

OPINIONS

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1993

8

"Each fall some 13 million students...enroll in American colleges...By the time that these students graduate, very few colleges have met their need for all-round development. Instead, by precept and example, universities have taught them that 'all rules are unjust' and 'all preferences are principled;' that justice is simply the will of the stronger party; that standards and values are arbitrary. Although university leaders speak of the self-evident virtues of diversity, it is not at all obvious why it is necessary to a first-rate education."

-from *Illiberal Education* by Dinesh D'Souza

Dittos, Dinesh.

The national trend in "higher" education that declares the deep need for "diversity" and multiculturalism has hit at Davidson. Over the past few years, the call for "diversity" has been growing here at a fair rate.

Some of the measures have been tolerable, such as the core requirement of "cultural diversity." Most of these classes are non-politicized, serious studies of non-Western civilizations; they enhance the educa-

Alex Crumbley Ignore the left wing nuts.

To all of the high school seniors who are considering Davidson College for their next four years, I would like to say a few words. I know Davidson has its drawbacks, like offensive fraternity flyers and nudity on stage and a student government that's antagonistic toward Christianity, but I would like to ask you to ignore those left-wing nuts for a minute and hear what Davidson's really all about—false progress.

You see, we at Davidson really want to be a national institution like other schools up North with which we compete in the college rankings. So we make a BSC and a COMA and a FLAG, and they look great on Davidson's resume when the U.S. News rankers look at us in comparison to Williams and Amherst.

With seemingly the same mindset and environment as those schools, and our location in the lovely South where it's eighty degrees in November, Davidson is hard to beat as a college choice. But don't be fooled! We don't really believe all that intellectual mess about inclusiveness and mind-broadening and art, and whatever else we say we believe in: We're proud to have alumni write in and say that *Equus*, our offensive mainstage production, was little more than an unnecessary display of nudity.

You see, we try not to cross the line into the artsy-fartsy-pansy way of thinking that those Northern schools promote. In order to stay P.C., we repress our sexuality so much here that our alumni can't even handle a little nudity on stage. And you know what? We like it that way!

Also, we like to invite people from all over the globe to come here and study. This helps our international awareness statistic, especially because the people we invite here are godless heathens who don't even love Jesus. And since they aren't Christian, of course, they can't make decisions for the good of a Presbyterian school, so there's no way we would let them be Trustees. Yep, that means we would never even let Jesus on our board of Trustees (he was a Jew, wasn't he?)

Oh, and how could I forget our terrifying fraternity flyers? Last week, one of the Greek monsters put a flyer around campus that made fun of a very serious topic around here, our phone books. In case you didn't know, the cover of Davidson phone book is a very good indicator of the ideological

Greg Garrison Don't put a capital in liberal arts.

tional experience of students who desire a liberal arts education (just in case any of you wondered, the liberal here is derived from *liberalis*, referring to persons who have been liberated—it has nothing to do with the Socialist, FDR-worshipping political leaders or their cronies). An objective view of another culture is a good mean toward the end of a liberal (small "l") education, and a liberal (small "l") education is the primary end of this institution.

Near the end of last year, and again on October 26, the political powers of the student body, under somewhat spurious leadership, effectively declared war on the very foundation upon which Davidson College is built, Christianity and Christian leadership. Last year, when the SGA asked for a change in the Statement of Purpose, this was just a step toward the goal of Liberal (not a small "l") education.

The SGA resolution on October 26, which calls for a change in the Trustee

requirements, is a blatant attempt to Liberalize Davidson further. The Trustees are one of the only powerful Conservative Christian elements remaining at Davidson to balance the trend toward pure Liberalism and a flagrantly political college agenda.

In addition, one cannot forget that Davidson was founded upon Christian principles and remains affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. That is one of the elements of the college that separates it from many other schools. It also gives it a static, unified purpose toward which to strive. Educational trends (such as the one mentioned in the above quote) change, but this purpose will not; it will stand, a beacon through time.

If I were to amend the policy at all, it would be changed to the following: "All persons elected as Trustees shall be active members of a Christian church or Jewish synagogue." My reason for this is that Judaism is the religion from which Christianity sprung. They believe in the same

God, and they hold the same morals, ideals, and ethics; as the forerunners of Christianity, their insights would be greatly helpful in coming to Christian decisions in keeping with the ideals of the college.

SGA Vice-President Alice Spivey was one of three who voted against the resolution. When I asked her why, she gave me the following statement:

"I came to Davidson knowing that it is a Christian school and not a totally secular one where 'anything goes.' Christianity is one of the main tenets upon which Davidson was founded, and there are some traditions which are too important to abandon. Davidson is a private Christian school and does not have to embrace the 'p.c.' ideals of a public school."

Why are people asking that the policy be changed? Ask anyone who voted for the measure, and they will tell you that it is to be fair to the non-church-attending students, who will, upon graduation, become alumni. This primarily emotional argument is highly fallacious—the Trustees should represent the

See Garrison on page 9

Now, see... that's just sad, 'cause that stuff doesn't work on me! Now, see if you pass NAFTA, you're going to have all this bad stuff.

BLAH, BLAH, BLAH, BLAH...



Will boys be boys (or men)?

Flyer continued from page 7

women as sexual objects is not unrelated to this statistic.

Did the creators lack respect for women? Or did they not see the connection between respect and portrayal? Why was the flyer put up without the approval of the co-sponsoring women's houses but with their names? I cannot know, and I will not speculate. The other, (in my opinion) more appalling possibility is that the creators of the flyer knew exactly what they were communicating.

What are the implications of posting a party flyer featuring a half-naked woman only in men's bathroom stalls? I leave it to the reader to continue this line of reasoning. Perhaps even more disturbing than the possibility that a few men created this sexist and offensive flyer is the fact that the flyers stayed up for days. Hundreds of caring, intelligent, thoughtful men use the bathrooms in their dorms each and every day, some of whom I know, care about, and trust. Why did the flyers not come down?

Was it fear of destroying property, hesitancy to take a stand, or just lack of thought

about the issues at stake? Or does something happen to the brain when the pants are down? (The Dean Rusk Program, for one, seems to think not).

This would be a good time for the "boys will be boys" ("men will be men?") line of rationale. With apologies to those who think otherwise, I simply cannot accept this reasoning because it ignores the intelligence and awareness of too many men and sidesteps the issue of personal accountability.

I don't know exactly why the flyers were posted, why they stayed up so long, or what the intentions were. I do know that regardless of the intent, those flyers join a chorus of cultural messages by which we are affected in more ways than we know. I don't know who was responsible, and I hope that no apology will rise from semi-sincere regret. I do hope, and demand, that this never happens again on Davidson's campus.

If we say that we are about "mutual trust and respect," we must live with that mutuality and respect constantly in mind or we risk nothing less than our integrity.

Sincerely,
Letitia M. Campbell '96