

## Dorm life: it's what you make it

Gail Kasun  
News Editor

"Door propping will result in judicial charges."

So the misspelled sign in one residence hall reads. Chastised by poorly spelled signs, what is a resident to do?

While with Tucker Page, my friend who resides in this hall, we decided to fulfill what he felt was his duty by circling and correcting the errors on the computer-printed sign. A sign of maturity, perhaps?

Maturity and immaturity. Sometimes I feel my identity in this area hangs in the balance, pending on my life in my, to be politically correct, residence hall. There, I've said it both politically and correctly, but for all practical purposes and ease on the reader, I'll call it a dorm.

Hmm. Dorms. Let's look at Shore Hall. It confuses its residents with two signs proclaiming different quiet hours. The hand-made sign has earlier hours, while the computer-printed one has later hours.

I fear trusting computer-printed signs now after my encounter with several misspelled ones in English. But if I should follow it and be loud until 11 p.m. (the computer-printed specification) will I face "judicial" charges if quiet hours really begin

at 10 p.m.?

Before I go any further, please excuse me if you find this to be an attack on any particular dorm or RA or Hall Director. I know several RAs who do a fine job working with what are supposed to be adults (including myself). But do we truly deserve careful efforts from those who oversee our behavior?

Shall we examine the life of residents?

As I look into my Bryan suite, I am inspired by the remnants of two holidays past.

Just below our glow-in-the-dark skeleton, our Christmas tree continues to illuminate the suite. Sometimes visitors dare to ask why it's still up. Of course it has nothing to do with being too lazy to take it down; we celebrate Christmas in our suite all year.

May I discuss the issue of cleanliness?

When I bounce my basketball on my suite's floor, I am asphyxiated by the heavy clouds of dust which rise like angry ghosts waiting for the opportunity to be stirred.

Sometimes I can't even find a place to bounce the basketball with all the newspapers and garbage covering the floor.

Enough of telling on my own suite. For there are far dirtier places of residence on this campus. We've

all seen cigarette butts ground into carpets of people's rooms.

My question is this—would we dare live in these ways in our own homes?

There is justification for misspelled signs or signs that contradict each other.

Why? Because we are often horrible residents. No landlord or parent would ever put up with the kind of behavior we exhibit—drunken, excessively loud weekends, complete squalor in the places we live, cigarette butts ground into the carpet, etc. My only point is to find a little humor in the misspelling of signs as it relates to an honest look at what are supposed to be adults living in dorms.

I know, some of us do live quite responsibly. You may even be outraged enough to write a letter to the editor at my somewhat abrasive comments.

At least I'm not bombarding you with my thoughts on heavy issues. You can find those everywhere else on campus. I simply want to demonstrate some of life's peculiarities.

But you are free to think and do what you will. You may even catch me in a "judicial" offense. (Although, I'd like to think I'm not *that* offensive.) Rest assured, you won't find me "propping" any doors, though, because now I know better.

## Letters to the Editor...

### TAKING THE CHALLENGE

To the Editor,

Early in December of 1993 Scott Spagnola predicted in his column that in the new year "some brave fool" on campus will agree to debate with him "on some important issue." Taking his words as a challenge to our entire community, I wrote to him to accept his offer. I told him that I "would be delighted to debate with him in a public forum, and asked only that he get back to me so we can "set something up." But I have yet to hear from him. I am beginning to wonder if Mr. Spagnola can be trusted to mean what he writes.

Scott, while one need not be brave to agree to debate with you, you have proven that he would have to be a fool...if only for not knowing better than to expect you to stick to your word, and your challenge.

Now my prediction for 1994 is that some less than brave person on campus will never "agree to debate," with me "on some important issue," even though it was he who made the initial offer.

Eric A. Parisi

### AGAINST NEW SENATE ELECTION RULES

To the Editor:

The proposed changes to the Community Senate Constitution reported in your article "Election rules: Senate rethinking exec. candidates requirements" are a sad attempt to right a perceived "turmoil" in the Senate seemingly caused by a lack of experience in both the methods of consensus and the Senate itself.

The first proposed change would require that Senate executive tickets only name a candidate for Pres., Vice-Pres., and Treasurer or Secretary; the fourth member of the ticket may be appointed after the election. A glaring flaw with this is that the position most vital to the Senate's primary task of allocating money to the student organizations, the treasurer, can be picked by three students as opposed to being selected by the student body as a whole. Later in the proposal there is a clause that states, "Treasurer candidates shall have two semesters of budget committee experience." This brings up the question if a treasurer is appointed rather than being a candidate for election must she/he fit the new proposed guidelines?

The seventh proposed change to the Constitution would allow a "re-vote" at the request of the losing ticket if they lost by less than five percent of the total votes cast. It is interesting that there is no argument for this proposal in the article by any member of the Special Projects Committee or any other Senator. Besides the fact that it is difficult enough getting a turnout of students for one election, the proposal does not state whether the "re-vote" must be decided by more than five percent. Therefore, must the student body continue to vote until they have selected a ticket by a margin of greater than the five percent?

The most disturbing proposed change is the requirement that candidates for Pres., Vice-Pres., and Treasurer, must have at least two semesters experience in the Senate, Res. Hall Board, or Budget Committee, depending on the position. This would severely limit the number of students able to attain the executive positions and would further re-enforce the stereotype of Senate being an exclusive body. This proposal allows that the only experience that is worthy of the Senate Executive Council is Senate-related experience. There are many precedents of competent executives that did not have previous Senate experience, but instead brought to the Senate an understanding of different facets of campus life. This did not hinder Senate's ability to function, but enabled the executives to relate with the new representatives as well as bring fresh ideas to a sometimes dormant body.

Clause five would allow potential candidates to petition the Senate to have the qualifications suspended. This is worded to sound as if the Executive Council of the Senate is representative of the Senate, not the student body. This not being the case, it is not the Senate's decision who is qualified to represent the student body, it is the student's themselves. If this proposal is passed, the Community Senate will cease being a representative student government because the students will be unable to choose who runs their government.

I urge the members of the Community Senate to block these proposed changes to the Senate Constitution. It is important that you do this to preserve the integrity of the Senate as a legitimate student government.

Sincerely,  
James R. Whitehead

## Cruise Ship Jobs!

STUDENTS NEEDED!

Earn \$2000+ monthly.

### World Travel

- Caribbean
- Hawaii
- Europe
- Mexico

- Tour Guides
- Gift Shop Sales
- Deck Hands
- Casino Workers
- ...and more!

Summer • holidays • fulltime

NO EXPERIENCE NECESSARY

CALL 602-680-4647, Ext. C147