

Condie should prevent segregation, intrusion

Dr. James Condie, the director of University Housing, is once again the center of controversy. Or rather two controversies: one over the movement of the International Student Center from Carr to Ruffin Dormitory, and the other over a proposed room consolidation in order to make more efficient use of university housing space.

1. The first has been a chronic problem at UNC, but one that was aggravated last spring when Condie's own housing office took over the ground floor of Carr dorm for use as office space. Last week, in a commendable effort to improve ISC conditions, Ruffin dorm was designated as the new home of the ISC. But Ruffin residents have recently mounted a campaign to stop, or at least delay, their eviction next year from "their" dorm. They claim a special fraternal spirit, good intramural sport teams, and a new TV and ice-maker as their reasons not to move.

We support Condie's decision to grant higher priority to the ISC. International students are guests of the university and deserve at least equal treatment from the hands of housing officials. They have been denied comparable facilities for too long.

Ruffin was as good a choice as any for the move because the displaced American students can move to one of the three adjoining mirror-image dorms (Manly, Grimes, or Mangum), or break down and live with a foreign student if they simply must stay in Ruffin. After a housing contract expires, students have no right to any particular room or dormitory. If, however, it would ease the pain of transfer, they should perhaps be allowed to take their ice-maker or their TV with them. And if some dorm residents are really so very close, they should be allowed to move *en masse* to another dorm.

The weakness of Condie's decision is in the fact that the first floor of Ruffin will be for handicapped students,

the second for foreign women, and the third and fourth for international men. One might as well reserve the attic for left-handed Americans of Serbian descent. The present plan will give Ruffin the stigma of a home for the physically, socially, or verbally handicapped.

Disabled students, like international students, need the freedom to live together if they wish, but also to have access to the facilities available to "normal" students. The university has learned to eliminate one kind of housing segregation, it must not institute another.

2. Condie was right again in his room consolidation plan. The 76 dorm students whose roommates moved out last semester and who didn't find replacements should a) have to find replacements, b) pay an additional fee for the space they are using, or c) move in with each other. Condie is correct to assert the principle that no student should have more dorm space than any other without paying for it. In this case, Condie is only trying to guarantee our own equality.

But Condie proposes that the vacated rooms be rented out to visiting students, alumni, or public health groups in order to pick up some additional revenue. This policy seems to conflict, however, with the strict university rule which even prevents graduate students from living in undergraduate housing. The unpleasant Mike O'Neal controversy of last semester should make administrators think twice before renting out rooms to old alumni or patients from a health clinic.

In conclusion, students of all nationalities and physical abilities should be free to live in any dorm normally set aside for their gender, or for co-ed living, as long as they are living efficiently in that space, i.e. paying the price of the services rendered. Non-students do not have these rights, however, and if, in the spring, there is extra space available it should be on designated floors or wings of dorms. We must guarantee our freedom, equality, and efficiency within the dorms, as well as the lack of interference and confusion from without.



'JUST A TEMPORARY ARMS-HALT, O, EXALTED ONE... UNTIL I CAN CONVINCE THE CONGRESS OF YOUR MURDEROUS GOOD INTENTIONS!'

Gerald Unks

Neatness + nice game = 'A'

When you send your little Jack or Jill off to school, you probably expect he or she will rise or fall on the basis of his intellect or some other academic-related behavior, such as his classroom conduct. This is a reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, most of our schools and teachers are unreasonable. Expect little logic in their actions.

Let's begin with personal appearance. That is hardly related to academic success — or is it? It is frightening, but true, that marks received by a younger child are positively related to his personal appearance. The more attractive the kid, the higher the marks he receives. The researcher who conducted this grim study concluded that many teachers seem to infer that because a child is attractive, he is also smart. He is treated accordingly and receives higher grades. How's that for dubious psychology and educational malpractice?

Can you imagine a less achievement-related factor than your first name? Well, never underestimate the ability of some of America's school teachers to unite the unrelated. A recent study indicates that your name has a good deal to do with your grades. If your name is Max, Homer or Mable, you are more likely to receive lower grades than David, Steven and Pattie.

The tragedy of this face and name game is that, in a self-fulfilling prophecy, students tend to perform as they perceive their teachers expect them to behave. Further, they develop an early conception of themselves as learners. If they start out believing they are less than good, the pattern is likely to stay with them throughout their entire school career. The obverse seems to be equally true.

Let's return to Jack and Jill. In the



rhyme they get essentially equal treatment. How about in out schools? Guess again. Sociologist Patricia Sexton indicts the schools for a pack of sexist activities — most of them aimed at the boys.

Her analysis goes something like this: A culture socializes its males and females in quite different manners. In America, Jills are brought up to be docile, quiet, submissive, neat and polite. "Sugar and spice and everything nice." Jacks get the "rats and snails and puppydog tails" treatment. They are expected to be rambunctious, down at the heels, aggressive and boisterous. These are ideal typicals, and Sexton places no valuation on the roles. She also notes that many children differ from the ideal role she describes, a role learned very early in life and reinforced

often. Nonetheless, take a look at our schools... if you can stand the sight. What sort of behavior do they reward? Docile or aggressive? Quiet or boisterous? Polite or assertive? Is it accidental that little girls receive higher marks than little boys? Is it mere chance that most "discipline problems" are males? Probably not.

A little boy often succeeds in school to the extent that he can adopt the overt behavior of a little girl. He must stifle behaviors he has learned as he grew up and was socialized to our society's male role. But that is only half the battle he faces. During recess or after school, he must switch back to his natural, socially dictated behavior. After all, would you want your little boy to behave outside the classroom the way he is expected to act inside its walls? If he did, would you wonder whether you had a flowering flag for a son?

This switchie-change game is hardly psychologically beneficial. Yet our schools demand a singular set of behaviors — most of which are overtly female, according to Sexton's role definition. Is it just an accident that three-quarters of all underachieving students are male? That is, they are learning at a rate well below what can reasonably be expected of them. No, the school system and unbending, witless teachers have rigged it to produce such gruesome data.

Soon you will turn your precious little six-year-old over to the tender mercies of Miss Carriage. Let's hope the child is a beautiful girl named Elizabeth.

© 1975 — Gerald Unks

Gerald Unks is an associate professor in the School of Education.

Tim Murphy

Doin' the 'Condie shuffle'

King Condie has done it again. With a cry of "head 'em up and move 'em out," Dr. Condie has devised a scheme to "consolidate" Hinton James residents. It all sounds nice on paper. But beyond the facade, the proposal is deficient for several reasons.

First, the proposal is blatantly inequitable. The ultimatum served on affected residents asks that they either a) cough up an extra \$70-80, b) find themselves a roommate, or c) move out. The proposal is unfair in its own right. But the inequity is compounded by the incomprehensible timing of the measure. Had King Condie and his klan unveiled this scheme in say, December, students would have been afforded the time to consider the alternatives and act on them. But instead the plan was sprung only last week. It is hard to find extra cash, especially \$80 worth, after the semester's expenses have begun. It is equally hard to find anyone needing a room. And it is disruptive to move. The proposal is unfair.

Second, the proposal is inconsistent with the avowed philosophy of the Department of Residence Life. The profuse propaganda that spews forth from Residence Life, via their "room to live" booklets and other material, constantly stresses that dorm life is a living-learning experience, a significant social encounter. Yet by this consolidation plan, Condie and Klan treat students as if they were only so many pawns on a vast bureaucratic chess board. Their actions belie their words. Residents are not really human beings involved in a "living-learning" experience at all. They are just red ink on the bureaucratic ledger.

Third, the proposal is economically dubious. The maximum revenue to be generated by allotting the School of Public Health 30 spaces in dorms would be \$6,000 — less than 3.6 per cent of our \$170,000 deficit from fuel increases. Is a minuscule 3.6 per cent contribution to eradicating our debt worth the human price involved? Even if we cannot do without the \$6,000 how does King Condie intend to reconcile

the fact that graduate students will be plopped into an exclusively undergraduate dormitory? When the intangible human costs are compared to the scrawny financial benefits this proposal would generate, the illogic of the scheme becomes obvious. Dr. Condie needs to lay his economic cards out on the table — even the ones up to his sleeve.

Fourth, the proposal is deficient because it seeks to remedy a situation that housing officials, through their own errors, have allowed to happen. If single rooms are the financial danger they are portrayed to be, why did housing officials allow some residents to transfer into other dorms or move out in the first place? And why did they allow the situation to persist for, in some cases, five months before plotting this "solution"? The wheels of bureaucracy move slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine.

And finally, the proposal aggravates still further the vast credibility gap King Condie and klan have created. Last spring we were told there were far too many applicants for UNC's spartan, overpriced dormitories. Now we are told of a plethora of half-empty rooms. We were told Residence Life is concerned with the personal growth and development of its residents. Now we see students capriciously shifted across campus like so many pawns, all to make a nearly imperceptible dent in a deficit. And all this is touted as being "for the sake of everyone." No wonder disbelief runs high.

But beyond all this wrangling over arguments is the fact, pure and simple, that this scheme will hurt people. Suitemates will be ripped away from their friends, and will be shunted off to some other room, all so that affluent and prosperous UNC can pick up an extra 200 bucks. The intangible, yet significant, violence King Condie's plan does to the social fabric far outweighs a 3.6 per cent reduction in the deficit. The King and his klan should reconsider.

Tim Murphy is a junior history/education major from Charlotte.

Rorin Platt

Western civilization is eroded by secularism

Amidst the present Age of Apostasy, one can still find remnants of the distinction between the sacred and the profane. I happen to have stumbled upon such fortune at the Newman Center several evenings ago. A Mass of the Holy Spirit was sung in Latin with the help of the Early Music Ensemble.

A disinterested observer might, in his bewilderment, wonder why the Mass would be said in Latin instead of in English. The motivation for such an "innovation" remains unknown to this writer. But I welcome such "innovation" in the name of a decaying civilization that is devoid of beauty and mystery, and full of the cheapening effects of secularism. It is this secularizing influence coupled with the effects of radical theology, which led the greatest institutionalized symbol of Western civilization, the Roman Catholic Church, to discard the Tridentine Mass of Pope Pius V and substitute the Latin for the vernacular (parts of the Mass were also altered), thus keeping droves of spiritually hungry Catholics away from their Sunday obligation.

Only the most primitive mind could fail to acknowledge the eternal beauty, the mystifying sanctity of the Gregorian

Chant which has been the official liturgical music of the Roman Catholic Church since the 6th century, A.D. Only the most incompetent analyst of historical mindedness could deny that the Roman Mass — the essence of Catholicism — transcends all Western faiths in its effect upon Western civilization. The avalanche of classic literature, art, music and philosophy derived from the fertile fields of Western Christendom was molded by the same institution from which entire nations would structure their codes of morality and societal forms. Having such a great impact upon a common heritage, men of all faiths must share in the tragedy befallen an entire culture — the demise of the Latin rite.

Perhaps such tragedy as this vulgar vernacularization of the Mass is symptomatic of our decadent 20th century society. If unborn children can be legally murdered then surely the liturgical prescriptions of the *Novus Ordo Missae* are in order. Interestingly enough, in both cases a widespread popular demand for such tragic "reforms" was limited to a minuscule minority. Abortion was sanctioned by a court of Caesars ruling in splended

isolation of Divine Law. The new Mass was the creation of a powerful elite which sought to partially free itself from the Vatican. While Pope Paul's attempt to make the liturgy more intelligible to modern man has made man more unintelligible, the Supreme Court's abortion decision which was intended to make the law more humane, has instead made society more inhuman.

Today's preoccupation with "revelance" and "informality" in the sanctuary and classroom has developed into a nihilistic attitude which rejects all traditions, established institutions and respect for authority. The young are being instructed in the arts of sexual and social permissiveness which cannot co-exist with the precepts of the Judeo-Christian heritage. Did this dismantling of the very fabric of our society begin with the substitution of "Thou" for "You" and "Holy Ghost" for "Holy Spirit"? Has the present emphasis on humanistic celebration of divine worship left the worshiper without the traditional awe of the Supernatural?

The spirit of this "progressive era," so solidly embodied in the Playboy Philosophy and relativist morality, is

one of "anything goes as long as no one is hurt." Well, the entire spectrum of Western civilization is at stake in this war against militant atheism and materialism and to say that the reform of the law decade have undermined the reassuring values and traditions of our common culture is a gross understatement. Today, people seem alienated from their roots, lost in a sea of sweeping change and unable to cling to a common unity. The drop in attendance at Sunday Mass from 71 per cent to 50 per cent in the last decade illustrates this point among the Catholic populace. Catholics can no longer view the central celebration of their faith — the Mass — with the same warmth and attachment that existed before the *Novus Ordo*.

The eminent Catholic scholar, James Hitchcock, explained this profound sense of loss and uncertainty when he wrote that "the Latin is so close to the Church's liturgical and theological well-springs that its abandonment has left many people badly out of touch with their traditions."

A sense of the sacred is lacking not only in the Catholic Mass, but in our society, our communities, our homes,

our world. The warmth, beauty, mystery and sense of belonging emanating from the Gregorian Chant are universal blessings which men of all faiths can appreciate. If men of all religious persuasions could feel this unifying experience, then perhaps the sense of sacredness we all so desperately need could translate itself into one of being, not becoming. The dignity and simple nobility of the Latin Mass is not a sectarian possession of the Catholic Church or of a dying era. It is instead symbolic of this sacredness of life

hidden in a world presently corrupted by the sins of mankind.

While Caesars have been dethroned and entire nations destroyed, the Mass of Pius V and the music of the Great Masters have persevered. If the Tridentine Mass can no longer remain within the realm of Western civilization, what hope is there for the classic treasures of Bach and Mozart?

Rorin Platt is a junior political science major from Greensboro.

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak Editors

David Ennis, Associate Editor
Lu Ann Jones, Associate Editor
David Klinger, News Editor
Alan Murray, Features Editor
Susan Shackelford, Sports Editor
Gene Johnson, Wire Editor
Martha Stevens, Head Photographer
Jim Grimsley, Night Editor