

Is co-ed living an option on Penn State campuses?

by Alicia Hartman
Co-Editor

It has always bothered me that on campus males can live together and females can live together, but that a male and female can NOT live together.

I view this as a form of heterosexual discrimination.

If you recall, most material that Penn State publishes has a particular statement at the end of it. Part of this statement reads:

"...The Pennsylvania State University does not discriminate against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status..."

If Penn State does not discriminate against sexual orientation, why doesn't it allow men and women to room together?

James Bowen, manager of Housing and Foods Service at Behrend, said there is no written policy stating that men and women can not live together. Reading through Behrend's

"Term, Conditions, and Regulations" for fall 1994 through summer 1995, I found nothing pertaining to a gender requirement for roommates.

Bowen said it's just "traditionally known that we don't have co-ed residence halls."

I'm sure when on-campus housing was created males lived only with males and females only with females because of "the sex thing." However today sex is going to happen no matter who's living with who, what gender they are, or what sexual orientation they have.

At Behrend the suites alternate male/female, and in Niagara and Lawrence Halls there are two floors of women and one floor of men. This is as close to "co-ed" housing as it gets.

Bowen said that some colleges in the West have co-ed residential arrangements, but doesn't "feel it would be well accepted in the East."

My question is, what if you're engaged, married or just very close with someone of the

opposite sex and you want to live on campus? The answer: you can't.

The only other alternative on-campus housing arrangement offered in the Penn State system (and only available at University



Park) is "family housing." However, to be eligible for this housing you must have children (it does not matter whether you

are married or single).

My problem with "family housing" is that numerous definitions of family do NOT include children. (More discrimination here!) "Family" can also be defined as those people living in the same household, those related by ancestry or marriage or people who share similar features.

I think not allowing men and women to live together is a form of heterosexual discrimination because two men or two women who are committed to each other ARE permitted to live together. This is permissible for homosexuals but not for heterosexual? Is this not discrimination based on sexual orientation?

I believe that colleges and universities which do not currently offer co-ed housing should do so or at least try it. My idea of co-ed housing is not a total overhaul of existing residential arrangements, but rather a modification.

Upper classmen living quarters such as apartments should

definitely be made co-ed (not that everyone has to or wants to live like this). Dorms could perhaps be one-fifth co-ed and four-fifths male/male or female/female. Making dorms co-ed may be more difficult because parents of younger-age college students may disagree with the idea and not send their "children" to a school that has co-ed housing.

Some people may ask what you do if the couple terminates its relationship? The answer: follow the same procedure that already exists for roommate conflict. If you think about it, the same types of problems can arise in homosexual relationships in which two men or two women are living together.

If co-ed housing was available, more students may decide to live on campus. It all depends on a college's culture and if it wants more students living on campus.

Without a written policy stating that men and women can't live together, heterosexuals should fight for co-ed housing. Isn't it a right they have?

A bunch of bull

by Dave Barry
Syndicated Columnist

It is pathetic but true that we Americans hardly ever think about agriculture. We walk into a restaurant and order a hamburger, and we rarely stop to ask ourselves: Where, exactly, did this hamburger come from? And did everybody involved wash his hands?

Yes, too many of us take agriculture for granted, failing to realize that, without agriculture, there would be virtually nothing to be in, for example, Nebraska. And that is why today I am going to devote yet another column to an extremely important issue of agriculture: the cow part.

THE NEW COW PRO-

worm cows (the headline states: "It pays to question your de-wormer"). There's a large color photograph of two men, clad in overalls and billed caps, standing behind the rear end of the cow (the cow's face is not shown, and you will soon see why).

The men look normal and sane, except for one thing: One of them has much of his right arm inside the rear end of the cow. The man does not appear to be at all concerned about this. He's not even looking at the cow. His head is turned casually toward the other man, and he's saying something, perhaps: "I'm afraid I can't go bowling tonight, Ted. There's a cow on my arm." Or: "Hey! I found my asshole!"

I want to be the manufacturer of

MOB LEADER: We caught this varmint palpatin' out at Jess Peoper's place!

VOICES IN MOB: Yeah! He's a palpatin'!

SHERIFF: But that's a perfectly legitimate veterinary procedure!

MOB LEADER: He was palpatin' a BULL.



grant, some of which came from the federal government, to paint words from a pioneer woman's diary on the sides of live cows. I am not making this up. The idea was that the cows, with the words on their sides, would wander around and poop on symbolic representations of U.S. taxpayers.

No, seriously, the idea, as explained by one of the artists, was that the wondering cows would scramble the words so as to "create a new text." I think this is a terrific idea, and I believe that the government should seriously consider using wandering painted cows to generate the instructions for filling out federal tax forms. I bet cows would do a MUCH better job than whoever is doing this now (my guess is, hamsters).

XXX
Speaking of government action, it is clearly time to do something about

COW PART SPILLS IN MARIETTA, OHIO

I have also several issues of

and **NEW SPILL NO JOKE** -- concerning an epidemic of trucks spilling loads of cow parts on the highways in and around Marietta.

There are some large, vivid color photographs, including one with a caption that says, "Street Superintendent Richard 'Moose' Mayer removes cow parts from Washington Street," and another one captioned, simply, "Cow heads and feet along Muskingum Road" (this one is directly over a headline that says, **CLINTON WORKS ON HIS IMAGE**).

In a strongly worded editorial, The Times came out four-square against cow parts on the road, and stated: "It's time for action." I could not agree more. I say the people who are doing this should be arrested and thrown into prison, unless of course it turns out that they are artists, in which case I say they should be given federal grants.

But the important thing is that **SOMETHING** must be done, if we are to maintain our quality of life in this great nation, a nation in which all people, regardless of religious beliefs or ethnic background, have the absolute and fundamental right to