it happen like they think. We’re going to keep pushing it," he added.
- Black arm bands to be worn at another rally next Friday, April 27. "We want every student to wear one of these arm bands on their left arm to symbolize the death of social life here at Notre Dame," said Bertino.

A Friday night candlelight vigil: "We’re going to start at the Administration Building with one candle lit. And we’re going to pass this candle around and have everybody light their candle. It will go on all throughout the quad to show the unity of the students," he explained.

see ALCOHOL, page 4
Student apathy may be over, but cause on unsure footing

Paul McGinn

Student government is on the verge of a great mistake: Student Body President Rob Bertino, in drink- ing a can of beer in front of the Administration Building yesterday, signalled the start of what might be a battle, which no students could win.

With great bravado, Bertino openly defied existing University alcohol policies in a seeming effort to stir the 2900 students gathered in front of the Dome. Such a token act of defiance, however, may have unforeseen implications.

If other students also confront administration policy with disrespect, not firm commitments to drink responsi- bly, undoubtedly they will lose.

Notre Dame administrators, protected by many jour- nalists who virtually idolize President Father Theodore Hesburgh, are ably armed to counter any such "polices of disrespect."

It would take only one statement to the press from Hesburgh to convince the nation that Notre Dame stu- dents are no more than spoiled brats and that ad- ministrators are selfless sur- rage parents worried that students might turn into al- coholics.

Media have grabbed the confrontation by its bottle neck — all three local television stations carried reports on the storming of the Dome.

The coverage was not ex- actly complimentary to the students' cause. But, then again, why should it be? After all, Notre Dame's last protest was over Cap'n Crunch cereal.

Though many students would like to think that their lar- ge Saturday evening building telecasts at Columbia University in April 1968, most of Michiana saw a bunch of children whining for a supposed right to get drunk.

While students of Columbia may not have been all that altruistic in their opposition to the Vietnam War (their own lives were at stake), they were protesting a policy infinitely more serious than an alcohol directive.

Assuming student leaders can salvage their image as responsible negotiators, they might do well to follow a few tips:

• Students should avoid expressions which only incite students but which display a less than reflective at- titude about the issue.
• Bertino, Student Body Vice President Cathy David, former Student Senator Brad Mckown and others who make speeches should not rely on slogans or jingles, but upon the actual implications of the alcohol policy.

Demonstrators, students, likewice, should shout "Let's get drunk!" or drinking in public. Nei- ther goal is the last issue of the newspaper before Easter Break.

The Observer will resume on Wednesday, April 25.

This special edition of The Observer is the last issue of the newspaper before Easter Break.

Publication will resume on

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
Happy Hour 3-8
Mixed Drinks 2 for 1
Irish Schuldt R2
Sign-ups for Corby Open Golf Tourney

The U.S. military is on the verge of a great mistake: Student Body President Rob Bertino, in drinking a can of beer in front of the Administration Building yesterday, signaled the start of what might be a debate which no students could win.

With great bravado, Bertino openly defied existing University alcohol policies in a seeming effort to stir the 2900 students gathered in front of the Dome. Such a token act of defiance, however, may have unforeseen implications.

If other students also confront administration policy with disrespect, not firm commitments to drink responsibly, undoubtedly they will lose.

Notre Dame administrators, protected by many journalists who virtually idolize President Father Theodore Hesburgh, are ably armed to counter any such "polices of disrespect."

It would take only one statement to the press from Hesburgh to convince the nation that Notre Dame stu- dents are no more than spoiled brats and that administra- tors are selfless surrogate parents worried that students might turn into alcoholics.

Media have grabbed the confrontation by its bottle neck — all three local television stations carried reports on the storming of the Dome.

The coverage was not ex- actly complimentary to the students' cause. But, then again, why should it be? After all, Notre Dame's last protest was over Cap'n Crunch cereal.

Though many students would like to think that their lar- ge Saturday evening building telecasts at Columbia University in April 1968, most of Michiana saw a bunch of children whining for a supposed right to get drunk.

While students of Columbia may not have been all that altruistic in their opposition to the Vietnam War (their own lives were at stake), they were protesting a policy infinitely more serious than an alcohol directive.

Assuming student leaders can salvage their image as responsible negotiators, they might do well to follow a few tips:

• Students should avoid expressions which only incite students but which display a less than reflective at- titude about the issue.
• Bertino, Student Body Vice President Cathy David, former Student Senator Brad McKown and others who make speeches should not rely on slogans or jingles, but upon the actual implications of the alcohol policy.

Demonstrators, students, likewice, should shout "Let's get drunk!" or drinking in public. Neither goal is
The protests are for more than just beer

Dean of Students James Roemer thinks Notre Dame students have a "sense of humor." What a great joke... demonstrating in the Administration Building on campus by painting醪" ההתבגרות" on the name plates. But isn't it a bit annoying matter. Convincing everyone else of that fact will be the most difficult task we'll face.

The first battle was won yesterday at the Administration Building. Local and national media have awakened the student protest movement in protest, and those working in the normally staid Dome found it hard to ignore the shouts of more than 2,000 angry students. The point was made --- the alcohol policy is a bad policy and will not die.

The yelling, the shouting and the demonstrations are coming from a student body that is tired and finally has risen to say, "Enough." Crackdowns in all areas of student life have made a mockery of the administration's "cafeteria style" of "responsible living." Does every new rule really help preserve the Catholic nature of this place? We see such reasoning as quite lame.

Yet, after watching the news coverage yesterday, we are concerned that many people will perceive this issue as merely a fight for Michelob, whiskey and gin. Beer cans hoisted high above the crowd made for great television shots, but they also helped to downplay the real reason for the protest.

The issue is not purely the right to drink alcohol on campus. The issue is here a social life that depends so much on alcohol that it will die without it. We are not trying to convince the administration that Notre Dame will be a very boring place to live.

The alcohol committee has put the cart before the horse by cutting off alcohol-based socializing before providing any alternatives. The momentum while making sure that the cause is true. Do not be placated by changes designed to resemble major concessions, such as allowing bars or larger groups in rooms.

The protest itself is moved, and the sooner the administration realizes that the protests are not about cans of Stroh's, the sooner the two sides can work out a solution. -- The Observer

P. O. Box Q

Deprived a choice

Dear Editor:

We simply is something which cannot be dictated. It must be acquired by those who desire it.

When I came here last fall, I had the opportunity to acquire my own morality. I was free to make my own decision concerning drinking. I chose, of my own free will, not to drink. Making my decision in this manner makes my character much more true to God than to any decision for me. I really wonder if that same will hold for those future students, who will be deprived a choice.

We have been robbed of our civil rights. Forbidden is the rule which limits the number of persons we will be permitted to have in our residence hall rooms. Forbidden is the rule that we may not consume alcohol or not! Such a rule is an abomination.

Let's face it, the social life is not fit for humans. There are only two non-studying activities from which one can choose on the weekends. The first is the alcohol policy which eliminates the alcohol policy eliminated. The second is the event that person will be of great assistance. Rather than dwelling passively on the problems here, like this absurd alcohol policy, fight what you don't like, what you think is right! It is no more deviant as it is the right thing to do, and you are a member of this community. And if the problems remain, then remember the good things about Notre Dame, especially the students here. The administration and its alcohol policy are not Notre Dame. We are Notre Dame and we do not "suck."

Diane Tyler Junior

Solidarity forever

Dear Editor:

Hooray, Notre Dame students have finally done it. Yes, they have finally shed the placid image and rebelled against the patriarchal authority of the administration. It's good to know that the students have joined hands for such a noble cause.

Never mind the injustice of South Africa apartheid or the precariously nature of the escalating nuclear arms race or even the simple injustice of starving Appian kids. Somehow these issues don't seem real to the average Notre Dame student - they, after all, don't directly affect them.

But alcohol, damnit, that's something to get riled up about. Hang the posters, christen the cameras. Indeed, show the authorities - Invite the media to our protests, shuttle in the protesters to your jocks. Send the cameras. The picture: students in a show of "rationality" and "solidarity."

The first signs of this basic policy-making maneuver appeared in the April 16th issue of The Observer, in a statement by Dean of Student Peace Officers James Roemer who said the administration is willing to negotiate on some points (all mine).

The message: Don't let yourself be intoxicated by minor victories over insignificant issues which the administration has instructed into the alcohol policy as a distraction. Unfortunately, that's the truth. But the administration is more afraid of damaging its reputation as a rational, concerned body of adults and they will do their best to place the burden of irrationality on the "heat-headed" student body. They will tell (and more importantly, they will tell the press) that they are willing to give a little if the students will give the students will give a little as well.

So let's haggle a little. The administration wants to make policy implemented in toto, and we? Well, we want every right we have now. The administration has done is the best interests of everyone involved. How wrong they are.

-Diane Tyler

Don't be intoxicated

Dear Editor:

In Monty Python's "Life of Brian," there is a scene in which Brian, in a frenzied attempt to escape the Roman centurians, stops at a stall to buy a fake beard. The proprietor refuses to sell Brian the beard until Brian "haggles" with him. You know, the owner asks an outrageous, high price for the beard, and Brian is supposed to offer a ridiculously low price. Then, the two hagglers come to a compromise price where both give up a little. Originally, the centurion is to be lidricted for the beard, which the person in control, the owner of the beard, always asks for much more than he really wants so that the naive buyer will feel he has won a moral victory when, in actuality, he is paying exactly what the owner originally wanted.

The administration is not stupid. Father Beauchamp and his committee knew we would be upset by the new alcohol policy and would demand to be rescued. So, in the spirit of the ancient art of haggling, the administration has added a few ridiculous articles to the policy with the intention of convincing them in a show of "rationality" and "solidarity."

The Observer in the April 16th issue of The Observer, in a statement by Dean of Students James Roemer who said the administration is willing to negotiate on some points (all mine).

The message: Don't let yourself be intoxicated by minor victories over insignificant issues which the administration has instructed into the alcohol policy as a distraction. Unfortunately, that's the truth. But the administration is more afraid of damaging its reputation as a rational, concerned body of adults and they will do their best to place the burden of irrationality on the "heat-headed" student body. They will tell (and more importantly, they will tell the press) that they are willing to give a little if the students will give a little as well.

So let's haggle a little. The administration wants to make policy implemented in toto, and we? Well, we want every right we have now. The administration has done is the best interests of everyone involved. How wrong they are.

-Diane Tyler

How wrong they are

Dear Editor:

I would like to publicly congratulate the administration for successfully sweeping the alcohol problem under the proverbial carpet. By restricting drinking to the extent that they have done, they have superficially "restored" the pristine image of Notre Dame.

The problem has not been eliminated. In fact, the administration is putting on a social life. The "social drinker" with no problem can now look forward to imbibing behind closed doors, indiscreetly, from the true alcoholic. The truth is the students will continue to drink, and the administration sees this type of statement as a threat rather than the reality that it is. I think it is noble for Fr. Beauchamp and the Board of Trustees to try to cure a society-wide problem by restricting alcohol use on this campus, but because the problem permeates society at all levels it is unrealisitcal. The blatant hypocrisy of the administration is that they call us intelligent adults (most from the top 10% of our high school classes, outstanding boards, etc.), yet continue to establish rules and regulations in an authoritarian manner.

As intelligent and responsible adults it is our unalienable right to discuss such matters in the open and to have the power to affect them. The administration, however, disagrees.

The University is now safe from lawsuits stemming from alcohol-related accidents, for they have condemned and restricted drinking. But it's the time is that they have indirectly condoned both closed drinking and nighttime drinking to and from various informal parties with the intoxicated "problem drinkers" sharing the road.

The University, instead of being safe from student protest, for we have no real power. It is too easy to blame the "bad" students, and give the future alumni of Notre Dame relatable when it comes time for donations to our alma mater.

In response to outside pressures of legal liability as well as their need to see the "Notre Dame image" restored, Fr. Beauchamp et al, have effectively sidetracked the entire problem. The irony of the situation is that the administration sincerely believes that what has done is in the best interests of everyone involved. How wrong they are.

-Charles D. Borez Freshman
Beauchamp downplays protest

Yesterday’s noontime alcohol policy protest at the Administration Building drew mixed reactions from administrators.

Father William Beauchamp, chairman of the alcohol committee, said the protest had no constructive purpose and exhibited a "herd mentality." Beauchamp, who was in a meeting during the protest, said he had heard reports of the controversy’s raucous and indoor demonstration, but did not anticipate students trashing the Administration Building.

Officials had expected some student representation, but Beauchamp and other administrators were unprepared for the contingencies.

"I’m not sure what the students expect from the rallies except voicing their disagreement," Beauchamp said.

According to Beauchamp, the policy recommended by the committee’s report will not change, but the directives that implement that policy can be discussed.

Dean of Students James Roemer, who made an appearance at the protest, said he was very willing to listen about the directives. "We’d be glad to meet with any small group. There is absolutely no way to communicate with a large group like that," he said, referring to yesterday’s protest.

Roemer characterized the rally on the front steps as "an impressive number and an impressive display of students. They handled themselves well." He expressed concern that the students had moved inside the building and said that was the reason he spoke to the crowd.

"A lot of emotional issues can be resolved at least partially, I said," said Roemer. "I don’t mean to imply anybody is going away from the committee’s report." Roemer urged student groups to approach him with proposals to modify the directives.

Father David Tyson, a member of the alcohol committee, also indicated that the committee policy would not change. "But no appeal doesn’t mean that it can’t be discussed," said Tyson.

No one on the committee is adverse to talking with students. I do think it’s better done in small groups," Roemer said.

He characterized yesterday’s noontime protest as "not vindictive or nasty. It is the expression of strong disagreement rather than one of belligerence."

**Alcohol continued from page 1**

He concluded: "We want the opportunity to choose ourselves how we are going to direct our social lives. More than anything else, we need to know what we need. This is what we demand. And this is what we will get."

The program of speakers over, the students near the front of the steps began to chant, "Let’s go in." Soon the group began to move up the stairs and through the tall oak doors of the Administration Building. Cathy David, said this action was not planned by the rally organizers.

The protesters quickly filled the top three levels of the building. Ripped copies of the alcohol report and other papers were dropped from the upper levels to the rotunda floor. Cans of beer crashed to the floor from above and shouts and chants echoed off the buildings walls. The floor sagged under the weight of the students, and office workers stepped into the corridor to see what was happening.

Roemer stepped out of his office on the third floor and went to the balcony rail. Between bursts of shouting, Roemer spoke to the crowd. "I appreciate the fact that you all had a sense of humor. May I say one thing? I think one point I’d like to make is when you jump on these floors, you may find that they’re going to come down." At this point the students began jumping up and down. Roemer continued, "I suppose there’s no real ability to be able to dialogue in a group," but he was interrupted by noise.

A voice from the upper floor yelled, "Let him speak."

To this Roemer replied, "Thank you, May I say that your student government is we are planning opportunities to talk about and talk about the issues." The crowd roared, and Roemer turned and walked towards his office.

After the encounter, Roemer said, "This is the first time I’ve seen a majority of the safety in the building. When all the secretaries and people in the building, they’re quite concerned what’s happening. It becomes a little bit of a problem. You’re always worried about whether things could get out of hand in a closed situation. The part that was outside was fine, and the inside part becomes more of a concern."

When questioned about the representation of students within the committee that wrote the alcohol proposal, Roemer replied, "There’s student representation right from the beginning on the council. There were two people — people selected by you that were on the committee all the way. Now it so happens they’re saying they didn’t agree, but there was student representation all the way and there will be student involvement through the C.G. from here on out."

Director of Notre Dame Security, Glenn Terry, who attended the rally in plain clothes, said he was pleased with the outcome of the protest, saying "they’re doing what we need. If we know in advance of any protest we will have someone nearby."

He added there were no special orders and that security would operate in its usual capacity.

The crowd dispersed at 12:45 p.m.