

The Santa Clara forum

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Dan Selmi Editor-in-Chief Peter Reck Photo Editor
 Jeanne Huber Managing Editor Paul Schmuck Sports Editor
 Tom Goethals Asst. Sports Editor

Parietal Proposal Debate

The ASUSC Senate's parietal hours proposal was passed last Wednesday by a 14-9 vote of the Community Council and is now in the hands of University President Fr. Thomas Terry. Terry has indicated that he will poll the 14 members of the council absent from the UCC meeting before announcing a decision.

The proposal is the first major issue affecting students the Community Council has taken up, and the resulting debate brought to light some interesting results. Perhaps the most interesting is the fact that, of the nine votes cast against the proposal (which would create an experimental dorm with 24-hour visitation and would evaluate that program with a view toward its implementation for the entire University next fall), seven came from top level University administrators, including five vice presidents.

Some of the points brought out as reasons for defeating the proposal are absurd. For example, Fr. Paul Goda's contention that the rights of the quiet and "less inclined to complain" students must be protected is a consideration that should be taken up by the students involved rather than by the Community Council. It is expected that by the time students reach the university level, they are capable of working out day-to-day living problems.

Another of the less enlightening comments was made by Fr. Steve Olivo, dean of students, who thought a petition signed in favor of open dorms was initiated with little thought and through peer pressure. But petitions are part of the democratic process—right, Father?

Main objections to the proposed experiment centered around three areas:

(1) It was said that there are no sound educational reasons for expanding parietal hours. We think, on the contrary, that the proposal is based on sound educational grounds. The coed dorms and the initiation of parietal hours in the last three years have revolutionized the social life on campus—for the better. Enhancing interaction in a community

living situation is desirable.

(2) Fr. Goda states in his memorandum that he favors keeping parietal hours the way they are now in all dorms because of the "sexual symbolism" involved. This brings to mind the implication that is commonly (if wordlessly) assumed: that giving dorms the right to set their own hours will somehow affect the sexual mores of students. We don't think such sexual considerations belong in the discussion of hours at all for two reasons: it is not the University's right to legislate morals, and, in this case, the problem of parietal hours has nothing to do with morals anyway.

(3) It is argued that the dorm system and dorm life have not been fully evaluated and that yet another committee should be formed to study it. We see no reason why the evaluation can't take place at the same time as the parietal hours experiment; this was suggested in an amendment passed by the Community Council attached to the proposal.

The main feature of the new parietal hours proposal is its experimental nature. A great number of objections cited against it (quiet in the dorms, roommates' rights, privacy, etc.), if they become problems at all, can be evaluated in light of the experiment rather than mere speculation.

The parietal hours proposal was a thoughtfully-worked out, student-initiated effort. We find the student initiative noteworthy despite the fact Dr. Mark Ferber, vice president for student services, decried the lack of faculty and administrative input. Students have long been urged to work through the proper channels. This time they did it.

Fr. Goda mentions that the phrase "in loco parentis" has become a cliché on campus. It has become a cliché because the ridiculousness of parietal hours as now constituted is so apparent. A constructive experiment has been suggested, and it should be implemented.



"I'D LIKE TO ARRANGE FOR A SUMMIT CONFERENCE..." No Sound Educational Reason Open Dorms-I Disagree

The following is a memorandum concerning the parietal hours proposal which was sent by Fr. Paul Goda, chairman of the Community Council, to all members of that body. Fr. Goda has placed the memorandum at our disposal, and we thought it should be brought to the attention of the university.

Last Thursday, I called Ruth Davis to ask her permission to speak on the parietal hours issue. Since I am chairman at this time, I wanted to make sure that I would not be taking advantage. She had no objection. Since then, I thought that it would be easier for me to voice my position and my questions in writing rather than go through the formality of asking someone to take the chair temporarily.

COMPROMISE IN 1970

The statement sent to us from the ASUSC Senate is a good one. It is by and large reasonable and well-thought out. If I have any objections, it is because I believe that the basic, reasonable compromise on parietal hours was made in 1970. The present hours seem to meet the need of responsibility and self-determination on the one hand and proper limitation on the other.

It seems to me to be too easy to voice clichés about the death of the policy of *in loco parentis* and the need for personal responsibility. Both are true but neither cliché solves all the problems of living in community. The dorms are also a part of a larger community, the university at large, which I think should have the right to set reasonable regulations.

VOICED BEFORE

There has been no argument that the present limitations on parietal hours are basically unreasonable. The arguments for abolishing limitations on parietal hours have all been voiced before, in the May 31, 1968, approval of parietal hours by Fr. Terry, in the proposals in 1969-70, A Coeducational Living-Learning Experience, A Variety of Living Choices, the Special Proposal: Graham 100 as a Coeducational Living-Learning Experience, A Program for educational Living and in the Residence Hall Program, e.g., room for personal responsibility, need for socializing, etc.

The parietal hours were given and expanded for precisely the reasons that are being given now for unlimited parietal hours. They were expanded because it was reasonable to expand them and unreasonable to limit them to 7 p.m. to midnight and 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Sundays.

It seems to me that it is now unreasonable to expand the parietal hours, not because disaster would strike if we did—it wouldn't, not because promiscuity would be rampant—it wouldn't, although I personally believe in the limitations on our sexuality that is inherent in a Christian vision and in the sexual symbolism of limitation as laid down in dorm rules of a rational kind, and most certainly not because the present rules are rigidly and irrationally enforced, which they are not. It

By KEVIN BRIGGS
 Staff Reporter

In answer to Edgar Suter's letter in the February 8 issue of The Santa Clara, I would like to point out that I am somewhat more scrupulous in checking my facts than Edgar would have you believe. First I would like to point out that I was not writing an objective news story, I was writing an editorial, which is by its very nature subjective. I did not consult Edgar in the matter simply because I believed his actions and words before the Senate reflected his opinion.

NO RUMORS

I did not rely on rumor as the basis of my condemnation of Edgar's non-budget. In certain cases my facts come closer to reality than Edgar's. For example the matter of SCCAP; Edgar says that one of the reasons he vetoed the budget was the fact that and I quote "SCCAP received approximately \$1700 of the over \$2300 requested." I talked to Jim Keogh, co-president of SCCAP, about this, and it is true they were only to receive \$1700. This is all they wanted, because they had some \$600 which wasn't spent last quarter. Keogh, in the original copy of the budget, subtracted this amount from the \$2300 and arrived at the \$1700 figure.

That's all he wanted, Ed. Further he told me that if no allocation was made in the next week SCCAP would have to cease operation because of lack of funds. Then of course there was the matter of the BSU allocation. Edgar said he vetoed the budget because the BSU was only getting 50 percent of their request. So he gave them nothing at all. I have

would be unreasonable to expand the hours because there are no sound educational reasons for expanding them.

RATIONALES

The limitation on parietal hours includes a cluster of rationales. Part of it is indeed sexual symbolism. But another part is the need for quiet hours. And another part relates to the need for privacy in the dorms for certain hours.

Strangely, the 1969 proposal A Variety of Living Choices called for evaluations of the program by prefects' logs and A Program for Educational Living called for on-going evaluations by the Dean of Students. None of these evaluations have been put forward by the proponents for expansion of parietal hours. On page 2 of the proposal, it is indicated that all of the Resident Assistants and Head Resident Assistants, including the Dean of Student's Administrative Assistant, agreed with the proposal. I have been led to believe otherwise. I understand, without having had time to check fully, that there are privacy, noise and discipline problems right now, which, although not grave enough to suggest retrenchment of parietal hours, do indicate that the optimum for parietal hours has been reached.

QUESTIONS

Some questions which I think should be touched on are:

1) "Why were there no evaluations or discussion of present problems?"

According to the published statements made before the present experiment of parietal hours was instituted, ongoing evaluations were supposed to be made by logs by resident assistants and studies by the Dean of Students.

2) "How would the rights of roommates be protected?"

This question refers to the whole problem of the need for some privacy at some time. I did not and do not oppose the hours as now constituted. I quite agree that most dorms as presently built are constructed so economically as to be *prima facie* undesirable living situations. That is the basis for my position that the parietal hours as now set up are a reasonable compromise.

3) "How would the rights of those who are quieter and less inclined to complain be protected?"

This refers to a strong tendency which I have seen in all the groups to which I belong to have those who are more vocal and articulate seize the banner of seeming progress. At least some of the students to whom I have spoken indicate that there are problems in the dorms which are being glossed over by those who abstractly talk about responsibility. I would be interested in speaking with those who might be able to enlighten me one way or the other.

4) "Do the Dorm Councils do an adequate job of enforcement of whatever regulations there are now?"

Again, from my limited information, these groups which are supposed to be at the heart of decentralized responsibility are not doing the work they are supposed to be doing.

The Budget—A Last Look

always suspected that Ed used Carrolian or Through-The-Looking-Glass logic and this seems to be an example of it. One member of the BSU told me "You expect to have the senate cut some money, but at least with some money you can do something—but now we can't do anything, we don't have any money at all."

RUIINED

What Edgar maintained was a move that would help these organizations in fact almost ruined them. The same is true of the Dorm councils. I was told by Tom Quinlin, president of McLaughlin, that at least six dorm presidents had been forced to use their own funds to operate thanks to the non-budget.

These are not indeed rumors; these are facts. Had the veto remained in effect it would have meant the end of three organizations of unquestionable value. It is that simple. Edgar's arguments on why he vetoed the budget are absurd. When viewed in the light of fact and reason, they shrivel like a slug in salt.

SMALL CLIQUES

If indeed Dorm Council, the BSU and SCCAP are the small cliques that Ed wants to cut back, I have to disagree. The fact that I disagreed in print does not constitute either failure or rumor-mongering, on my part. The "facts" that Edgar gathers around him to prove I am a poor journalist are simply not facts at all. Indeed, Edgar's facts bear little or no relation to reality. That he chose to display his own lack of taste, hysteria and ignorance on matters financial I find, to use Edgar's words, "Too bad."

Letters To The Editor

Dixie Mystery; English Lover

Dear Editor:

We were very fascinated by the story concerning a mystery mask received by Santa Clara sophomore Dixie LaGrande. As have been pointed out by several experts, the Chinese words don't have much meaning when put together, neither do they mean anything in relation to this story when taken apart. When we read them out loud in "Cantonese," the words have a pronunciation which sounds like "Dixie." Now, we are certainly positive that those two Chinese characters meant just that, "Dixie."

We think the mystery mask was a sign of good fortune and Miss Dixie LaGrande certainly shouldn't be troubled by it.

Sincerely,
 Austin Huang
 George Chu
 Denny Luk
 of C.S.A.

The words I used were "sophistic" and "sophistical".

I am calling this to your attention in the hopes that a correction will restore my seriously eroded standing with the diminishing but still gallant band of those who love the English language.

Sincerely,
 James Albertson, S.J.
 Academic Vice President

Bubble Gum

Dear Editor:

We don't need another committee to study parietal hours, refrigerator wattle consumption or removing bubble gum machines on dorm floors. What we do need is some effective leadership in our present on-campus living situation.

The committee would only meet twice anyway, once to set a date for the next meeting, and again for their annual end-of-year dinner.

Rob Eskridge '70

Referees

Dear Editor:

Within a few weeks, I have concluded that the intramural games are all a farce, specifically basketball.

A great percentage of the time, the referees are in no way qualified to fairly call any type of basketball game.

When two teams remain undefeated, mainly BSU and Wagoner, and are competing for the championship, it is highly unfair to have a member of one such team act as referee in a contest involving the other team (for that matter, it is impossible to have a representative from any team fairly referee a game involving other teams in the same league).

One such incident occurred Sunday night, BSU vs. Johnson. The refereeing stood as the determinant factor in the game (in which a Wagoner team member refereed) and in compliance to the situation, BSU lost. (This in no way undermines the opponent!)

If intramurals are to remain a great part of sports, I strongly and urgently suggest that the structure be reviewed so that such incidents need not occur again.

This should be done not only in fairness to the participating teams but for the sake of the sport itself.

Angela Bunting

The opinions expressed in the editorial column are those of a majority of the editorial board. The opinions expressed in other columns on the FORUM page are those of the individual editor or contributor. These opinions do not necessarily represent the opinion of the associated students, the university administration or faculty, or the other editors. Contributions for this page are welcome and should be brought to the Santa Clara office, Benson 213, by 5 p.m. for the Tuesday edition, and by 5 p.m. on Wednesday for the Friday edition.

The Santa Clara is the official student newspaper of the University of Santa Clara, composed and edited by students, and published twice weekly, except holiday or examination periods by the University. Entered as second class matter February 21, 1922, at the Post Office at Santa Clara, California, under the Act of March 3rd, 1879. Subscription \$5.00 per year. Telephone 984-4546. Member National Educational Advertising Services, 350 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10017. Send changes of address to, The Santa Clara, Box 1190, University of Santa Clara, 95053.

TWO THE SANTA CLARA FEB. 15	
Editor-in-Chief..... Dan Selmi	Lizard-in-Chief..... Jane Wiegstein
Managing Editor..... Jeanne Huber	Photo Editor..... Pete Reck
News Editor..... Robert Ortaldo	Asst. Photo Ed..... Ken Barnes
Asst. News Eds..... Terry Trucco	Cartoonist..... Howard Anderson
Rita Beamish	Composition Mgr..... Flip Bennett
Paul Schmuck	Business Mgr..... Don Slaughter
Asst. Sports Ed..... Tom Goethals	Ad Manager..... Jim Ferrigan
Layout Editors..... Tom Burke	Circulation Mgr..... Bill Battaglia
Forum Editor..... Matt McAlarney	Office Managers..... Susan Eskridge
Feature Editor..... Rick Tohey	Caroline Bazzano
Staff: Louise Aiello, Terry Alonso, Clara Sacani, Becky Boehmer, Russ Brown, Tom Burke, Margaret Camarena, Ron Campbell, Tom Crotty, Elise Davidson, Mike Detweiler, Paul Fry, Tom Goethals, Ed Huribut, Susan Kaiser, George Kornievsky, Dixie LaGrande, Lynne Laney, T.M. Lucas, Dawn McNiece, Frank Nagotte, Claire Ortaldo, Terry Pfeiffer, Terry Phillips, Beth Robinson, Paul Sidenblad, Marie Snodgrass, Chris Suarez, Tim Ward, Lynne Yates, Tom Zipsa, Dave Layton, Pat Logan, Barb Boyle, Terry Brennan, Terry Phillips, Ed Vargas, Bill Teifer, Elyse Davidson.	