

The Belles of St. Mary's College



900 HILLSBOROUGH ST.
RALEIGH, N.C. 27611

PHONE: 828-2521

THE BELLES STAFF

Editor Mary Glenn Barwick
Faculty Advisor Douglas Murray
Reporters Anne Latham, Cree Taylor, Julie Glossen,
Mary Newman, Mary Nell Hassell, Kathryn Heath
Karen Lado, Foo Vaeth, Lynn Jones, Kathleen Kinkaid
Leslie Derby, Ann Campbell, Becky Rogers,
Virginia Hodges, Elizabeth Archer, Tracy Braent
Photographers Ellen Block, Patty Bab,
Ann Campbell, Foo Vaeth
Typists Leslie Derby, Kathryn Heath,
Anne Latham, Lynn Jones



We have had many speakers for our new forum series. All of them have had something interesting to contribute. Our forum series has included women gynecologists, designers, fashion retailers, broadcasters, actresses -- the list goes on. Not many could argue against this new series. Not only does it entertain, but it educates at the same time. Another positive feature is that it draws outsiders' attention to St. Mary's and its diverse educational offerings. Perhaps this will become another St. Mary's tradition.

There is one feature that seems to be included in each forum series speech we listen to. THE ST. MARY'S STANDING OVATION. As long as we have been on this earth we have understood the standing ovation to be a situation where one stands on their feet after an exceptionally good speech. Here at St. Mary's we have begun to feel that THE STANDING OVATION is done out of a sense of duty. Perhaps it is done because we are on our feet already, so it is faster to get out. Hopefully, this is not the reason.

We were particularly upset after President Rice's December speech. In our opinion, that speech deserved, on a scale from 1-10, an 11. That speech touched us so much there were tears in our eyes. After the speech was over, we dutifully stood up and clapped. It is our feeling that

since we had held a standing ovation for every speaker, we were saying that this speech was like any other.

What we are trying to say is: other speeches have been good, and it is all right to give them standing ovations; but what about OUTSTANDING speeches? We think many of us will agree that Jane Goodall's speech was exceptional. After giving her a standing ovation, we felt as if this was not sufficient since we had done the same for other speakers. As a result, we felt that we hadn't shown her enough appreciation for a truly excellent speech.

Perhaps St. Mary's students feel that this showing of appreciation (THE STANDING OVATION) is necessary. But it is our opinion that too much of a good thing grows old soon. Perhaps we should truly listen to our speakers and then evaluate - was it good enough for a standing ovation? Then, if it is good enough, by all means let the speaker know.

It is difficult to determine between a "10" and a "1" speech; however it is even more difficult to tell between a "5" or "6" speech. Together, however, we feel we can form a universally satisfactory opinion and make THE ST. MARY'S STANDING OVATION not an unnecessary tradition, but the perfect culmination to an exceptional speech.

Mary Glenn Barwick
Jacque Taylor

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

A few weeks ago, President Rice discovered quite a few girls had skipped chapel and were munching down in the cafeteria. Because of the rule which requires chapel attendance, these girls were supposed to be campused. They were not, due to the large number of girls and a few misunderstandings. But this did raise the question among the students of whether chapel should be required or not. There is some feeling that chapel should not be required. I have done some research on the present rule and why it should be changed.

To start, I contacted the Reverend Dillard, the present chaplain of St. Mary's. He, himself, does not feel that chapel should be required because he doesn't like the idea of forcing people to go to or participate in something they would rather not. But, the chaplain read the book before he got here and in spite of required chapel, he felt there was a good ministry here. The Rev. Dillard also informed me that St. Mary's Junior College is a non-profit, private organization; it is not a parochial school. A parochial school is one supported and controlled by a church. St. Mary's is controlled by the Board of Trustees and it is their decision to require chapel. Although St. Mary's was founded by an Episcopalian priest and has a chapel, the school is not under the jurisdiction of the diocese or a church. Therefore, St. Mary's is not an official parochial school.

Next, I contacted Mrs. Martha Stoops, Associate Professor of History, who is writing the history of St. Mary's. She told me that in the fall of 1971, the question of required chapel had been raised and told me where I could get the information concerning the controversy. I then obtained the St. Mary's Bulletin. This presented the reasons of the girls petitioning "non-compulsory chapel" and those of the President and the Board. Some of the girls' reasons resemble those of today.

Chapel (religion) is a tradition at St. Mary's and an integral part of our school, but it is not the reason why the girls decide to come. They come mostly for academic reasons. Chapel can still be a tradition at St. Mary's even if it isn't required. The feeling is not to abolish the chapel, just the rule of required chapel.

Forcing the students to attend chapel at an age when they are just beginning to evaluate their religious values and morals can alienate them from the church and cause resentment towards it. If chapel is not required, the girls still have the option of attending chapel and would probably get more out of it. This would give the girls a chance to understand and determine their religious values.

An argument for required chapel is that the student knows when she decided to come to St. Mary's that she must attend chapel services. There may be, however, girls who decide not to come to St. Mary's because of required chapel. Competition for students is getting worse

every year, and St. Mary's is having a hard time recruiting students. Even though enrollment is up, what does the future hold in store? If the rule for required chapel were eliminated, several more girls would probably decide to come here. This would strengthen enrollment, and still give those girls desiring religious services that opportunity.

For these reasons and a few of my personal ones, it seems that the rule of required chapel is irrelevant to a non-parochial school and may do more harm than good to one's religious feelings and to the future of the school.

Sincerely,
Robin Hardy

Dear Editor:

I was extremely pleased when I was asked to participate in the chapel service last evening; however, my pleasure was dampened as the service progressed and the conduct of the students became a barrier to worship -- even to contemplation and reflection. If they do not wish to worship themselves, the least they could do, out of respect for the service and their fellow students, would be to KEEP QUIET! Whether or not they wish to be there is immaterial -- this is a chapel service and should be given the respect due the occasion. This, in my opinion, also requires at least a modicum of proper dress. I am not suggesting "Sunday best" but simply modest clothing.

Perhaps the saddest part of the abhorrent conduct displayed by so many of the students is the lost opportunity for them simply to be quiet and reflect and allow the benefits of this frame of mind to be theirs. I strongly suspect the reason that they do not take advantage of this opportunity is that they have had the experience so rarely they forget what it is like to "...be still and know...God."

I sincerely hope that I will be able to return to a service at some future time and be able to worship. Although this is my letter, I am sure that I speak for others who attended the service.

Janice C. Doffey, PhD
Associate Professor
of Biology

Dear Editor:

Dinner at 4:45???
Yesterday afternoon was

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE BELLES staff encourages letters of any size, shape or form, concerning any subject matter. Letters,

terribly busy for me. I had classes straight until 3:00 and by then I was exhausted. After classes I had several errands to run and before I knew it, it was 5:30; 5:30 meant it was time to go see "Raisin in the Sun" which was required. I went in spite of the fact I was so tired and I might add enjoyed it thoroughly. I didn't get out of there until 7:45 and I realized I had missed dinner in the dining hall once again.

The dining hall's hours are from 7:15-8:30 in the mornings; 11:30-1:15 at lunch, and 4:45 to 6:00 at dinner. Now I agree that an hour and 15 minutes is a long enough period for each meal, however I do not agree with the times it is served. The first period of classes begins at 8:00 and ends at 8:55 or so. Instead of breakfast beginning at 7:15, which is 45 minutes before classes begin, I think it should start at 7:30 and end after 9:00. This way, people who want to eat breakfast but don't wish to get up before first period could still eat.

I believe the lunch hours are suitable since they are from 11:30-1:15 you can eat if you have from 11:00 to 12:00 free or 1:00 to 2:00. My big complaint is about the dinner hours.

Who gets hungry at 4:45? If you eat then, you are starved by 8:00. If someone gets hungry before then it is easier for her to walk somewhere else to eat if transportation is a problem.

The only problem I can see in changing these hours are in the dinner shift. People say that the workers like the present hours better. However, if the only problem is getting the workers to agree, maybe we could talk it over with them and institute new hours on a trial basis. If these new hours fail, then they fail, but at least we can say we gave it our best shot. Perhaps housemothers and students could help out with the hours. It worked smoothly when it snowed.

In conclusion, I would like to stress the importance of these hours, especially dinner. The dinner hours of 4:15-6:00 are not practical. We are paying to get food along with our education so we should actually get both. Lastly, I think it is interesting to note that although dinner is over at 6:00 p.m., basketball practice is also over at this time. Is this fair??

Sincerely,
Mary Tad Carson

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE BELLES staff encourages letters of any size, shape or form, concerning any subject matter. Letters,

however, are subject to revision. Any letters can be sent to the editor, Box 17 campus mail.

LITTLE PEOPLE

(Continued from Page 1)
Hunter Elementary School.

The water fountains hit mid-thigh. The basic chair was two feet off the ground. One had to take a great plunge downward in order to sit on one of the tiny seats. The little people themselves were all very candid and wonderfully delightful, each in their own way.

Each classroom was divided into four groups with the minimum of four children and the maximum of seven (perhaps more). Some brave girls taught by themselves while others were doubled up. Various stories were read and acted out to the youngsters

who either participated or sat enthralled at the "teachers" telling the stories. A name tag was made for each story representing something within that particular story. Games seemed to be the highlight of the whole hour. The most favorite of these games was seven-up (memories huh?) and of course, the golden oldie, duck-duck goose.

When the St. Mary's students left the school, they left with a sense of not only having taught something, but also having learned a great deal from the little people. All in all, it was a marvelous experience for both the old and young.