Not going to let it happen'

More than 2,500 students gathered outside the Administration Building to protest the University's new alcohol policy. Student Body President Rob Bertino (above), one of four students to address the crowd, said, "We're not just going to sit back and let it happen." The demonstration climaxned when students stormed into the building (left) and shouted jeers from the rotunda under the Dome.
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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 assembled.

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.

"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 referred to the administration as treating students like "legal infants." She also 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 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 Hall President's Council, 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 represent 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.
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Student apathy may be over, but cause on unsure footing

Paul McGinn
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her will convince administrators or the media that stu-

dents can drink responsibly.

• Students should avoid expressions which only incite

students but which display a less than reflective at-

titude about drinking.

Bertino, Student Body Vice President Carly David,

and Vice President Dave McAvoy and others who

make speeches should not rely on slogans or jingles, but

upon the actual implications of the alcohol policy.

Demonstrating students, likewise, should shun

shouting "Let's get drunk" or drinking in public. Ne-

other goals.

To correct the disparity between the University's

media image as a defender of human rights and the ac-
nual working conditions of tax-paying, dues-paying and

dormitory employees.

To voice disagreement with University acceptance of

a composite sex at Notre Dame by promoting coeducational

proposals for the Observer. Complicate the reporting of the Observer's

student government.

To provide input to the academic process — includ

ing examination, writing and research procedures.

To advise administrators and trustees about invest-

ent policies of the University.

Whatever the outcome of the controversy, students

now realize that by coming together they can make ad-

ministrators and the public more aware. That is, in

itself, a victory.
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Dear Editor:

Moral simplicity is something which cannot be dictated. It must be acquired by those who hold their own values.

When I came here last fall, I had the opportunity to acquire my own morality. I was free to decide my own position concerning drinking. I chose, of my own will, not to drink. Making my decision in this manner makes my choice more meaningful and adds to my right decision for me. However, I really wonder if the same will hold for those future students who will be deprived a choice.

We have been robbed of many of our rights. The University is now, more than ever, trying to deprive us of a right we believe we should have. They say that alcohol is not good for you, and that because of this, you must not drink it. Such a rule is an abomination.

Let's face it, the social life is not fit for human beings. There is no place for personal growth or development. There are no places for intellectual pursuits, religious growth, or intellectual activities from which one can choose on the weekend. The only place left by which anyone can drink alcohol is Notre Dame's. 

This is a Christian institution which purports to have Christian ethics, and many of us are Christians striving to live ethically. Chris- 
tended to us love our enemies, as He loves us. The University and the administration may be our enemies right now, but wishing to bless them is an immoral contradiction of the Christian ethic which says that we should not wish well on those who have harmed us. This contradicts the teachings of our Lord, and we call ourselves Christians.

No human being has the right to take away from us or our opponents the chance to become better human beings. We must continue to use the administration's ideas on what is right, but Notre Dame does not "suck." It has many problems which are continually exaggerated by administrative policies (and the alcohol policy is just one of them), but this nation and the world are full of complex people which have problems. 

Cynicism is the number one enemy that needs to be avoided, especially now. Instead of falling prey to cynicism, fight it. Stop and reflect on the positive assets of Notre Dame and Notre Dame students. 

People who feel that they are losing your advantage. Rather than dwelling passively on the problems here, like this absurd alcohol policy, fight to change what you don't like, what you think is bad for Notre Dame. And if the problems remain, then remember the good things at Notre Dame, especially the students here. The administration and alcohol policy are not Notre Dame. We are Notre Dame and we do not "suck."

Diane Yoder
Junior

Solidarity forever

Dear Editor:

Hooray, Notre Dame students have finally done it. Yes, they have finally shown that abstract political place and image and rebelled against the patriarchal authority of the administration. It's over. We got the lackey who[c] the students have joined hands for such a noble cause.

Never mind the injustice of South African apartheid or the preoccupations of the escalating nuclear arms race or even the simple inhumanity of starving Appalachi kids. Somehow these issues don't seem real to the average Notre Dame student — they, after all, don't directly affect him.

But alcohol, dammit, is something that gets riled up about. Hang the posters, chisel the rails, hooten the rhetoric and raise almighty hell! The administration can take away our senior exemptions, threaten to close down our housing, and expel naughtiness students for breaking paroles. But try to curb our alcohol consumption — never!

The rights of the Notre Dame student are in peril. Join hands with your neighbor in alcohol solidarity. Burn your bras women, refuse to set foot in your jocks. Show the administration a signal they will never forget. Inside the media to our processes to the camera. Indeed, show the authorities the show the world — that what really matters to the Notre Dame student of the '80s is the most important issue of alcohol.

Peter A. Graham
Senior

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 centurion, 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 in outrageous high price for the beard, and Brian is supposed to offer a ridiculous low price. Then, the two hagglers come to some compromise price where both give up a little. Each person is then pleased with the bargain. For the person in control, the owner of the beard, will always ask 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.

If the administration is not stupid, Father Beauchamp and his committee knew we would be upset by the new alcohol policy and would demand it be rescinded. In the spirit of the ancient art of haggling, the administration has added a few ridiculous articles to the policy with the intention of concealing them in a shroud of "rationality" and "benevolence."

The first signs of this basic policy-making maneuver appeared in the April 18th 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 minor).

The message, Don't let yourself be intimidated by small victories over insignificant issues which the administration has inserted into the alcohol policy as a strategy. Remember, too, that the administration is most 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 "hostile" student body. They will do it (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 split the policy implemented in toto, and they want every right we have now, plus the legalization of kegs on campus. Be in no doubt, Father. Who knows, we may even give in on the few.

Philip Allen
Junior

How wrong they are

Dear Editor:

I would like to publicly congratulate the administration for successfully swamping the alcohol problem under the pavement gravel. By restricting drinking to the extent that they have done, they have superficially "restored" the positive image of Notre Dame.

The problem has not been eliminated. In fact, there is a problem now with students referred to as the "social drinkers" with no problem can now look forward to imbibing behind closed doors, indistinguishable from the true alcohol. The truth is the students will continue to drink, but the administration sees this type of statement as a threat rather than as the reality that it is. I think it is noble for P. Reambechamp and the Board of Trustees to try to create a worthy solution to the alcohol use on this campus but the problem persists society at all levels it is unrealistic. The blatant hypocrisy of the administration is that they call us intelligent adults (most from the top 10% of our high school classes, outstanding individuals, etc.) yet continue to establish rules and regulations in an authoritarian manner.

As intelligent and responsible adults 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 to the extent that they have done, that they have indirectly condoned both closed drinking and night-time driving to and from off-campus parties with the intoxicated "problem drinkers" sharing the road.

The University is now safe from student protest, for we have no real power. It will be the future of Notre Dame that will make the future alumni of Notre Dame realize 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, P. Reambechamp et al., have effectively sidestepped the entire problem. The irony of the situation is that the administration sincerely believes that what it has done is in the best interests of everyone involved. Their own.

Charles D. Borez
Freshman

P. O. Box Q

Dear Editor:
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The problem is 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 and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . . demonstrating in the Administration Building and chanting clever phrases. But to us, it's a great joke . . .
Beauchamp downplays protest

COMPILED BY OBSERVER STAFF REPORTERS

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 "certain mentality." Beauchamp was in a meeting during the protest, said he had heard reports of the outdoor and indoor demonstration, but did not "anticipate students trashing the Administration Building.

Officials had expected some student response but Beauchamp questioned student motives. "I'm not really sure what the students expect (from the rallies) except voicing their disapproval."

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 is very willing to talk about the directives. "I'd be glad to meet with any small groups. 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," said Roemer. "I don't mean to imply anybody is going to back off from the committee's report." Roemer urged student groups to approach him with proposals to modify the directives.

Father 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," he characterized yesterday's protest as "not vindictive" and said this isn't an issue of strong disagreement rather than one of hysteria.

Alcohol

continued from page 1

He concluded, "We want the opposition to alcohol. We are going to direct our social life away from the bar. This is what we need. This is what we will demand. And this is what we will get." The program of speakers over the students near the front 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 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 while 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, we are planning opportunities to talk about the issues."

The crowd moved to the front steps and Roemer turned and walked towards his office.

After the encounter, Roemer said, "This last part is a little bit of a concern because of the safety of the building. When all the secretaries and people in the building, they're quite concerned about what's happening. It becomes a little bit of a problem. You're not concerned about whether things could get out of hand in a closed situation. The part that was outside was fine and the inside part became 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 on the board from the beginning on the council. There were two secretaries, people elected by you that were on the committee all the way. Now it so happens they're saying the voter's 'speak my mind.' But there was student representation all the way and there will be student involvement through the CFC from here on in."

Director of Notre Dame Security Glenn Terry, who attended the rally in plain clothes, said all security officers were stationed and two bottles of liquor at the rally. He commented, "We'll be shocked if we're not. They feel we are needed. If we know in advance of any protest we will have some security deployment."

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

The crowd dispersed at 12:45 p.m.