

# Davidson should not support Gay movement

Grant Morain

gay is not against the law, the homosexual act is; however, one naturally follows the other. Should we look for our administrators to next form a Rapist Support group or a Vandal Support Group?

Davidson College's "Statement of Purpose" contains the following words: "Since Davidson's founding the ties which bind the College to the Presbyterian Church have remained close and strong. It is the desire of all concerned that this vital relationship be continued in the future, to the mutual advantage of church and school." Davidson is "a college committed to the historic Christian faith." In that vein, Leviticus 18:22 reads, "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination." This is a strong condemnation of homosexuality by the "historic Christian faith." Yet the Office of the Chaplain takes an active role in the new organization.

In February 7 issue of The Davidsonian an anonymous article stated, "Gays at Davidson . . . lack support because we are never able to get together. This is a problem because . . . we need to talk to each other and share our feelings and problems. We need to be assured that we aren't the only person in the world with these feelings, that we are not alone. Yet, there is no way to do this at Davidson because of the recrimination that would occur if it were even attempted." Well, now the support will be available.

And here is the recrimination. I am able to accept independent individual offerings, but Davidson College should not provide support for unlawful acts which are in direct opposition to its statement of purpose. Specifically, I question those members of the Davidson administration and staff who are forming this organization. What do you perceive as being your role? In offering support are you condoning homosexuality or acknowledging it as a fact of Davidson life? If you agree with it, I humbly submit that you should re-evaluate your position at Davidson. If you are merely acknowledging the fact that gays exist, you should not offer your support under the guise of a Davidson organization.

The article of February 7 also states, "Davidson is the worst place on Earth to come out." To the gays who feel this way, I suggest you find a school without ties to the church in a state without laws prohibiting such activity. In the meantime look for your support elsewhere. To those who are willing to offer such support, please do so on your own time without representing Davidson College in the process.

Morain is a sophomore from Canfield, OH

## Student condemns Apartheid

Jay Barron

African life for millions. Yet, with all the publicity the South African cause has received, it should not be treated merely as a bandwagon campaign for bleeding heart liberals and image-conscious rock stars. The system is an affront to basic human rights, as well as the very ideals Americans hold most dear: freedom, justice, and equality. Can the freedom we enjoy allow us to support such a system? Have economic interests blurred our moral priorities? Apartheid is wrong, and we must be willing to admit this without hesitation or reservation.

More often than not, Davidson students cannot feel the pain that exists in our world, and as a result, no motivation exists for becoming involved in world affairs. Ours is one of ivory tower intellectualism in its truest form. Just before our shanty was taken down, a grounds crew worker asked what the shack would accomplish. "We're just trying to alert people to the racist policies in South Africa," we said, to which he replied, "But you don't live in South Africa." Incredibly, this attitude seems very popular at Davidson, and it reflects American support of apartheid that exists in the form of disinterest. Yet isolation is no excuse for apathy.

Nevertheless, the question persists. Why concern our-

selves with people thousands of miles from our own shores, especially since South African whites have created affluence on an impoverished continent? Arguably, South African blacks who live under apartheid are better off financially than many Africans. In fact, many American business interests derive more benefits from the present system than would ever be possible if apartheid were to break down. So why must apartheid be abolished?

The answer is quite simple. In effect, apartheid, strife, bigotry, racism, and hatred are all synonymous. In a country where the potential for freedom exists, that potential should be realized. No nation should have the right to develop economic interests at the expense of human rights. The situation is an oppressive one that exploits the poverty of the blacks rather than providing an opportunity for mutual prosperity. A similar situation existed in nineteenth century American slavery. Just as modern slavery would be completely unacceptable, apartheid must be seen as a shameful, outdated institution.

Barron is a freshman from Tuscaloosa, AL

## Feminism struggles for everyone

Sarah Smith

I am writing in response to the article "Putting the feminist mess to rest," by Kenneth Bogert. Kenneth, you state that your aim in the article was to "put the mess about feminism to rest." However, in your article, I did not see a "feminist mess" either defined or put to rest. What I saw was some confused, self-admitted misconceptions. I was not offended, nor am I asking for an apology. I only want to clear up some of the ideas you seem to be confused about. I won't cause you to look at the issues differently, but I think that it is illogical to persist in an opinion that you are based on misconceptions.

Kenneth you are right that Equal Rights will benefit everyone. Women are not the "same" as men, but if you look in those terms, no one is "the same" as anyone else. We have our differences and feminists are not trying to deny our differences. We do not want to be the "same" as men. We just do not want to be penalized in any way because we are women.

Feminism is the struggle for equal rights. It has been defined as "an organized movement for the attainment of political, economic, and social equality of the sexes;" The Equal Rights Movement. I have never heard someone who advocates such a philosophy called an Equal Rights Movementist, such people are called feminists and their philosophy is called feminism.

All feminists are not the "same." I think that it is very dangerous to put all feminists in a box and tie it up with a

ribbon. People can not be labeled and categorized that easily. For example, it would be unfair to make unflattering generalizations about certain fraternities because of the exploits of the more visible of their members. It would be unfair even if I had observed the behavior because there are probably many more members of that fraternity who do not subscribe to that behavior, who are not visible, than those I have seen. Please don't cut and dry feminism because of your observations of a few women.

**It is very dangerous to put all feminists in a box and tie it up with a ribbon**

I do not think that women have ever lost sight of the "responsibilities" that equality will give them. Women have been responsible for seeing that their families are fed, raising children alone, making sure that their husbands finish college . . . I could go back in history and find many, many examples of the incredible responsibilities that women have had because they did not have equality.

Kenneth, you are correct that we have not openly lobbied for the "rights" to be drafted, to pay alimony, and to hold the door open for men. However, I think that you chose to ignore some basic realities.

It is against the law for women to be drafted. It is also

against the law for women to be allowed in active combat. Women did not make these laws, but at least with the latter women have lobbied for the right to fly fighter planes and even be included in the infantry. No, we have not lobbied for the draft, but our hope is that we will never go to war. Why should we lobby for something with which we do not agree?

Women do pay alimony and child support. Instances of women paying alimony are rare because there are so few women who make more than their husbands. I recently talked to a Davidson man who said that he would never marry a woman who made more than he did. Obviously, this man would not be willing to quit school in order to put his wife through college. Women who are economically equal to men are already taking on the responsibilities that their economic position allows.

Why does it matter who holds the door for whom? I know very few women who will let a door slam in a man's face or who will wait by a door until a man comes to open it. Holding the door for people is common courtesy, it is not a duty or burden.

Kenneth, I too am looking for a future of equality for everyone. However, until that time, we need to continue the feminist movement or at least continue the movement "promoting political, economic, and social equality of the sexes." Please feel free to call feminism the "Movement for Equal Rights" and to call feminists "Equal Rights Movementists." Their meanings are the same.

Smith is a junior from Raleigh, NC