

# THAT DIRTY LITTLE WORD:

The Carnival Ball was a real ball, but it was rather difficult to enjoy a drink with the law there...but there was little room to dance...but hell of a lot of our swinging students didn't deign it worthy of their attendance.

Lend an ear to this little talk between two of our local Clark Gables, recorded before the Carnival began:

Clark I: Going to the Carnival Ball?

Clark II: Naw, the hell with it.

Clark I: Same here, can't be bothered.

Clark II: A bunch of the guys are going to hang on a terror. I think I'll get bashed. Should be a real ball.

Clark I: Is that right? Who's going?

Clark II: I don't know. Most of the guys, I guess.

many of you, readers, have said to a friend: "I really like her and respect her! Jeez, I'd never lay a hand on her!" And how many of you having said that, have gone down to the Pit on a Saturday night to pick up a "pig". Many have done exactly that. And what are the implications? If a man gives his mind to a woman he really respects, and his body to a woman for whom he feels nothing and has no respect, can he be said, then, to have any respect for his own body? Is he not ashamed of it? It seems natural if a man loves a woman that he should want to give her pleasure, and since man is made up of both mind and body, should he not give her both spiritual and physical pleasure? And if he does give her both mental and physical pleasure, why should he speak with pride of only one, and with shame of the other? Why do young men say "I really respect her; I'd never touch her"? Are they inhibited? Are you?

all, only by diligent, persistent, and perhaps somewhat daring self-examination and self-expression. It may be painful!

It would certainly be a great accomplishment could the origin of these various unnatural attitudes toward sex be pinpointed. Of course, this is a nearly impossible task; the most that can be done is to point out a few factors common to the backgrounds of most students on campus, which might possibly have had some part in the formation of present sexual attitudes.

## "You can't love one another if you're not married"

Our first observation is that most of the students on this campus have been raised as Catholics, thus, for a great many of us our earliest outlooks on most subjects were shaped by Catholic teaching as interpreted by our parents. As is well known, in fact too well known, the Catholic faith forbids premarital sexual relationships. (Indeed, as many will well remember, even French kissing, the most innocent of sexual activities, is forbidden by most, if not all, of our parochial RELIGIOUS under pain of fatal sin.) As we understand it, one of the chief reasons for this ban on sex before marriage is that the sex act was designed by God for two reasons and two only: 1) the procreation of the human race, and 2) the physical expression of mutual love between partners in the love relationship. It seems that if lovers wish to engage in sex then they must do so for both reasons, which fact is testified to by the Church's stand on birth control. At least, so it seems. But the Church says that the practice of rhythm is acceptable if a couple does not wish to "procreate the human race"; that is, the Church says that it is permissible for lovers to engage in the sex act even though only for the mutual expression of love if they do not wish to have children. But the Church says they may engage in sex for this reason only if they are married. In effect, then, the Church is making two general statements: 1) it is possible to have sex merely as an expression of love, and 2) sex may be had only within marriage.

taken lest...well, you know what happens. This, of course, could lead to nothing but frustrated sexual drives covered by a protective coating of false modesty or an armory of sexually aggressive TALK, resulting in both cases in sexual inversion, or, masturbation. Although in college the sexually segregated structure has been formally broken, "homo-sexual" tendencies still persist. Now it is time to make some changes in the situation.

## A FEW HINTS

### Recommendations:

Let's put our new S.D.U.S.U. executive to work right away. They'll need our ideas and our support, but through them we can achieve such much-needed reforms as these: open residences; freedom for co-eds to dress as they please and to come and go when they wish; lounge facilities; and—who knows? — perhaps even a liquor control outlet on campus.

Let's take a look at other universities that once faced the same problems we now face. How did they overcome them? By apathy?

Let's re-establish the Spain as a meeting (mating?) ground off campus — as a home-away-from-home for the Saints. Any suggestions for a fun way to fill those Saturday afternoons? How about films in the gym — all it would take is a projector, a screen, some chairs, and a few reels of who-cares-what.

Let's clean up our class parties so they'll become the ideal place for a guy to take his date. Hootenannies in the Coffee Shoppe always go over BIG... but, must we wait for Carnival time to have one?

We need a re-ordering of attitudes toward sex on campus. This is something we can't achieve by petitioning, by organizational effort. This is up to YOU. You wouldn't wear clothes fashioned in the early middle ages, would you? Don't you realize you're still sporting attitudes from "way back when"?

GIRLS — Get moving. It's Leap Year, remember. Why not have a Co-ed

## Thou Shalt Naught...

Clark I: There'll be no one at that all. None of the guys are going.

Clark II: It's a goddam waste of time. There's nothing around this campus worth taking anyway — nothing but a bunch of dumb broads.

Yep, that's what was said. Yep, it has been said about more things than the Carnival Ball. Yep, we've got us a real problem on this campus — a problem with sex, a problem with people, a problem with being a person. In this article we are going to take a good look at this, one of our major problems — nature, its origins, and its chances for cure.

There is very little evidence to be found on this campus of natural, healthy, sexual relationships among the students. Of course we are not suggesting that students should form a "society for free sex", although the results of such an action would certainly be interesting; rather we are investigating and questioning attitudes presently held by many of the students towards this most important of physical relationships. We wonder whether or not sex is ever intelligently discussed among the students; or are even the thoughts of it shrouded by our so-called modesty? The first question which we must ask is "are we honest with ourselves and with others regarding our attitudes towards sex?" This observer thinks the answer is NO!

### Look here! I'm a man!"

When conversation amongst young men turns toward sexual relationships, two very general attitudes usually appear. The most common amongst the younger men is the aggressive attitude: "Look here! I'm a man! I screwed such-and-such a broad last weekend. I must be a man!" As they grow older, however, they realize that they must become more mature, and so they become extremely reticent about their sexual relationships, and even upon the most insistent prodding, will reveal only that they had "a good time". And if one dares to ask why they prefer not to talk about "it" they will mumble something about modesty.

Must sex really be something either to brag about or to keep hidden in the dark corners of the mind, behind the so-called "modesty"? Are there no alternatives? And what about the popular "going steady" relationship? How

So we see evidence of three common attitudes towards sex on campus: The bragging attitude, the reticent attitude, and the attitude which embraces a double set of morals. Are these healthy, honest attitudes? Do you have one of these attitudes?

Thus far critical observations have been made only of the undesirable attitudes held by some young men on this campus. Now the morals of the "equal" sex must come under closer scrutiny. It will immediately be observed that very few of our co-eds are at all willing to participate in any discussion of sexuality; in fact, very few are even willing to consider it. It seems that some of the young ladies are saving themselves for their wedding nights, and this fact, of course, precludes the possibility of intelligent discussion. We wonder how many of those who endorse such an attitude are actually motivated by generosity and love towards their unknown husbands. And how many are motivated by fears of which they are not aware, or by fears intentionally concealed from themselves. Where is the line between virtue and prudishness?

## "...in some danger of being labelled pig"

It is possible to interpret certain female attitudes toward sex as the counterparts of corresponding male attitudes. For example, considering that a young woman who gives herself to a man is in some danger of being labelled "pig", it is quite understandable that many young women would be extremely cautious about so giving themselves. Also, there would seem to be some correspondence between the fact that some young men refuse to touch the woman they love and the fact that some young women refuse to be touched by the men they love. The origins of these corresponding attitudes and possible solutions of the problems they present will be dealt with later.

For the present, we can only ask that the attitudes themselves be seen in somewhat clearer light. It seems that social fears, i.e. fear of obtaining a bad reputation, and hidden inhibitions, i.e. prudishness, determine in large part the conscious, or perhaps only the outwardly shown, attitudes of women students on this campus. It appears that the sexual situation amongst the young women can be changed, if at

Is the Church then saying that real love can only occur within marriage? For most people, even a brief reflection will reveal that they have had love relationships, and real ones, without the question of marriage ever having entered the matter. If two people believe that they love one another, (and no one can know better than they themselves), and if they believe that sex is a good expression of that love, and if they don't want to get married, then who should say to them: "NO, you can't have sex because you aren't married. I don't care whether or not you say you're in love; you can't be in love if you don't want to get married. Yes, sex is a good expression of love, but you can't love one another if you're not married. That's final! So there!" Who can give such absurd commands?

Another factor which has probably had an influence on young people's attitudes towards sex is the fact that until recently in Island schools the boys were taught in separate classes from the girls. Boys were boys and girls were girls — and never the 'twain could meet. NEVER! No chances were week? And, by the way, girls, we're

not knocking friendship or anything, but must you ALWAYS travel in packs of six? Perhaps your bodyguards are scaring him off.

S.D.U. girls have a tendency to hold on very tightly to the strings of their purses. Ever hear of "Dutch", anyone? The idea behind a date isn't to see how much of the Student Loan you can eat, drink or otherwise squander in one night.

REQUIRED READING FOR CO-EDS: Sex and the Single Girl.

MEN — You are men, aren't you? Well, let's see a little aggression. We'll grant you that the situation here isn't as good as at P.W.C. where the girls outnumber the guys by far, but that's all the more reason to exert yourselves, isn't it?

Let's separate the men from the boys around here.

REQUIRED READING FOR MALES: Aphrodisiacs in Your Garden.

Let's have some heated discussion, some irate letters to the editor, but, above all, let's have some ACTION.

## LOVE