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WELCOME!!
This time around...

Sexism and Gender Issues

- What is Sexism? a collection of definitions...
- Interview with a Survivor of Rape by Suzanne Burns
- A Campus Survey
- Equality and Justice for Women. Now!!! by Zad Lloyd
- Modern Love and Chivalry by Robert Warren
- Date Rape on College Campuses by Lisa Little and Jeff Cardille
- In Defense of Choice by Louise Franzen
- Sex and Civilization by Allan W. Yarbrough
- Quality Childcare: the issue of the 90s by Margaret Horse
- Beyond the Wages by John Mark Caney
- More of The Beautiful South by Tom Hickman
- Interview With a female Eastern Indian Student by Suzanne Burns
- Subliminal Persuasion by Jillanne Baab
- Sitas & Stuff

Fishrap yet another assortment of goodies...

- Interview with Kuane Ture (Stokely Carmichael) by Jeff Cardille
- Racism Revisited by David Wiens
- Interview with A South African Student by Zad Lloyd
- Interview with Leonard Zeskind of the Center for Democratic Renewal by Chris Boyer
- Greased Lightning: The Story of Wendell Scott by Andrew Robinson
- A Right to Die? by Allan W. Yarbrough
- AIDS on Campus by Jeff Cardille
- The Trial of Granny M by Ed Gibbs
- Countdown to Earth Day by Steve Denkin
- Human Rights Quiz
- Hypocritical Garbage by R. Steven Hinton
Editors:

I am happy to report that being a female here at Tech has been something of a non-issue. People have been friendly, but I don't think they've been any more or less friendly than if I were male. Well, maybe that isn't completely true - there are some who may have been slightly more helpful than if I were a male, and others who may have been slightly more wary than if I were a male student coming to ask a question. Even in those cases, it was not to any extreme and did not cause any problems.

The only big complaint I have about Tech is the total lack of child care. I can understand that it isn't a big issue with most of the student body, since the majority of students are young males. On the other hand, Tech claims to be trying to attract female and minority graduate students. Without reliable, inexpensive childcare it is just not feasible for most women with children to be students. I happen to have my mother living nearby and willing to care for my daughter for a few hours each day. Even with that help, I still spend virtually all my pay on child care expenses for my daughter for the remainder of the day and for my son for after school. On-campus day care would not only be less expensive and more reliable, but would allow the mothers (and fathers) to spend time with their children during the day thus alleviating the anxiety that comes with being away from our children for long periods of time.

--A Female Graduate Student

To the editors:

"Go Man Go" printed on the last page of issue 4 is sexist. Please be more aware of using male gender forms such as "man" and "he" when you also mean to include women. "Man" and "he" are not neutral gender terms.

Sincerely,

Carl Messineo

Editors:


Breasts come in all varieties of shapes and sizes. Sometimes certain of these characteristics can cause a woman's mammarys to be her foremost quality, while the rest of her is ignored. An example of this could be a teacher I once had in elementary school who was famous for her triangular-shaped breasts, but I can think of some larger examples. It is size, not shape, which is the focus of all this hype.

The arrival of breasts is anticipated to a great degree. This could be because some brilliant manufacturer invented "training bras" one day, so that all pre-pubescent and pre-pre-pubescent girls could find some sort of obsessive pleasure in the growth of their mammarys, just like in Judy Blume books. In New York this pastime isn't so common—bras are just not a big thing, I guess. But in Connecticut, where there's less diversion, training bras are purchased by the truckload the day a girl first conceives of the notion of breasts. I happened to become familiar with this phenomenon while attending summer camp with a bunch of wonderful, breast-obsessed Connecticut girls. Besides not knowing what the hell a training bra was (I still don't quite understand the reason behind it), I wasn't wearing a "regular" brassiere. I was the only girl in the camp, besides one "loose" counselor who wasn't Vicki, a "training bra" junkie, who wasn't any more "developed" than I, lectured me on the consequences of this negligence. "You'll be sagging," she whispered to me in grave confidentiality, "by the time you graduate from college." She then proceeded to relate the plight of an elderly relative of hers, the details of which I don't wish to disclose. I didn't believe a word. The boys in the camp, I might add, were just as afflicted. They wanted to touch your breasts before they kissed you. Before they knew you. It was a small camp and the boys used to compare the girls' breasts in "code of honor" conversations. I know because my friend Pete told me. He broke the code.

This "mammary madness of the American people," as Jasper referred to it, is returning, in an ever-so-reactive mode, to the worship of the chesty. Cleavage is in, as are low-cut attire and swooping necklines. Cleavage is revealed said cleavage, as are certain models, easily found in the Sports Illustrated swimsuit issue, who expose this desirable asset and model these desirable fashions. But what of the large-breasted woman? Is it an easy life she leads? After years of construing these complaints as methods of drawing attention to their abundant knockers, I'm just beginning to believe some of my chestier friends when they answer resounding, "No."

First of all, when someone develops early, say in sixth grade—when it's still hard to tell the guys from the girls—all the boys, in your class and out, will be taken by and eventually enthralled with the size of your breasts, despite preoccupation with the teacher's teardrop-angled gems. It may take years for them to recognize your brain (or the existence of one at all) behind your fruitful and ever-distracting exterior. Even if eventually one else's breasts eventually exceed yours in size, yours will always stand out. Alone.

...continued on page 5.
Many large-breasted women have been plagued with poor posture and the feeling of being overweight. "Each one weighs five pounds!" remarked Lillian a few years ago, clinically speaking (she had actually weighed them). Not only do these women feel constrained to wear bras all the time, but they are restricted from certain physical activities. Ruthie Dee was forced to terminate her avocation as a prima ballerina due to generous casatas. Which is really not funny. Aside from the jokes, the ogling and the jiggling, which these full-figured victims are powerless to combat, even in the simplest and most necessary daily endeavor-running to class-there are the gym classes. There's a limit to how many jumping jacks one can perform in a 40-minute gym class without wondering.

The tribulations of the flat-chested must also be looked into. These include the trauma of not being considered feminine enough and not considering yourself feminine enough. Far worse, is the idea that your brain will be too scrutinized by men for lack of distraction. These fears, of course, are paranoid and neurotic, but are only a function of the obsessiveness of society. A woman who had her breasts surgically altered a couple of years ago, commented in a national magazine to the effect that "Breasts are what makes a woman a woman. I just didn't feel feminine with small breasts." Apparently, being a woman nowadays has a lot to do with silicone.

Besides reading magazines and viewing "Cross Your Heart Bra" commercials with Jane Russell, shopping can be traumatic. I went shopping for a dress about six years ago, before I had entirely given up hope, when the saleswoman commented to me, in private, that maybe I should get the dress in the next size up because I was probably still "developing." I almost screamed. What was really terrifying about the experience was that this saleswoman was not the sort of person I would have imagined saying such a thing-the kind... continued on page 6, column 3...

To the Editor:

Abortion is not simple and it is not easy. It was not simple and easy for me and it was not for anyone else I have met. It was the only choice I could live with and it was a painful choice to make. I support those who have made the opposite decision and I hope that we will always all have the chance to each make our own decisions.

"American Holocaust!" (Issue IV Feb. 1990) ignores the personal emotional struggle women go through when they do decide to end an unwanted pregnancy with an abortion. It is sensationalistic of Johnny Herbert and Bart Jones to compare the legality of abortion to the Holocaust and to mass killings in Russia under Stalin's rule, without offering an explanation on what it is like to be a woman with an unwanted pregnancy. The Holocaust and the killings under Stalin were systematic exterminations. Abortion is an individual and personal option.

Many writers who are trying to get an idea across to the reader, as Herbert and Jones are, will use "puller topics" to get the reader's emotions excited. The truly capable writer can involve the reader without sensationalizing the topic. Writers who are inadequate frequently fall to involving the reader by juxtaposing the chosen topic with an event such as The Holocaust that immediately, at the mention of the word, brings up strong emotions. The writer then counts on the reader not being able to acknowledge that his or her immediate response is due to the added topic and not to the real issue at hand. In comparing the legality of abortions to The Holocaust, Herbert and Jones have attached the emotional results of The Holocaust to abortion without even trying to address the emotional struggles a couple or a woman goes through with an unwanted pregnancy. These emotional struggles are the real issues at hand. People who have been close to someone who has had an abortion and women who have had abortions know that it is an extremely personal experience.

It is clear in the article that Herbert and Jones believe that the terms "human being" and "baby" include a egg in a woman's uterus the moment it is fertilized. Many people disagree with this, even knowing all the information that people against having the choice of an abortion offer. With all the debate over the definition of when a human being starts it seems more feasible to define a fertilized egg becoming a human being when a woman feels this from within herself emotionally. This happens for some women even before an egg is fertilized and for some women it will not happen until a few months prior to the actual birth. For many women it is a gradual process that brings about the feeling of an existence growing inside them. It is condescending and patriarchal for Herbert and Jones to want to decide—for each and every woman in the entire world—when a fertilized egg becomes a human being. It is condescending for Herbert and Jones to try to define each and every pregnancy by staunch, unyielding and exclusively objective standards.

It is not surprising that Herbert and Jones support the statement, "Until birth, the fetus in invisible...if the abdominal wall of the pregnant woman were transparent, what kind of abortion laws might there be." Sir Francis Bacon, the 17th century philosopher well known as a father of modern science, speaking on nature said, "Neither ought a man to make scruple of entering and penetrating into these holes and corners, when the inquisition of truth is his whole object..." Bacon was responsible for fashioning a new ethic sanctioning the exploitation of nature. He viewed nature with an unyielding desire to use science to break it down into objective terms, and his ideas seem to have been carried over into the science of the antichoice movement. Both quotes believe that all questions concerning a pregnancy can be answered with the microscope. Both quotes take the focus off one of the strongest elements in life—that of emotion. No matter how invisible science makes the abdominal wall of a pregnant woman, it will not be able to uncover and manipulate the emotions that a pregnancy brings about for the woman herself.

continued first column
next page...
It is clear that even with all the scientific knowledge that we know about the process of fertilization and what happens afterward there is not an answer to the question of when life begins. Abortion is felt strongly about on all points of its spectrum because it is an extremely emotional issue. Herbert and Jones get extremely emotional about the issue yet want to discredit all pro-choice emotions. The discrediting of the value of emotion in human life goes back to the beginning of patriarchal ideology. This is why I recommend that we do not accept what Herbert and Jones have mandated to women for what they should do with an unwanted pregnancy.

To get caught up in the terminology issues and to side with articles that try to shock the reader through sensationalism would be avoiding the real issues that abortion brings up. Bearing and parenting a child is a great deal to bear in today's society. Guarantee of housing, food, education from our youth? Why is there no guarantee of housing and food for families? Why is there so much sexual violence against women? Why are some people so afraid to admit that America's youth is sexually vibrant and alive? The anti-choice political struggle over women today aims to control women's bodies and mandate what women can do with their reproductive systems. The fact that women's bodies have become such battlegrounds and the fact that we are all emotional human beings leads me to believe that a political decision—and therefore, general, and distanced from each individual—cannot suffice. The answers to an unwanted pregnancy are not something to be mandated by the Supreme Court, by religious factions, or by Johnny Herbert and Bart Jones. A pregnancy is wholly between a woman and her partner.

Carey E. McDougall


...continued from page 5, column 1

you're afraid to go near in the first place. She was young and "nice" and not so overbearing, and her lipstick was all on her lips. This is when I realized how widespread this disease is. Needless to say, I bought the size that fit me then, and it still fits me now. Perfectly.

Shopping for bras is the worst. It's quite humiliating purchasing a brassiere in a "collection" called "A-OK!" They don't have a shove it down your throat. And those lingerie departments are saturated with the type of saleslady that I mentioned before. I usually make my mom shop for me. A few summers ago I got up the nerve to go with my friend, Ruthie Dee. We went to the lingerie floor of a Major Department Store in New York City. The place was swarming with men. There were more men than women. Some were with their wives and lovers, flipping through the merchandise which was fine. They had every right to be there. But most of them were alone. Alone or with each other. I suppose some were waiting for women, but they were like spectators: sitting on the sidelines, grinning, smirking, talking quietly to each other without ever taking their eyes off the main event. One of them had the gall to ask us for the time. Men. You might be interested to know that I did actually buy some bras. I hate them. The bras, I mean.

"It's quality, not quantity," I've been told several times over the years by various males that I still don't buy it. "Okay, maybe for looking, but not touching" concedes Walter. "For touching, there's only one thing that counts." And what's that? Ralph Edgar ravenously exclaims (if you had been here to hear him, you would have described it as ravenous too) "I like them big!" I excuse him, because he is drunk, but isn't that just what I want to hear? Lars mentioned a T-shirt contest he once attended in Tennessee, then gets sort of embarrassed, and starts getting more embarrassed when I probe and request that he be specific. With the tales of large breasts, Darrin interjects "They get in the way." "In the way of what?" I ask. I think I've asked this question before. "You know," he says, "the N-word. "The N--word...continued on next page, column 1
Nicaraguan Reality

To the not quite editors:

On Wednesday, February 28th, The Atlanta Journal featured an article dealing with the problems facing the newly elected government in Nicaragua. Although the major focus of the article was the potential for difficulty in the restructuring of the military, passing reference was made to the need to resolve the question of ownership of land confiscated by the Sandinista government when it came to power. I feel that this extremely important matter deserves more thorough coverage.

When the Sandinista government took control in 1979, they seized only the land owned by the Somoza family. However, this accounted for forty to fifty percent of the available land in Nicaragua. Upon seizing this land, the Sandinistas gave sixty percent of it to individual peasants. In addition, the reform set up collective farms owned and operated by the peasants. These Nicaraguans, who had previously toiled at subsistence levels while the Somoza family, through their absolute control over the country, extracted hundreds of millions of dollars from them, now had an opportunity to improve their lives, and, at the same time, increase the economic strength of the country. Unfortunately, because of the political realities involved, the resources previously available to work the land were removed, thus making economic success much more difficult. However, in spite of the U.S. imposed economic sanctions, the land reform has improved the material conditions of these Nicaraguans. Also, vast improvements are now possible with the use of U.S. resources and capital.

The land ownership question, when viewed in light of these facts, becomes a much more complicated question than the Journal article indicated. Although we would all agree that it is wrong to take property from others in any society where equality and justice are the norm, Nicaragua does not fall into this category. Decades of repression and injustice led to a situation where all wealth was concentrated into a few hands and the vast majority of the population lived in abject poverty, without the ability to improve their conditions. The Sandinistas’ land reform removed this injustice and set the stage for economic improvement for the Nicaraguan people. Now, the UNO coalition must set their position on this matter. They can reverse this land reform, return power to a few hands, and thus create the situation which originally lead to the Sandinista revolt. Conversely, UNO can support the reform and begin to work with the Nicaraguan people to develop their country. In the long run, these issues will be far more important than any political struggle arising from the transition of power.

Raymond Close
P.O. Box 35356

Dear Editors:

I wish to respond to the article entitled “Another Modest Proposal” by Lon Remlinger, published in the November issue of the NAR. I agree that saving the earth from ourselves may be humanities most difficult task. However, I strongly disagree with Mr. Remlinger’s suggestion that we humans embark on the systematic destruction of members of our own species in an effort to reduce and control our population, and thus help to preserve all life on earth. As Mr. Remlinger stated in his article, the earth’s “immune system” consists of a tightly woven, interconnected tapestry made up of groups of organisms that symbiotically hold each other’s populations within healthy limits. However, what Mr. Remlinger doesn’t say is that it is the will to survive which provides a major driving force toward maintaining a sustainable natural balance. To deny one’s own species the right to pursue survival goes against the workings of the balance of nature. While human technology can undoubtedly help to solve some of our environmental ills, we should forever be mindful to direct the technology along streams consistent with the teachings of nature. To work against the natural limitations within which all life exists, no matter how great the effort, will ultimately lead to disaster.

Mr. Remlinger likens humanity to an infection of the earth. I can understand the comparison in terms of our multiplying our numbers to levels burdensome to the earth and of our producing toxins in such quantities as to test the handling capacity of the earth system. But beyond this, the comparison is wrong. A bacterial infection may have no choice in the matter of whether or not it multiplies indefinitely and poisons its host to death. We humans, however, do have that choice. I advocate exercising that choice by implementing ways in which we can work within the framework of nature on earth in order to preserve and promote the life of the earth and, so it follows, the life of humanity as well: control of population growth, energy conservation, use of renewable energy sources, reduction, recycling and reuse of waste, environmental protection, planting...
Mr. Remlinger responds:

In response to your response, you say that to deny a species’ will to survive is contrary to the balance of nature. However, Homo sapiens has left the ways of nature behind for the most part. I’m sure you will agree. Therefore, thwarting him would not necessarily be thwarting nature. If you look at Earth as a single living unit, of which humans are a small part, I think you will find that the continued survival of Earth is more value than the continuation of human civilization. And I think that these two things are at odds, and that only one may survive.

You suggest means by which humans might save Earth while retaining civilization: population growth control, energy conservation etc. I think it is clear that these measures are too little, too late, and not even likely. Let’s imagine that all of Earth’s human political units joined to become one country, with the goal of saving the Earth. Let’s assume that this government had significant influence over all humans. A slow decline in “human count” would now be possible. In addition, a single government could force a lowering of the technology level (or “quality of life”) of its citizens, especially of those citizens living the ecologically rapacious First World lifestyle. With these measures, humans would eventually be living off of the interest, phasing out non-renewable energy sources, and manufacturing solely with recycled materials. The Earth could then begin to heal, the ecology to re-balance. The Earth could then construct to live until it stopped rotating, but only if this world government held together and influenced humans daily lives for millions of years.

Earth’s resources. The planet is so overburdened that we would need to dig heavily into the principal even with population growth zero, intense recycling, and zero pollution. As you can see, this would postpone the world’s demise a bit, but that’s about it.

Okay, so let’s look at a more optimistic scenario: let’s say all the human political units joined to become one country, with the goal of saving the Earth. Let’s assume that this government had significant influence over all humans. A slow decline in “human count” would now be possible. In addition, a single government could force a lowering of the technology level (or “quality of life”) of its citizens, especially of those citizens living the ecologically rapacious First World lifestyle. With these measures, humans would eventually be living off of the interest, phasing out non-renewable energy sources, and manufacturing solely with recycled materials. The Earth could then begin to heal, the ecology to re-balance. The Earth could then construct to live until it stopped rotating, but only if this world government held together and influenced humans daily lives for millions of years.

First of all, it seems very highly unlikely that the countries of the world could ever unite, but even if they did, it doesn’t take much knowledge of human history to see that the chances of any government lasting a million years are pretty slim, especially when that government demanded a reduction in the standards of living of its citizens.

If you can devise a greater way to save Earth than the end of civilization via predator/healer machines, I would be the first to embrace it, but don’t give me this “recycling, planting trees, and environmental protection” stuff.

You state that I have fallen victim to the belief that humans are superior. Actually I think that humans are equal. That is, one human is equal in value to one tree, which is as important as one snail, which is as significant as one fern, etcetera. In fact, I can see merit in the position that humans are less valuable than snails and trees, since they have the audacity to think they are the most important species on Earth, and armed with this misconception and oversized brains, we actually wipe out other species. But I’ll stick with the assertion that humans are equal to cockroaches and birch trees, not inferior. After all, I wouldn’t want to be seen as an extremist.

You accuse me of proposing genocide, yet the predator/healer machines I recommend would not discriminate on the basis of race, politics, nor culture; human populations with a density less than or equal to that of hunter-gatherer (stone age) societies would be left alone, all others would be destroyed. It’s that simple.

By the way, you shouldn’t be too quick to knock the hunter-gatherer life. From what I understand, hunter-gatherers have more leisure time, more acute senses, and fewer problems and worries than modern men.

I’m listening to nature right now John, and she is saying, “Damn, I’ll never get this straightened out while these civilized humans are around. It takes me hundreds of millennia to work up something to attack them, yet it only takes them a decade or two to adapt to it and defeat it.”

“It looks like they’ll be the death of me. I hope they don’t manage to infect my sisters; I don’t want another eco-system to suffer my fate.

---

John Schendel
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES
What Is Sexism?

Here are some short views on what sexism is....

T. Hickman

Sexism is the attitude that fosters the perpetuation of stereotypes which ultimately leads to the oppression of one gender by another. When such oppression exists to any degree (whether racially or gender based), the whole community is dragged down; sexism against women hurts men as well as women (albeit to a smaller degree for men). Humankind suffers.

Can sexism be defined as to say that a calendar is sexist when containing pictures of Georgia Tech men fully clothed and not in any precarious poses? Is the calendar a sexist publication because it presents men in a forum where beauty is the only relevant dimension (which perpetuates stereotypes of what beauty is in our culture)? Or is the calendar merely a celebration of beauty? If this is the case, whose standard of beauty are we operating under?

Since we live in a historically patriarchal society, sexism has manifested itself mainly in the male domination of the female. Obviously not all men discriminate against women, support media that perpetuate stereotypes, or harass coworkers, but what may be said of a society that, for example, rewards women with 70 cents for every dollar a man makes? These are the types of questions with which we as a human community need to grapple. True, gains have been made in the last two decades, but there is a very long way to go toward gender equality.

Steve Danjo

Sexism: Discrimination or generalization based on gender.

Most people would agree that paying a woman less than a man when she works as diligently and efficiently as he does at the same job constitutes sexism. Most people would also agree that statements such as “women are the weaker sex” and “a woman’s place is in the home” propagate sexism. Pay discrimination and sexist comments blatantly degrade women but obvious sexism only represents a small part of the problem.

Sexism can be compared to a volcano. Like a volcano, sexism reaches much deeper than is obvious. Although the visible peak of the volcano looks like the most dangerous and explosive part, the volcanic activity actually occurs at much deeper levels. The menacing ruptures from the crater result from movement beneath the earth’s crust.

Sexist actions and comments result from the generalizations and traditions that are ingrained in society—preconceptions and ideals that are embedded beneath society’s “crust.”

Society accepts sexism as natural and normal. When a sexist joke offends a woman, people sneer in disgust and say, “Can’t you take a joke?” Many women who are discriminated against accept prejudice because they are afraid they will be labeled a radical feminist or a man-hater if they...
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES

What Is Sexism?

In the business world women are often accused of being distracting to the men in the office and therefore negative for overall production. In today’s offices women are being asked to change their appearance instead of men being asked to change their own discriminating minds. I have been told several times to watch the way I dress so as not to attract a male colleague’s eye. I have been asked to cut my hair and tone down my makeup so I won’t be accepted as anything less than a “respectful superior.” Somehow the general idea originated that it is the woman’s responsibility to downplay her female features in order for her male colleagues to work to their abilities. Unfortunately, this widely accepted idea is sexism.

Karen Steadman

What is Sexism? Essentially, it is the same thing as Racism, but with a slightly different twist. While Racism holds that a person’s ability to think is determined by his or her particular genetics, Sexism holds that a person’s ability to use his or her brain is determined by his or her particular sex. That is all of the difference there is. The purposes of the promoters of both Sexism and Racism are the same: to allow subjugation of people by destroying peoples’ capacities to think. This is done by declaring the mind impotent, as I describe in my article “Racism Revisited,” which appears elsewhere in this issue.

It is obvious how Sexism started, so I won’t go into detail. What I feel is important to remember is that men and women are physically different. The intellectual abilities of both, however, can not be prejudged on a sexual basis, but must rather be judged for the specific individuals in question. Today, women are in every profession, doing as well, or as poorly, as men do.

Now, let me discuss Sexism from both sides: male chauvenism and women’s lib. One uses ‘roles’ to enslave the other; the other retaliates by revenge, i.e., “man-bashing”, in order to settle the score. Both sides, I reiterate, do what they do for the same reasons as the Racists, and therefore hate the thinking mind for the same purpose. I personally find the behavior of both sides unbecoming and offensive, if not downright disgusting. I feel that both the chauvenists and the man-bashers act more like swine than humans.

The type of world that the Sexists and Racists advocate is indeed one where most people would actually live more like swine than humans. Some women’s lib supporters, for example, publicly protest pictures of scantily clad women on billboards on the grounds that these pictures are ‘demoting’ to women. Anyone who falls for this argument is missing the point: the real objection is on the grounds that the pictures are beautiful. Such Sexists would rather see something ugly and profane on the billboard, regardless of what sex it is; to them, such a horror would be a suitable reminder of their low self-esteem and perverse hatred of the world—and a symbol of their conquest of it.

Previously, someone called this last paragraph ‘yellow journalism.’ Yet, this argument does exist. I am not trying to say that everyone who protests against seeing the human body displayed publicly is a pathological Sexist or Racist; what I am trying to say is that I see no reason why women should be offended at such displays which glorify the human body, or men for that matter, under the conditions that the displays are attractive and not profane in any way. For example, while I was driving down I-95 in Florida in December, a girlfriend of mine and I saw a billboard of a shirtless man advertising something. “What a hunk!” She exclaimed. I was not offended in the least.

Don’t get me wrong on another point. I am not against most people who call themselves feminists, or who are lobbyists for equal rights legislation. I feel that this is good. To anyone who has any doubts, I shall restate the point made in Racism Revisited: Women should have the same legal rights as men, more, and NO MORE.

One thing disturbs me, by the way. Many people put excessive pressure on me to ‘watch out’ when I talk about Sexism and Racism. I realize that sometimes this is an attempt at facto censorship, and am not impressed. Therefore, let me stress that there should be nothing in these articles which would offend a rational person, what acts for his or her own benefit. If there is, I would like to know about it, so that any misconceptions which result from these articles can be corrected.

...continued from last page

speak out. Others think sexism does not affect them. They just cannot see the volcano through the clouds of tradition.

Most people seem to completely overlook sexism. They accept sexual stereotypes as reality. For example, they may not realize that an advertisement featuring bikini-clad women draping themselves over farm machinery is sexist until someone is offended by it. Some people may not even think that a comment such as “Women are more emotional than men” is sexist. “What’s wrong with people being different?” they may ask. Nothing. People should be different—but as individuals. Categorizing people into neat little groups based on physical traits discredits their individuality.

We can dispel the large, obvious problems much easier then the hidden, traditional beliefs that are ingrained in society. The problems must be relieved at deeper levels as well as on the surface. Bulldozing down the volcano will not end the eruptions.

Jillanna Babb

David Wille
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES
Interview With a Survivor of Rape

by Suzanne Burns

On the average there are 6 cases of rape reported by Ga. Tech women every quarter. This number is alarming enough in itself, but even more horrifying is the fact that this number most likely represents only a fraction of the rapes committed. National studies now show that in the United States more than every one in four women will be the victim of sexual assault in their lifetime. In other words, the next time you are in a lecture hall, look around. If there are 40 women in the class, chances are at least 10 of them have been, or will be, victims of sexual assault. The following is an interview with one such woman.

Was the person someone you knew?

No.

Where and when did it happen?

In my house in the middle of the night, about 2 a.m., last October. I was asleep. I didn't wake up until he was in my room and was holding me down. I never saw him, except that I saw he was black from under the blindfold.

Did he physically hurt you?

He told me that if I didn't struggle he wouldn't hurt me, so I didn't. There was no one around who would have heard if I had screamed.

Do you think that the man came to your house with the intent of raping someone and just decided to steal things while he was there, or vice versa?

I really think that he broke in because he knew I was there alone and had come there to rape me. If he just wanted to steal things, he could've come when I wasn't home.

Did you tell someone immediately afterwards?

I called the police. The man tied me up and blindfolded me. He took a lot of things from my house. He stole my car but he told me that he didn't want the car; he was just going to use it to take all of the things and that they would find my car somewhere, and they found my car the next day and it was okay. He took the cord off of the telephone so it would take me longer to call the police. When I got the phone back together I called 911. The lady at 911 stayed on the line with me until the police got there.

How were you treated by the police? Did they believe you?

Yes, they believed me and were good about the whole thing. It was so obvious that it had really happened. The police could tell that someone had broken in. It is a lot harder for people when you do know the man because a lot of times it isn't so obvious. With me, there is no way that the police would think I had made this up. It's so sad that a lot of women are raped and they didn't do anything to contribute to it- maybe they were out late or they went out with somebody they didn't know that well, but people look at them and say that they shouldn't have been out late or whatever. Well maybe they shouldn't have, but no woman asks or deserves to be raped. I think an ideal world would not be one where we were always protected, but one where we didn't need to be protected.

What happened to the man legally?

The police sifted through everything in my house looking for fingerprints, but they didn't find enough to identify the man. They also took bed sheets to try to find semen, but they didn't find anything. They had a suspect and were pretty sure that it was the man that raped me. They brought me pictures of him to identify but I didn't see him enough to identify him. All they had on him was circumstantial evidence so they were never able to make an arrest.

Do you worry that he's out there and that he might come back?

Sometimes. Not too much, though. The police told me that it's very uncommon for a rapist to come back to the same place twice. And he would be crazy to, since the police are pretty sure they know who did it. If he did come back, he would have a much greater chance of getting caught. I still drive home at night though, and see men standing on the side of the road and wonder if one of them could be him.

How do your family and friends react when you told them?

They were all very supportive. My best friend was a former roommate at Tech and she took it especially hard when I told her because she was raped by someone she knew at Tech. She has been very helpful since she knows how I feel.

Did the police tell you about any rape support groups?

No. The general procedure in a rape case is that they take you to Grady Hospital and they have a rape crisis center there. A counselor stays with you while they are examining you. She tells you about the rape crisis center at Grady.

How did you find out about the support group at Tech?

I was looking around a lot for something else besides Grady and I called the counseling center and made an appointment with a counselor there. The support group was formed a few weeks later.

Do you feel like the support group has helped you?

Yes. One of the most important things in dealing with rape is to just know that there are other people out there who know how...
you feel. I've had so many weird feelings and it's easy to start to wonder about yourself. It helps a lot to know that someone else is feeling the same things. I have a long way to go though.

In your support group are there date rape victims as well as stranger rape victims?

Yes. Although every case is different it helps to support both types of victims. The stranger rape victims have a lot in common in that they all wonder who the man was, and if he will come back, and the people who were raped by people that they knew will also have common questions and problems.

**Do you think this experience has changed your attitude towards men?**

I wish it hadn't, but it has in some ways. It's real easy when you've been treated like that to generalize and say that all men are bad and that all men treat women badly and are mean and I fall into that trap sometimes. Now I am much quicker to get upset by things that men say and I jump to the wrong conclusions thinking that the man is the one who hurt me when I wouldn't have thought so before I was raped.

**Were you dating anyone at the time of the rape or since then?**

I have dated the same man for over a year.

**How has this affected your relationship?**

It's been difficult, but he's been very helpful. The night of the rape, the police called him and he met us at the hospital. He called my parents for me. He understands when I feel scared for apparently no reason and he tries to make me feel better. He realizes that there are things that he used to do that never bothered me, that bother me now. He knows that I am more sensitive and he has been flexible.

**Has the rape made you feel afraid of sex?**

No, but you have a lot of things going on in your head sometimes. I think about how sex can be such an act of love, but for me it was also an act of violence. It's hard to reconcile that sometimes. My fiance has been very patient with me and very gentle and kind. He knows that I need lots of hugs and he is always there for me. He's very understanding.

**Are you afraid to be alone now?**

I was more at first, but I'm more comfortable now. I went to a locksmith and got better locks for my windows and put better flood lights in my yard.

**Are you a religious person?**

Yes.

**Has this experience made you doubt your beliefs?**

A lot of people would say "Where was God?" I believe that God gives everyone choices and that if I want choices in life then I have to let other people have their choices too. A lot of times people are hurt by other people's choices, and that's just the way it is. When the man was in my house I just prayed. He raped me twice and all I could do was lie there and pray that he wouldn't kill me. And then I thought that it was okay if he killed me because I knew where I was going to go when I died. Then I just prayed for him not to hurt me, but I decided that I could handle that too. Having a strong faith has definitely helped me get through this. The hard part is now. I was writing something once about how I am a rape victim. I wish that I could say I was a rape victim. Other crime victims can say "I was a victim of a robber;" "I was a victim of a mugger." I am a rape victim.

**Do you think that you will always feel like a victim, or that there will be some time in the future when you can say you were a rape victim?**

I hope so. It's heading that way. It gets better. My feelings kind of go in cycles. One day I'll think, "Hey! I'm licking this thing!" and then I'll be depressed for three weeks.

**What would your advice be to someone who had been raped?**

There may be some times when it's best not to report it, but for the most part I would say always report it. Even if you know you don't have any proof and you know that there is nothing they can do to them, if you report it you are going to be in a much better situation if you remember something later that might help catch him or if he bothers you again, you can go back to the police and say "I reported a rape by him before- keep him away from me." You can't do that if you never report it. And if you don't think that you can report it, at least see a counselor or go to a support group. It just helps so much to be able to talk to people who have been there. Also just be careful. I get so scared when I drive to work and see women jogging alone or standing on the side of the street waiting for someone or late at night alone. There have been so many times in the past few months that I have almost pulled over to the side of the road when I see a girl standing there and said, "Don't do this." So many people think that it won't happen to them. Well it happens a lot more than anyone knows or thinks and I bet that most people have friends that it has happened to. Carry tear gas. If you're a guy, don't ever think that a woman is silly to be afraid. If she's afraid, it's probably for a very good reason. Don't take the risk of her being right.

**Note:** For more information about the rape support group at Tech call Dr. Benham at the Student Career Counseling Office at 894-2575.
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES
A Campus Survey
by The Collective Editorial Entity of The North Avenue Review.

The following survey was conducted by several of the staff of the N.A.R. The questions are a product of the communal editorial process. Five randomly selected Georgia Tech students of each gender were given the survey and informed that their answers would be printed anonymously. The responses printed below are not meant to reflect the opinions of the N.A.R. or of the Georgia Tech student body as a whole. They are merely the thoughts and comments of ten individuals.

Briefly, in your own words, define sexism.

Male Responses:
Sexism is an act of discrimination, intolerance, or inequity based on gender.
Harassment, discrimination or stereotyping based on an individual's sexual preference... can also appear in the form of advances or untasteful propositions for sexual activity.
Discrimination (or recognition!) on the basis of sex where gender has no relevance to that which a person was discriminated or recognized for... Or focusing on gender and sexuality where it becomes a hindrance to an individual.
Treating an individual differently because of their gender.
Sexism is the belief that the content of a person's mind is not theirs by their own choice, but is determined by their gender.

Female Responses:
Sexism is an attitude which makes you treat people based solely on their sex
The double-standard of the sexes, where one sex receives unequal treatment just for their gender, whether it be in the work place, in the classroom, in the evaluation of ability, etc.
Altering the treatment of an individual only on the basis of his or her sex.
Sexism is prejudice against the opposite sex due to preconceived stereotypes; believing one sex is better than (supreme to) the other.
Any words, actions, or ideas that place more importance or show favoritism toward one sex over the other sex.

Is sexism a problem? Why or why not?

Male Responses:
Yes.
Like any discrimination, it is a problem, probably not as much as it once was. However, the complete materialism of our generation and society has made sexism pretty rampant in advertising.
Sure. It really sucks. But it can be avoided. It is used to subjugate people involuntarily.
Yes. Even if women are equal in pay, attitudes of sexism still exist, keeping them at a secondary level in our society. They as individuals cannot reach their potential.
Yes, people’s ideas are not equally expressed.

Female Responses:
Yes. It’s like racism. Basing an issue on something mostly physical.
Definitely! It’s ignorance. You cannot validly make decisions (or sweeping overgeneralizations) on anyone simply on the basis of what reproductive organs they possess.
Sexism is a problem if it denies someone their rights such as a job, but in idle conversation I suppose it should not be a problem. People should not get offended by what close-minded people say. I don’t think it is just a problem women deal with; I think men deal with it just as much!
Definitely. Sexist actions and thoughts are extremely prevalent. Sexism prevents people from reaching their potential. Sexism devalues women and feminine characteristics.
Sexism is definitely a problem in society because it often expresses itself in a negative way towards women. It results in viewing women as being powerless, treated as objects to be dominated over.

Have you experienced sexism? Briefly elaborate.

Male Responses:
Little Sister...Big Brother...The Greek Scene. (not me personally)
Yes. But...elaboration on depravity is boring!
I don’t think I’ve ever been the object of a sexist remark, except in jest. I don’t think I’ve made any sexist remarks except in jest.
Yes, as a guy I catch verbal stereotypes from girls all the time. I have
continued on next page...
also received an anonymous written proposition from another guy.

Yes. At meetings, the females in the group do not participate enough due to their feelings of not being taken seriously.

**Female Responses:**

1. Disgusting "cat calls" by construction workers. It's very degrading as a person but then you know these guys don't yell at other guys - so you know it's targeted to you as a woman.
2. Men and women bashers: i.e. "all guys are walking perverts out for only one thing" and "all women are manipulative bitches," etc.

The most blatant sexism I have ever experienced didn't happen to me, it was something that I heard about. A male co-worker at my Co-Op job was known to ask "May I speak to a man please?" when he called a vendor and a woman answered the phone.

I have experienced sexism on the Tech campus. I had a teacher one time say that if you are a minority, female, and from Georgia, you will have problems in his class; it was true. I had problems, so I dropped the class. I also feel that some Tech guys are sexist; guys are always assuming I am stupid or that I can't carry anything. I was also told that it was not feminine to do something better than the guy I have a crush on.

I have experienced sexism while working at an internship. The engineers let me do all the busy work i.e. copying, faxing, drawing charts, while they gave design projects to a male student with equal or less experience than myself.

Yes. I got into a few engineering schools only because they wanted to boost the male/female ratio. At a party I was asked why I was bothering to go to college if I was just going to get married and have kids. He almost got slapped.

How, in your own life, have you dealt with the issue of sexism?

**Male Responses:**

I have spoken about it with friends to spread the idea that sexism is not an idea that can continue.

Change vocabulary, i.e. from chairman to chairperson. Simply be aware of it. I am sexist by default (by being born into a sexist system) and therefore must work against it.

I try to educate females by telling them all guys are not the same.

I do not become a sexist. Never have been. Never will be. And I don't like sexists. Never have. Never will.

I try to treat people as people and not as members of a gender specific group. Some people may call this sexist because I am not recognizing women or men as a group deserving of rights, etc.

**Female Responses:**

I have basically ignored it assuming those that think that way are not worth bothering with. I tend not to deal with people that refuse to be open minded or educated. It is not worth me being offended.

I became more aggressive, pushed hard for what I wanted, didn't let up until I thought I was treated fairly.

I think the way to deal with sexism is through education. Sexist ideas and values are passed down from generation to generation. If we educate the young about what sexism is and if we reduce the sexism in the media, we will begin to eliminate sexism.

I have tried to deal with sexism on a one-on-one basis by bringing up things which I think are sexist in conversation and just trying to make people aware of attitudes and policies that my perspective as a woman sees as sexist.

Mostly with indignant, intellectual debate and discussion on the issue. I never swallow an insult.

**How would you propose to deal with sexism on a larger scale?**

**Male Responses:**

Educate educate EDUCATE educate EDUCATE! Educate educate.

Like most of our societal problems, people must first be made aware that there is a problem.

Get women to realize it exist. Unless women act equal and demand equality, there will be sexism.

Educate in the schools about women's roles. You cannot legislate morality.

(one individual surveyed chose not to respond to this question)

**Female Responses:**

I point it out to people when they are being sexist and more importantly I explain why something is sexist and what negative things result when people are sexist.

Promote education. Promote fair, rational thinking and decision making.

Education is always the key in dealing with prejudices. Educated, truly educated people don't have prejudice because they realize the importance of the mind, not the sex.

Some sexism is inevitable - we are NOT the SAME. However, the differences aren't on a negative/positive scale and to solve negative sexism would be to remove that scale. -Not better, just different.

I think that the only real hope to deal with sexism is resocialization within the family. My hope is that women who are actively combating sexism now will instill their ideas in their children so that the new generation will be raised in an environment which is increasingly non-sexist.
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES
Equality and Justice for Women. Now !!!!

by Zed Lloyd

Greetings once again to the Review-readers posse. This time around, I'll be looking at an aspect of our society which really needs an antitode. I'm referring to the tremendous lack of respect and conditions of inequality that women are exposed to on a daily basis.

Just pause for a moment and think of the broad range of areas within which the blatant lack of respect and conditions of unequal opportunity for women manifest themselves. I'll tell you, it will be no surprise to me if you happen to be rudely awakened by the realization that this principle runs through the very core of our social fabric. From religion to politics; from friendship to intimate relationship; from the corporate world to marriage; yes! from our basic social rights to self determination, and even in some of our cultural settings, these attitudes prevail.

For instance, in the area of organized religion, it is appalling that such a notion as the incompetence of women in holding leadership roles is allowed to exist and be even justified in an institution which prides itself as being the moral conscience of society and the ultimate advocate of equality of all human beings. I mean, isn't it common knowledge that the kind of media blitz and social uproar that follows the appointment of a female priest, archishop, etc, only occurs because such actions are not anticipated? This is an obvious double-standard and a perfect example of religious hypocrisy.

Now let's look at the political arena. Here, especially in the Third World countries, improvements have been made. However, in this machoistic capitalist society, and even in some European socialist, and social democracies, the women's involvement in political activism and leadership has been systematically suppressed. Hence, women in these localities and in other parts of the world need to work consistently to eliminate such barriers and limitations. At this point, I'd like to add that I do not necessarily support the political line of some of the prominent female political leaders of our time, but I do take this opportunity to bow in respect to them for having accepted the challenge, because in so-doing they have proved that political leadership is not something that men have an exclusive right to.

In the sphere of friendships and non-marital relationships, I too am guilty of denying women the full respect and understanding that is rightfully theirs. I do not intend to endorse a stereotypical sort of attitude by men, but I do know that I am not in a minority when I say that, WE CONTINUALLY DISRESPECT, EXPLOIT, AND SUPPRESS WOMEN. We are the products of a society that embraces male dominance and hence, we've become collaborators to the process of the continual degradation of women. We need to be aware, however, that if we continue to see women as just objects for satisfying our physical needs, and as mindless beings who should accept our will as law, then the prospects of striking the rich mines of equal opportunity and respect for each other (men and women) will continue to elude us and may even bring us to the point where we may start believing that such a thought is an illusionary perception which just cannot be attained. Be warned also, that women who are guilty of helping to perpetuate the inequality of which I speak, do need to work at finding a solution. I do not claim to have all the answers, but as one who continually seeks to obtain truth, I humbly suggest these three guidelines:

(a) One should try the utmost to know and understand his or herself.
(b) Develop a conscious understanding of the world and the changes that are taking place around it.
(c) Learn to respect people regardless of their gender.

Now, taking a look at corporate America, we see that while their has been an increase in the number of women being employed at the professional level, there has been an equal persistence of the policy of unequal pay for equal work for women relative to men. Worse still, we have seen the upsurgence of an attitude which says: AS LONG AS I PAY YOU, I OWN YOU; and it is one which has led to an increase in an exploitative attitude that is continually exhibited towards women in the workplace. Hopefully, as more women establish themselves in areas of prominence, there'll be a change in such attitudes. Women, however, need to be aware that the very capitalistic principle upon which this corporate world operates is exploitative in essence, so to expect too much may really be asking something of a system which in itself can only promise but knows fully well it can't really give.

In terms of basic social rights and self-determination, the facts are clear and highly visible, so I'll just note a few. Have you really stopped to think about how absurd and disrespectful it is toward women that men in Congress, etc, by some self-imposed supreme moral power, really believe that they have the right to decide for a woman wether or not she should have an abortion? Personally, I'm not pro-abortion or anything like that, but who the hell am I to sit back and decide what's in the best interest of someone whose position-I can never really be in but only try to imagine? This absurdity has really gone too far. Also, we see a continued increase in the number of families which survive solely on a woman's income simply because so many men have failed to accept the responsibilities that come as a consequence of our actions. Added to that, we have a Federal Government who, by some economic gadgetry, justifies a minimum wage which puts a lot of women on the path to prostitution, homelessness, and drug trafficking. We really need to address these conditions seriously because this is definitely not the right direction.

To the Women out there, I say seriously that you can't just sit back
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES  
Modern Love and Chivalry

by Robert Warren (tongue-in-cheek)

For the gentleman of the '90's, these are certainly times of change. The days of simple chivalry are gone. Not since the days of knights and ladies have things been concise concerning how a gentleman should behave. It used to be pretty straightforward on how to treat our friends of the opposite sex. Before, you only had a few simple guidelines. Always protect the honor and dignity of ladies, always maintain an attitude of unselfish service to ladies, and never compromise your standards when dealing with them. If you were walking with a damsel and encountered a mud puddle, you meant you should throw off your cloak and provide them with a safe path through the mire. If she was insulted, it was your duty to bring her good name to justice, fighting to death if necessary. And you were to never make any unwelcome advances towards her. In other words, when dealing with women, it was the man's job to uphold her dignity, protect her safety, and make her feel like a treasured being.

Today, however, things have changed. Holding a door for a woman is no longer seen as a gesture of service, it's now seen as an insidious Freudian slip on the male's part to suggest that the woman is either too weak or too stupid to open her own door. In fact, doing anything for the woman now seems to imply that the man is assuming that she can't do it herself. Even offering to pay for a meal is an insult; another plot to assert financial dominance over the woman by implying that she can't support herself.

This has all made for many changes in the way men are forced to deal with women. In any social interaction there are certain protocols established by society to facilitate the interchanges. For example, it is not proper to prop your feet on the job interviewer's desk or to ask questions in the middle of a church sermon. With dating interactions, though, those protocols are now very ambiguous. When eating out, the waitress used to leave the check with the male, since he was expected to pay for the meal. Now, he/she places the check exactly in the middle of the table, so as not to offend the female patron. This presents an enormous problem for the male in such a situation. If he makes a move for the check, he is seen as trying to be a domineering chauvinist, but if he totally ignores the check, or whips out a calculator to figure out individual tabs he is seen as hopelessly cheap.

What then has gone wrong with the social protocols? Certainly there is nothing wrong with the women's lib movement! Freeing any group of people from oppression is always a noble endeavor. The problem is inconsistency. Some women want to be treated like a lady from old with flowers, held doors, and bows from the waist, while other women are insulted by any show of chivalry. Therefore, you, as an honest guy just trying to be accommodating, are totally confused and often embarrassed. It's hard enough to unite two people into sharing common interests, but now we are faced with a double standard in behavior. We can act in two socially acceptable ways, but be taken as a jerk in either way.

So, is there any solution? Well, we could say the heck with it all and simply live like cavemen. You know, club 'em in the head and drag them to your cave. However, the women of today are more prepared to defend against such tactics, and it would be hard to introduce her to mom: (mom, meet Judy, when she recovers). Then too, we could take the old redneck approach (no offense, honest). In other words, don't treat them nice.

EQUALITY & JUSTICE
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and think that men are going to improve conditions for you, or that the majority of men are just going to, out of the goodness of their heart, automatically start respecting women. You need to realize that a lot of times you're going to have to demand and deserve that respect. In using the word demand, I do not mean in a strict physical sense; What I do mean is that women need to take a serious analysis of their situation and in so-doing they will realize that a lot of times if they would just take a little time to handle themselves and situations in a more respectful manner then they would command a lot more respect and admiration from their fellow human beings. Women need to understand that ACTIVISM on their part, and also on the part of men who are serious about making a difference, is the best and right thing to do. Please don't be fooled in believing that individualistic achievement is the solution. It needs to be emphasized that the STRUGGLE for the LIBERATION EQUALITY, and TOTAL RESPECT FOR WOMEN is UNIVERSAL and COLLECTIVE. So let's all pull our resources together and work diligently and eternally at making a lasting difference.

Thank you.
Zed Lloyd.
SEXISM AND GENDER ISSUES

Date Rape on College Campuses

by Lisa Little and Jeff Cardille

One of four females in the U.S. is sexually assaulted or molested by the age of 21.1

"In one survey of women on 32 college campuses, 15% had experienced at least one rape, and 89% of the time it was by men the women knew. Half the rapes occurred during a date."2

"A woman is about 50 times more likely to be raped by somebody she knows than she is by a stranger."3

About half of a group of polled men said that "they would force a woman to have sex against her will if they could get away with it, ... but if you ask them if they would rape a woman if they knew they could get away with it, only about 15% said they would."4

These statistics are frightening. They indicate a serious problem—not only with rape by strangers, but with rape of women by men that they know. Though men are raped, it is vastly more common that rapes involve a man forcing sexual activity on a woman. Since so little is understood about acquaintance rape, and since it is so grossly underreported (some experts suggest that only one in ten rape survivors report their rape5), it's important that both men and women understand what the definitions of rape are and how they can decrease its likelihood.

College students display damaging ignorance about the definition of rape. Researchers have found that "if they ask women if they've been raped, 3 to 4 percent will answer yes. If the word "rape" is omitted and their state's legal definition of rape is used instead, as high as 20 percent of the female students will say they have been the victims of forced sexual intercourse against their will and without their consent."6 Many men, too, are unaware of what rape really is: many interviewed "do not seem to realize that there is no difference between rape and forcing a woman to have sex against her will."7

Regardless of the legal definition of rape (which varies from state to state), the subjective experience of rape can occur from any of the following events:

Rape occurs any time a sex-related act is forced upon another person. This includes everything from fondling or oral sex to actual intercourse. Even forcing a person to disrobe and be stared at or photographed is included in this definition. Sexual acts that do not include the rapist's genitalia (but rather hands, mouth, or some instrument) are also included.

Rape includes attempted as well as completed acts. Simply being placed in the position of fearing rape, even if the rape is not completed for some reason, constitutes the crime of rape.

Rape involves the use of force or threat of force. Any time a victim is forced or coerced to the point of physical or emotional powerlessness, rape has occurred. Even if the victim does not fight back, force or threat of force is all that is necessary for rape to occur.

Rape may be committed against any person. Rape is not a crime that necessarily strikes any one group of victims. Young and old, black and white, male and female—anyone can be raped. Rape is a violent sexual abuse against another person, regardless of who that person is or what that person does with her or his life.

(Descriptions taken from If You Are Raped: What Every Woman Needs to Know, by Kathryn M. Johnson, courtesy of the Georgia Tech Counseling and Career Planning Center)

It's important to remember that many rape survivors who fear for their lives or personal safety do not physically struggle during the rape itself; many who are attacked are too frightened of the rapist to resist. This is especially true for acquaintance rapes, where a certain level of trust is established before the rape.

On college campuses, alcohol and drugs often interfere with clear communication about sex. Sexual activity with a person who has not explicitly consented is considered rape. Obviously, a student who has passed out from alcohol or drugs has not given explicit consent.

It's important to remember that rapists, whether raping a stranger or an intimate acquaintance, treat the person they are raping as an object to be controlled. Rape often leaves its survivors feeling helpless and guilty, sensing that they have no control over their own lives.

Individual counseling is available at Georgia Tech to support women recovering from a rape. A rape recovery group also meets on campus; it is a small support group explicitly designed for women. For information call the Counseling and Career Planning center at 894-2575. Confidentiality is strictly observed. Men who would like to discuss any of these issues with a counselor can also call the counseling center at the above number.
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For Women

Believe in your right to set sexual limits with anyone and communicate these limits clearly, firmly, and early. Say "No" when you mean "No."

Be assertive with someone who is sexually pressuring you. Often men interpret passivity as permission.

Don’t lose your identity but be aware of actions and dress that are easily misinterpreted by men. A sexual attack will never be your fault but by being aware of the situation you may avoid being raped.

Don’t doubt your own personal feelings. If you feel you have been raped, then you have been raped. Many women can benefit from counseling. Don’t hesitate to get support and counseling. You can reach the Career Counseling Center at 894-2575.

For Men

Be aware of social pressures. It’s OK not to “score.”

“No” means “No.” Don’t continue after “No.” “No” is not a personal rejection, but expresses a desire not to participate in a single sex act. The relationship will almost certainly be stronger if you learn to trust each other sexually.

Don’t assume sexy dress or a flirtatious manner are invitations to sex or that previous permission for sex applies to the current situation.

If a woman confides to you that she has been raped or abused, be supportive of her feelings. Understand that she may have serious insecurities about her sexuality and being open about her uneasiness is not personal rejection, but rather shows a trust in you as a friend.

Seek counseling if you feel you have made a woman uncomfortable during sexual intimacy, or if you have ever felt similarly vulnerable.

Adapted from the American College Health Association
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In Defense of Choice

by Louise Frantzen

Reading Mr. Yarborough's article "Pro-choice, Pro-abortion, Anti-life, ..." (North Avenue Review issue 4v), on the semantics of the pro-choice/pro-life controversy, I felt my pulse quicken and a sick, clammy feeling in the pit of my stomach. There was a time when I might not have felt anything at all. Coming from a very non-controversial high school background and an apolitical family, I had very few set ideas about issues when I arrived at Tech as a frosh (the non-sexist word for a first year student adopted as official policy by schools such as Cal Tech). I have seen the Tech campus become more activated and thus more segregated politically and ideologically, and I have gradually become more aware of the prevailing attitudes on many controversial topics held by the "average" Tech student, if there exists such a creature. I have considered my own stance on various issues, and when I reflected upon what my positions were, I found that my views correspond to what I see as the minority opinion on campus. I am pro-choice when it comes to the abortion issue. It is not a decision I came to lightly, but by questioning what I felt to be the arguments for both sides and facing my own inner fears and hopes for humanity, I chose what I believe to be the best position.

It disturbs me greatly that by a seemingly arbitrary dissection of articles written in The North Avenue Review, Mr. Yarborough implies that statistically speaking, I am most likely "pro-abortion." I have gotten to know many of the people on campus who call themselves pro-choice and I would like to inform Mr. Yarborough that he could not be farther from the truth. Not one pro-choice student I have spoken to likes the idea of abortion. The pro-choice stance is that abortion is an imperfect solution to the bad situation of unwanted pregnancies. As for myself, my priorities are pro-sex education, pro-birth control, and then pro-choice. If we had the first two items under control, the third would be unnecessary.

Consider, if you will, a perfect world. It is a world where birth control is affordable, convenient, and fail-safe for everybody. Children are taught the facts about their reproductive systems as well as responsibility for their sexual actions at an early age so they are armed with knowledge by the time they are able to conceive. All the boys of this world are brought up, in an environment where women are respected equally as human beings so there is no such thing as rape and date rape. All women have equal opportunities to get decent education and good jobs if they so choose. Women are given more and better positive role models than the full-body or Sports Illustrated models revered by men. Career women have enough options in daycare and flexible work benefits so they need not feel they must choose a career or a family. And as the ultimate ideal, both men and women feel comfortable enough with the male and female aspects of their personality to openly discuss issues of sexuality on a rational level. So call me an idealist. But notice that nowhere in this ideal world do I mention free and convenient abortions for everyone. If the problems of sexuality and male-female relations were resolved, there would be no need for abortions.

Unfortunately, most "pro-life" people that I have listened to have tunnel vision. They repeat as if programmed into their central nervous system "Abortion is murder, murder is illegal, therefore abortion should be illegal." If I saw pro-lifers actively trying to do something about the unwanted pregnancies in the first place, I would perhaps be more sympathetic. However, many of them are also anti-birth control and anti-sex education. Does this make sense? Perhaps it is because many of the pro-lifers who oppose sex education and birth control are also religious zealots. Their faith defines their views on the issue, a faith which is not necessarily...
I will begin this essay by confessing what many of my readers have long suspected: I am a sexist. However, the Tower-esque query, "define sexism," is not merely polemical in my case. Even the experts here at The North Avenue Review disagree as to what sexism really is, which is why, in the questionnaires on sexism that was prepared for publication in this issue, people were asked to define that on which they were commenting. To cut through this confusion, I shall articulate the sexist position before I proceed to defend it.

"Sexism" is the belief in and adherence to two distinct and complementary gender roles. These roles represent a complex product of natural impulses and nurtured loyalties leading to participation in the family unit, the foundation of civilization. A prudent public policy will always encourage and strengthen the family unit as much as possible.

It is within the nuclear family that these roles are performed. The husband is the primary breadwinner and authority figure, while the wife is the primary homemaker and care-giver to the children. The relationship between them is to be monogamous and abiding.

These roles are by no means arbitrary, as many feminists argue. Rather, they depend on properly channeled natural impulses. While the woman is the only one biologically equipped to nurse an infant, this is not the primary reason why its care is entrusted to her; rather it is her intense maternal instinct, for which there is no male counterpart, that makes her ideally suited to the task. In her latest book, Enemies of Eros, author Maggie Gallagher describes this instinct from her own experience.

"I was twenty-two and unmarried when my son was born, just a few months after I had graduated from Yale University. I remember sitting in the hospital bed, holding my tiny naked son. It came as such a shock to me, more powerful and yet akin to the shock of falling in love, this sense of absolute and unbreakable connection. At that moment, he was the most important thing in my life, and though I have endured, as other mothers do, the usual quota of baby messes, emotional aggravation, missed deadlines, and deferred gratifications, I have never doubted it since. I have since talked to many women of my generation to whom motherhood came in the same way: as an intense gratification, and an unutterable shock. I made the choice, as every woman must today in a society in which abortion is easily available and widely promoted, to give birth. But I never succumbed to the delusion that my measly little act of choice had anything at all to do with what I felt for my son." 1

The man presents a special problem, for it is here that the requirements of the family and society demand that he overcome the promiscuous element in his sexual nature. Nowhere is this element more manifest than in the male-dominated world of the structured military environment. It is here, in a world isolated from feminist sensibilities and refinement, that the natural instinct is given full reign. Love and commitment are dirty words and are used only where necessary to assist the warrior in his sexual pursuits. The problem, therefore, is to encourage virtuous behavior in otherwise profligate males. This is accomplished by appealing to another aspect of the male human nature: possessiveness. Allan Bloom, director of the John M. Olin Center for Inquiry into the Theory and Practice of Democracy at the University of Chicago, and author of the book, The Closing of the American Mind, writes:

"The old moral order, however imperfect it may have been, at least moved toward the virtues by way of the passions. If men were self-concerned, that order tried to expand the scope of self-concern to include others, rather than commanding men to cease being concerned with themselves. A true political or social order requires the soul to be like a Gothic cathedral, with selfish stresses and strains helping to hold it up. In family questions, inasmuch as men were understood to be so strongly motivated by property, an older wisdom tried to attach concern for the family to that motive: The man was allowed and encouraged to regard his family as his property, so he would care for the former as he would instinctively care for the latter." 2

The solution, according to Bloom, is to put the man in charge, i.e. to make the family patriarchal. By appealing to their concern for possessions, women are able to persuade men to provide for them, freeing the women to concentrate on the care and raising of children. Feminists make the legitimate criticism that such a social order is inimical to women's rights; however, the alternative that they propose, that men participate in family life out of a sense of altruism, that they accommodate women's careers while incurring household duties, is doomed to failure for the same reason that socialist agricultural experiments have been doomed to failure: neither takes into account the nature of human beings.

If the nuclear family cannot exist on their terms, reply the feminists, then in must not be permitted to exist at all. However, this still leaves...
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The difficulty of the children, for women cannot care for them and hold a career at the same time without outside help.

And it is here that the whole business becomes frightfully tyrannical. The issue of centralized government day-care was not invented for the purpose of the 1988 presidential election. In his book, The Republic, the Greek philosopher Plato lays out the design of a communist state, where private property is abolished and all interests are made subservient to the government. One of the requirements of such a system was that all sources of competing loyalty be destroyed; consequently, the nuclear family was targeted for liquidation. All children, from the moment of birth, were to be placed in government centers operated by government-employed child-care professionals. It is there that they would be raised. This is precisely the model followed by modern totalitarian regimes.

One of the defining characteristics of the human race is that it is able to pass on the store of knowledge and culture accumulated in past generations to the next generation. In modern, industrial society the process of raising an infant to become an active, refined, and productive member of a democratic community takes anywhere from 17 to 25 years, requiring a large investment of time, patience, and resources on the part of the child’s family. With the collapse of the family comes the collapse of civilization. The astronomical divorce rates brought to this country on the back of the Feminist Revolution are already precipitating precisely this sort of collapse. The symptoms are manifest in the failure of education, the spread of venereal disease, the explosion of teen drug abuse, suicide, and pregnancy, and a host of other social problems.

The feminist solution to the destruction of the family is to substitute the state in the role of child-care provider. But such a solution raises two new concerns. One is that day-care centers do not do a very good job as surrogate parents. In the February, 1988 issue of Child Development, Jay Belsky and Michael J. Steinberg reported that children placed in day-care for more than twenty hours per week develop insecure attachments to both their mother and father, a condition known to produce aggressive behavior later in life. The economist Belton Fleischer, using the Department of Labor’s National Longitudinal Survey and taking into account other variables, including schooling, earnings, and IQ, discovered that the children of mothers who work outside the home were on average less successful economically. The second problem is the specter raised by Plato: that government day-care centers weaken our attachment to the democratic system.

These fears are the impetus behind the resistance of the Republican Party to government day-care centers. The Democrats, proposing the Act for Better Child Care, call for a day-care subsidy which bypasses family choice and goes only to women who put their kids in for-profit day-care centers. Should they prevail, the new law will entrench Congressional Democrats by creating yet another group dependent on their patronage, please the doctrinaire Socialists who wish an ever-increasing role of the government in our lives, and appease feminism by financially penalizing the traditional family, and therefore eroding it. The Republican alternative, to grant tax credits to families with children, gives married women the opportunity to stay home with their children while permitting working mothers to make whatever arrangements they choose for the care of their children, be it a neighbor, relative, or non-profit church-operated center.

This alternative is an excellent example of a public policy that does not sacrifice the ideal situation (the traditional family) for an often necessary situation (a single woman with children struggling to make ends meet). While it is true that many mothers must work for financial reasons, public policy, it is effort to assist them, must never punish the homemaker in the process. Feminists demands that the government must secure their liberation from the family unit must be resisted. To paraphrase William Jennings Bryan, we must not crucify this nation upon a cross of feminism.


2. Since I make this observation based partly on my own experience in AFROTC here at Georgia Tech, I must qualify it by noting that, as individuals, most of the military cadets are not entirely devoid of sexual restraint, for they bring with them to the military the influences of religion, family upbringing, and other cultural restraints. However, the distinctively masculine environment necessary to nurture the aggressive warrior spirit of a good soldier has, without countervailing influence, the effect of requiring those who live in the environment to cultivate the image described above. Whether the promiscuous image is solely a product of this environment or is merely given free reign within it is perhaps an open question, but the fact that it appears universally in male-dominated settings suggests that it is endemic to the human condition.
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Quality Childcare: the issue of the 90s

by Margaret Horst,
GTRI member of the Georgia Tech Child Development Center Committee

A few years ago, participants at an executive seminar at the Harvard Business School were asked to estimate what percentage of their employees belonged to traditional families, where the father worked outside the home to support his family and the mother stayed home to care for the children. The executives guessed 40 to 70 percent of their workers fit this profile. In fact, at the time, the number was more like 19 percent, and studies have shown a continuing decline in this type of American household. There are plenty of reasons: women are better educated; they have more career options and they want to work outside the home for self-fulfillment; these days, “the good life” requires a two-income household; with divorce on the rise and many fathers not meeting their obligations to pay child support, some women are the sole support of themselves and their families. For whatever reasons, more women are working outside the home. So, who’s caring for their children?

Fifty years ago, if a mother had been forced to work outside the home out of dire necessity, her children would have been raised by some member of their extended family - grandmother, aunt, cousin. Nowadays, with families spread all over the country, it is not unusual for children to live hundreds of miles from any relative. And if the relatives do happen to live nearby, the chances are that they are out in the workforce too and are not able to help with child care.

Parents’ attitudes have also changed over the last fifty years. Coupled with the former belief that it was the woman’s “place” to stay home and raise the children was the notion that somehow the children suffered from being separated from their mothers during the day. While these ideas are still common today among people not directly affected, studies have shown that children of mothers who work outside the home do not differ greatly from children whose mothers are at home all day, with one important caveat: so long as the quality of the child care situation is high. So now the focus of parental concern has shifted from guilt over “abandoning” the children during the day to worry over the quality of available day care arrangements.

A common misconception is the assumption that since so many mothers and fathers are working, they must be able to find the child care that they need, and that the free market system will be sufficient to guarantee the quality of available day care programs. In fact, there is a serious shortage of quality programs. A recent study found 75 percent of the women and 57 percent of the men surveyed reported it difficult to find child care. The long waiting lists for the good child development programs speak volumes about the need for more such high quality opportunities for children.

Corporate studies have shown that child care problems and work-family stress affect productivity, absenteeism, and turnover of employees, both male and female. Increasing numbers of companies are seeking ways to help their employees with child care options that are being called “the employee benefit of the 90’s.”

Organizations that spearhead the child care benefits arena usually fit one or more of the following profiles: a high-tech industry, competing for young, highly-trained workers; a company with comparatively young middle and upper management, with families and child care concerns of their own; a business with a high percentage of women employees, including women in management positions; or possibly a manufacturer of family-oriented products concerned about their public image.

Perhaps the most obvious way that companies can help is through an on-site child development center. On-site centers usually offer significantly higher quality than simple custodial day care, in part because they are usually subsidized by the company to some extent. The situation can range from a center completely owned and operated by the company, to a center managed by a consortium of organizations, each with a predetermined number of slots for child care, to an independent, third-party center operating with some concessions from the company (e.g., land or building). Each arrangement has its advantages and disadvantages to the company, but the employee usually wins, and in the long run, the company does too - with lower absenteeism and turnover and higher productivity and morale.

Georgia State University operates the Suite Child Development Center for the children of students, staff and faculty of the university. The center is part of the Department of Early Childhood Education, and provides opportunities for case work and research projects for the department. The center accepts children on an hourly basis, primarily to accommodate the needs of working parents.

Two well-known consortium centers in Atlanta are the Downtown Child Development Center, operated by a consortium of Rich’s department store, the Federal Reserve Bank, the Atlanta Journal, George Pacific, and First Atlanta Bank, and the Clifton Child Care Center, started by Emory University, Henrietta Egleston Hospital for Children and the Centers for Disease Control.

An exciting trend in the corporate world has been the inclusion of child development centers as part of industrial park developments. Here in Atlanta, for example, Technology Park/Atlanta, the hub of the Peachtree Corners high-technology community, the recently acquired Prodigy Child Development Center as a new tenant, to provide on-site high-quality child care services for companies in the Park.

Sometimes companies resist the idea of an on-site center, because of cost or liability issues. An alternative is a resource and referral service. IBM, for example,
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hundreds of business sites around the country, so the cost of on-site centers for all of them would be prohibitive. Instead, IBM has contracted with Work/Family Directions, a Boston consulting firm, to provide nationwide information and assistance to all IBM employees. Referrals can be provided to convenient day care centers that serve many children or to family day care providers, who care for a few (usually up to six) children in the provider’s home. Here in Atlanta, the non-profit organization Child Care Solutions is affiliated with Work/Family Directions and provides similar referral services for local businesses. Individual assistance is also available through Child Care Solutions for a very nominal fee.

As a logical consequence of resource and referral services, some organizations discover a lack of quality child care providers available in a given area and are moved to try to remedy the deficiency by encouraging day care development. Child Care Solutions, through its parent organization, Save the Children, was instrumental in obtaining grants and setting up a Food Program, whereby family day care providers can be reimbursed for the food they feed children in their care. Child Care Solutions also assists prospective family day care providers in obtaining state licenses, in joining the food program, and in obtaining continuing training. Other organizations, such as La Nourriture in Decatur, also promote the development of licensed family day care providers. Some companies, such as Mervyn’s department store, make sizable contributions to day care centers serving their employees.

A final form of assistance that many companies can provide is perhaps the simplest: cold hard cash. Some companies pay a portion of day care costs as a benefit to employees, while others subsidize day care centers of their choice. Recent Internal Revenue Service provisions have made it possible for most employers to offer a dependent care benefit through a pretax spending account. A predetermined amount of the employee’s salary is placed in this account, and can be used to pay for child care or care of any other dependent. Georgia Tech offers this benefit to faculty and staff. The money in the spending account is not considered part of the employee’s salary, so the employee does not have to pay income tax on it, and neither the employer nor the employee pays Social Security taxes on it. The only disadvantage to the plan is that the employee must declare at the beginning of the year how much money is to be placed in the account over the course of the year. That money can only be used for reimbursement of allowable child care expenses, and if it is not spent by the end of the year, the employee loses it.

What is the outlook for the future? Child care issues will become increasingly more important to more American parents, and American business will begin to take notice. Parents now pay an average of $3,000 a year on child care. They will have to spend more to ensure the quality programs they demand. Business will subsidize child care, at first for altruistic reasons, and later because it makes good business sense. Government, too, will see that the cost of providing quality child care now will be less than the cost of correcting future problems caused by the lack of such care (remedial education, juvenile delinquency, school drop-outs).

Child Care Options for the Georgia Tech Community

The need for child care services has been studied at Georgia Tech for a decade. Auxiliary Services Director Roger Wehrels conducted a survey in 1980 that indicated 277 children whose parents would consider using an on-site day care center at Georgia Tech. Some five years later, Dr. Carole Moore, Assistant Vice-President for Student Affairs, chaired a Child Care Task Force that presented a formal report to the President of Georgia Tech in 1987. The following year, a group of graduate students asked the President to appoint a committee to carry the study further and come up with specific recommendations.

President Crepine appointed a Child Development Center Committee last July with graduate students Randal Mandock and Jon Jenkins as co-chairs. “We are looking at long-term solutions for meeting the child care needs of our community,” Mandock says. “Hopefully this will be an on-site child development center that will provide not only excellent child care, but also an innovative multicultural educational program.” Other active members of the Child Development Center Committee include: Cliff Norris, Undergraduate Student Council; Katherine McVay, Graduate Student Government; Jane Ammons and Terry McLe-roy, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Robert Duckworth, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences; Carr Payne, Psychology; Margaret Horst, Georgia Tech Research Institute; Phyllis Ray, Graduate Co-op Office; and Norman Johnson, President’s Office.

Tech Offers Child Care Fair

My child is running a low-grade fever. I can’t drop her at the nursery, but I have to get that proposal out today. Where can I turn for sick child day care?

How can I find out where the day care centers are located that are most convenient to home and work? Which ones take infants?

My wife has to stay home with our two preschoolers and we could use some extra income. What would we have to do to start a family day care service in our own home?

These are some of the questions that will be answered at Georgia Tech’s first Child Care Fair. Sponsored by the Georgia Tech Child Care Development Center Committee, the fair will be held Thursday, March 15, from 10:00 am till 3:00 pm in the Student Center Ballroom. All parents in the Georgia Tech community - students, faculty and staff - are invited to come and learn about their options for child care.

More than 100 day care centers, family day

see CHILDCARE, p. 28, col. 2...
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Beyond the Wages

by John Mark Coney

The prime fact of life is the sexual superiority of women.

--George Gilder, 1986

Kings shall be your nursing fathers and queens shall be your nursing mothers.

--Isaiah 49:23

The 1981 Current Biography describes George Gilder as 'the most widely read supply-side economist.' He is perhaps better labelled a sociologist, although the typical university economist or sociologist might object to either label, and after all he is essentially a writer.

As a speechwriter for Senator Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland, he participated in the riots of April 1970 that met Richard Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia. However, by 1972 he had supported Nixon's veto of a daycare program for the poor. In 1973 he published a book entitled Sexual Suicide for which he was designated a leading male chauvanist pig.

In 1986 he published a reworked version of this under the title Men and Marriage.

I must regard Gilder as a traditional feminist, and interpret the response from the feminists of the Lennonist revolution as alarmist. They were alarmed by the fact that here was a man who would not stop at equality for women, but would declare their superiority, while undermining the apparent freedoms gained in the revolution. Some might argue that the claim of the superiority of women cannot be taken seriously, in fact they might go so far as to argue that Gilder cannot even be sincere in his claim. I would like to entertain such an argument, but I would insist that we go deep into the Middle Ages and analyze chivalry there (as opposed to analyzing it in a nonhistorical way). Although some Lennonists will categorize me with George Gilder, I advocate a revolution (in thinking) that could be fairly reduced to the statement: A prime fact of life is the superiority of women in commerce.

Consider now the child protector from Binghamton. Randy Terry led about 100 fellow child protectors to Atlanta to join Michael Hirsh and about 40 other child protectors from the Atlanta area to save some children during the Democratic convention. They were arrested for blocking some doorways on July 19, 1988. Over the next year more than 40,000 people around the United States were arrested for similar behavior. Again, some Lennonists will simply put Randy Terry in the Gilder category, but for Gilder, man must have a greater income than woman, at least during childbearing years, while Terry is probing beyond the question of wages. Money may be to the members of society what blood is to the organs of the body, but the cure for various blood diseases is beyond physiology. With governor Jimmy Carter I associate the idea of zero-based bugetting, and it seems analogous to annually draining all the blood from your body. Others are thought-experimenting on zero-based social policy.

In this vein return with me to sixteenth century Europe: Mary, a Catholic, was queen of England, the Scottish reformer John Knox was the guest of the French reformer John Calvin in Geneva. John Knox published the book entitled The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women; it apparently killed Mary. Mary's protestant sister Elisabeth assumed the throne, but Knox's book apparently kept Elisabeth from fully embracing the 'Calvinist' version of Protestantism. Calvin was ill for most of the rest of his life, dying at the tender age of 55. Calvin had found support for female sovereigns in Isaiah 49:23. I find the idea of a nursing father more striking here, and I suspect that Randy Terry fits this more than George Gilder. Of course Randy Terry would hardly be dubbed a househusband, but he reveres the law of Moses and Hebrew writings, and King Lemuel's mother (see Proverbs 31) describes the virtuous woman who provides for the household while her husband sits at the gates (or in jail) with the elders of the land.

Some modern Europeans fear the law of Moses (Mosephobia?), particularly the death penalty for such indigenous sex crimes as adultery. I suggest that we first contrast the Mosaic and Platonic views of law. The Mosaic law was given because the offense was already there and not before, lest the law itself encourage the practice. Plato was a social engineer. Secondly, for those who revere the tradition of the English common law, I end with a report from the court records of Northumberland (the year is 1255):

(from Arthur Hogue, The Origins of the Common Law, 1966, 1985, p16) A certain 'foreigner' (extraneus), Gilbert of Niddlesdale, met a hermit on the moors of Northumberland, 'beat him and wounded him and left him half dead, and stole his garments and one penny, and fled away.' Gilbert was caught. The hermit asked for his stolen penny. But he was told to observe the custom of the county: to recover his stolen chattels a man must behead the thief with his own hands. Determined to regain his penny, the hermit mustered enough strength to get it by the custom of the country (sic).

(end Hogue)

The nominally Christian prosecutors of Randy Terry seem to say: Abortion may be murder, but thou shalt not trespass. The question, then, arises whether it is Moses or the county judges of 13th century England who are the barbarians.
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More of The Beautiful South

by Tom Hickman

A million men, a million castles. One mentality, one kingdom. The Beautiful South...Suburbia at its finest. Rural America in its purest form. A million men...a million castles.

And behind every man a woman...a million women...standing behind their million men. A million women in their suburban castles...The Queens of Suburbia: housewives in the truest sense of the term, their only purpose in life to find a good man and to keep him happy. Ahh...the Beautiful South, as always a stroll down memory lane, When finished, tie leaves...

The Queens of Suburbia! What of them? What forces shape their lives and motivate their ministrations? What forces? Ha! An easy question that. The Forces of Man. Yes...Mr. Beautiful South rears his ugly head again. Tradition in one hand, a most excellent Book in the other, Mr. B.S. jumps to the fore, climbs upon a piece of morally higher ground and begins to pontificate.

"Women should do what their husbands say...They always have, haven't they? It says so right here in the scripture. Women should cook, they should clean, they should have babies. They should, in their most liberated form, be secretaries, cleaning ladies, waitresses. They shouldn't be oppressed, no that would be going too far. They should have their own lives. They should be able to vote. It's just that they should just vote for whom their husband tells them to vote. When you get right down to it, they should do whatever their husbands damn well tell them to do. It's always been that way. It's supposed to be that way. By God, it should stay that way!"

Mr. B.S., his tirade over, slumps in his easy chair and extends his right hand. Instantly, an ice cold can of beer appears there. He extends his left hand. Instantly his ashtray appears, along with a pack of matches. He grunts and instantly the television is on, the remote control is at his fingertips. He watches the news, eager to keep himself informed about the level of moral decadence in the world around him, eager to find new battle fields in the war to protect the world from itself. Exactly five minutes after the news is over, he rises from his easy chair and strolls into the kitchen. Magically, a three course meat and potatoes meal cooked just the way he likes it appears on the table. He eats. When finished, he leaves to do man-stuff until bedtime. Perhaps he will clean his guns, or work on his car engine. The dirty dishes magically clean themselves. Mr. B.S. returns from his day, a victorious soldier returning to the castle. He opens the door knowing full well that she will be there waiting for him with a kiss and a kind word. He is perplexed by her absence in the foyer when he walks in. The last time she met him at the door was...oh, he can't even remember. In the living room, he slumps into his easy chair. His right hand shoots out of his own volition, fully expecting to instantly be filled with a frigid and frosty beer. His left hand follows in suit, resolute in its knowledge that it will be met with an ashtray and a pack of matches. Neither beer nor ashtray appears. Nothing, in either hand...not a thing. Perplexing. This has never happened before. Mr. B.S. begins to irate.

"Honey!" he calls out. Silence...

Well, there was the remote control, on top of the T.V., at least ten feet away. Why wasn't...see Beautiful South, p. 28, col. 3...
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Interview With a Female Eastern Indian Student

by Suzanne Burns

In every society the role of women is different. We can often see our own society more clearly, or at least from a different perspective, by examining certain aspects of other societies that are so foreign to us. This interview is an attempt to gain some insight into the way women are treated in India, by talking with someone who has seen it first hand. This Tech student was born in India, and grew up in England and Ghana in Indian areas separated from the normal English and African cultures. These areas are very traditional Indian societies. Her parents were raised in India and still adhere to Indian customs and beliefs greatly.

What role does religion play in every day life in Indian society?

Well it depends on what religion you are, and in each religion it depends on what sect of the religion you are. My parents are Hindus but we belong to a specific branch of Hinduism called Jainism. We aren't supposed to eat meat or even onions or potatoes or anything that grows below ground level because insects feed on those plants and you are not supposed to kill them. Most Jains eat potatoes and things like that though because if you are a strict Jain there isn't much you can eat. There are some Hindus that eat meat, but no Hindu eat cows because they are considered a mother animal since we drink milk from our mothers and we drink milk from cows. Cows also help in many other ways. They are used in farming since agriculture isn't very mechanized, and the manure is used as fuel by poor families.

To what extent are women allowed to participate in religion?

Most of the time the women are the most religious people. The women kind of are religious for the men, so that the men don't have to be. In fact, in some Jain families the men eat meat even though they aren't supposed to, but the women are very orthodox and don't eat meat.

In the Hindu religion are there organized churches, or do people practice the religion on their own?

Mostly people practice on their own but there are organized churches.

In these churches are women allowed to be the head of the church?

We don't really have a leader of the church. The main people are sages and the women are allowed to be sages, but there are very few of them.

Are Indian women treated differently according to the social class that they belong to?

Amongst the very poor class families some Indian women are allowed to work just because they have to in order to get more money. But in any other situation, unless it is absolutely necessary for the woman to work, she is not allowed to. Some Indians are very modernized like Americans and they might work, but most Indian women are very traditional and their husbands wouldn't allow them to work.

What do you think of the role of women in Indian society?

In India there are still very specific roles for men and women. The women are expected to stay home and take care of the children and house while the man makes the money. But the women consider these roles as equal, just different. I think that the women are very oppressed. When I lived in an Indian society, I was not allowed to freely mix with guys. Just hugging a friend would start all kinds of gossip about how I was sleeping with them. Even talking to men is looked down on. Women are expected to keep their distance from men.

Do you think that most women in India feel that they are being oppressed or do they think that this is just their way of life and that there is nothing they can do but accept it?

It is interesting but the women are the first ones to gossip about other women. They are so used to this way of being treated that they think it is only natural to accept it, and they think of women who don't accept it as too bold. I have several female cousins that are my age in India and whenever I visit them and talk about some cute guy at school they are just shocked that I would be so outgoing towards men. This attitude is so ingrained in them that they don't question it.

Is there any kind of women's movement?

continued next page...
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Not really. There probably are a few women who openly go against the system but they don't gain popularity because most women aren't ready to accept the idea that the way they are treated is wrong. I don't know why, but maybe it is because most Indian women are so uneducated.

Do you think that they have ever seen how women are treated in other societies? Would that make them realize that there is another way?

I don't think so. I know Indian women in this country who are still very reserved and don't accept the way American women act. I don't get along with them because they look at me funny since I am so modernized. They would be appalled that I would go out with an American guy. I have heard an Indian friend say that they couldn't look at a guy as a guy unless he was Indian!

Are dowries and arranged marriages still practiced?

Yes, very much. Indian guys are in short supply since there are so many more females so it is much harder to find a husband. From the day that a female is born her parents start collecting gold and money and other things to give her so that it will be easier for her to find a husband. This is not called a dowry but it is understood that that is what it is. The more money, gold, property, and material possessions your daughter has, the better husband she is going to get. When a girl's parents are trying to find her a husband and they meet a boy's parents these things are subtly discussed. The girl's father doesn't even want to be asked, he just says "My daughter has this much to bring with her when she gets married," and if the boy's father doesn't think it is enough then he will just say that they didn't like the girl or that she wasn't pretty enough. It is so humiliating. Every one is married this way though. They meet people through friends or professional matchmaking services or ads in the newspaper. When the girl's family meets with the family of a prospective husband the girl is expected to dress in very traditional clothing and act very polite and demure. That's what Indian men like—very timid women. Then they'd discuss the dowry and of course the girl's father has to have a good job. If for any reason the boy's parents don't think things are suitable then they just say that the girl wasn't good looking enough or something. And if you are rejected like that then everyone in the town will know about it and gossip about what must have been wrong with you.

Do people ever marry someone whom they just met and fell in love with?

For these women the idea of falling in love or making a choice like this on their own never occurs to them. If they are ever allowed to get to know a man and have feelings for him they would never let this show or admit it to anyone. In the cities there are some people who are modernized who will date normally, and there are people who act very modernized and extreme, but they are just rebelling against the old ways and customs.

What do your parents think about you dating people here?

My parents know that I don't accept the customs between men and women in India and are pretty liberal. They definitely want me to marry an Indian, though. I wasn't allowed to go on dates at home, and my parents were not as strict as most parents in India. They would prefer that I not have a boyfriend here but they know that I will never have an arranged marriage. They think I am too picky. Every time I talk to them they always remind me that there are lots of nice Indian men here and that I should try to meet someone to marry. Most people get married, or at least engaged by the time they are my age—20.

Are there any divorces in India?

There are some in the big cities but very few outside of the cities. You rarely hear of a divorce, and if there is one both the girl and the guy are considered outcasts and would seldom remarry.

Are there any laws in India concerning the treatment or rights of women?

There are laws similar to those here but they are pretty much ignored. They aren't enforced and are usually forgotten.

How do you view the role of women in American society? Do you think that they are lucky?

Well I don't think that they are really lucky because the Indian women are used to that way of life and are not ready to change. When I first came here I was shy and it took me a while to get used to the openness but I had lived in other Western societies before so it wasn't as much of a shock as it would have been coming straight from India. Now I am pretty well adjusted to it and love it here.
CHOICE
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shared by everyone else. Because they are religious, it is hard for them to consider any position but their own. When I say “religious”, I am not referring to one’s deep down personal belief in a God, but one’s association with and organized religion. Sometimes the two coincide, sometimes they do not. A recent article in Psychology Today entitled “Do Religious People Help More? Not So You’d Notice” states “What then can we surmise about the likelihood of someone’s being caring and generous, loving and helpful, just from knowing that he or she is a believer? Virtually nothing, say psychologists, sociologists, and others who have studied the question for decades.” Therein lies the problem with some of the extremely religious pro-life people. They may talk as if they truly care about humanity, but they are not necessarily caring and helpful Good Samaritans. If these people were pro-life after the birth of an unwanted child, I would maybe even support their view. But how many of them do you see adopting these unwanted children, many of whom may have been born addicted to drugs, or are of a different race? And how many of them do you think work to help the unwanted children who are later abused and neglected? And forget about talking over possible compromises between the two sides for some positive action. There is no chance for a reasonable debate or discussion with them because God is on their side and therefore it is the morally superior side. There is just no arguing with God. Have you ever tried? It is very frustrating. I am not attacking organized religion in itself, but many of the pro-life supporters I have seen at marches and rallies and terrorizing women’s clinics bring up their religion as the reason for their actions. They are the ones bringing religion into the issue, and I am pointing out that their religion could be a basis for more constructive action. The fact is that an “I am right, you are wrong” attitude is far too simplistic. This is too complicated a world to afford simplistic views on anything, and until a perfect world comes about I see the right to obtain a safe, legal abortion an essential option to keep.

CHILDCARE
...from p. 23

care providers, and referral services have been invited to send representatives to offer information and guidance. Information will be available on care for mildly ill children and infant care, as well as how to start a day care service at home.

Parents and students also will have the opportunity to sign a new baby-sitting registry that the Child Development Center Committee is starting for the Georgia Tech community.

The committee will have a table at the Fair. Parents are invited to stop by to learn about Georgia Tech’s plans for child care. “We welcome questions, comments and suggestions,” Mandock says. “Hopefully this will be an on-site child development center that will provide not only excellent child care, but also an innovative multicultural educational program.” Other active members of the Child Development Center Committee include: Cliff Norris, Undergraduate Student Council; Katherine McVay, Graduate Student Government; Jane Ammons and Terry McLeRoy, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Robert Duckworth, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences; Carr Payne, Psychology; Margaret Horst, GTRI; Phyllis Ray, Graduate Co-op Office; and Norman Johnson, President’s Office.

Beautiful South
...from p.25

it in his hand like it should be by now? Why wasn’t he tasting the first sip of liquid fire from an ice cold beer can? Why wasn’t he happily smoking a cigarette and dumping the ashes into his favorite ashtray? These were the questions that went through our man’s head at this moment. He thought, looked for some greater pattern in these anomalies. Where the hell is my wife? That’s what it all boiled down to.

He failed entirely to question the absence of furniture throughout the house. He failed entirely to notice that his children, lovely tykes that they were, were nowhere to be seen, nowhere to be heard. The fact that he had not once since he had walked into his house had to yell at the little brats to be quiet and go outside did not register.

“Honey, where’s my damn beer??”

“Well,” thought he, “I’ll fix her.” He fumbled in his shirt pocket for a pack of cigarettes. “If she won’t bring me my ashtray, then I’ll dump the ashes on the floor. They’ll get cleaned up somehow.” A cigarette dangling from his lips, he searched his pockets for a match.

Mr. B.S. found a pack of matches, thought about how he would simply dump the ashes on the floor. He wondered how long he would have to wait, how long he would have to be inconvenienced, how long the T.V. would remain inert. He thought about the roast beef he had had for lunch. She damn well better not have made roast beef for supper tonight. He struck a match to light his cigarette. The natural gas had by this time quite inundated the suburban castle of Mr. Beautiful South. He lit his cigarette and began the slow, agonizing process of roasting alive therein his easy chair, wondering how long he would wait for his beer, pondering the inert television screen and wondering why the remote control was not in his hand. He hoped, for his wife’s sake that she had not prepared roast beef for supper, as that was what he had eaten for lunch. He was not in the least concerned about who would clean up the ashes he would flick onto the floor from his cigarette.
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Subliminal Persuasion

by Jillanna Babb

You're sitting in a movie theatre in the 1950s with your latest crush when you suddenly get this intense craving for popcorn. And a coke. You have to have it now. You turn to your date to ask if she wants anything. She turns to you at the exact same moment. "Are you hungry?" you both ask simultaneously. You are completely unaware that you've just been told, by a 1/3000th of a second advertisement to "Drink Coca-Cola" and "Eat Popcorn."

Much controversy has surrounded subliminal advertising for about 40 years. Advertisers stopped experimenting with subliminal persuasion in the 1950s because many people thought that the messages were unethical. But the critics completely overlooked another type of subliminal message.

Intrinsic sex-stereotypes in advertising bombard our subconscious almost every time we are exposed to an ad. Most people do not notice the stereotypes because advertising reflects the traditions of society. The generalizations of the sexes in advertising perpetuates sexist views in society, especially for children.

On the other hand, media also influences reality by affecting people's views of themselves and others. Many people, especially children, use TV personalities as role models. Others trust their favorite magazine as if it were the Bible.

Is reality a reflection of the media—or is the media a reflection of reality? Or do the media and reality reflect each other, creating an endless cycle of sexism in society?

Is reality a reflection of the media?

Although much debate surrounds the issue, studies show that the media does alter people's concepts of others and themselves and can influence their behavior. If media did not influence people, the advertising industry would not exist.

Media imagery especially influences children, compelling them to model themselves after sex-stereotyped roles. Ads representing women as housewives, mothers, sex-objects, and menial workers can instigate the formation of sexist generalizations. Sex-stereotyping in advertising influences children to describe women's roles in traditional ways (Brown, 1979).

In advertisements geared toward females, women are encouraged to identify with the female who achieves success with men as a result of using the product. Male oriented advertisements promise the female as a reward accompanying the product. Women must be beautiful to be successful with men, which the media presents as their number one priority—right before childcare and housework. Fat, wrinkles, or gray hair is unacceptable.

In a 1987 study by Karen Carroll, M.J. (Louisiana State), magazine advertisements portrayed males and females equally in recreational and leisure roles, but emphasized women as decorative or sex objects. In contrast, males were represented in professional and high level business positions with the emphasis on power and position.

Consumers, especially children, may unknowingly absorb the implied sex stereotypes of advertising even while consciously discounting the more overt message concerning the product. Sexism in society will not decrease until the media stops presenting stereotyped role models.

Is media a reflection of reality?

Media reflects reality more than most people would like to admit. Advertisers act on the consumer's perception of sex roles in order to prompt identification with the advertising message.

Many people have preconceived images of women as housewives and mothers. The media implies that women have nothing important to do except wash their family's clothes until they are "as white as they can be" or scrub the floor until "it looks wet even when its dry." Seeing women in the media in these stereotypical roles reassures and comforts the consumer's insecurities. The media uses images of housewives cooking and cleaning to appeal to the consumer's longing to return to childhood when mother took care of them and they had no responsibilities.

The media's reflection of society's sex-stereotyped views of women perpetuates sexist views and makes breaking out of the stereotypes increasingly difficult.

Sexism in advertising will not decrease until sexism in society decreases. Sexism in society will not decrease until sexism in advertising decreases. Media reflects reality but reality also reflects the media. The circle cannot be broken, but we can use it to our advantage. If the media treats women as equals to men and stops categorizing them into sex-stereotyped roles, maybe society will do the same.

If we as consumers boycott products that use sexist advertising and write letters to the companies to voice our views, the companies might realize that unbiased, non-sexist advertising would serve their best interests and stop producing sex-stereotyped ads. If that doesn't work, we could always use subliminal persuasion....
Top Average Salaries for Men and Women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers and Judges</td>
<td>48,360</td>
<td>39,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautical Engineers</td>
<td>42,640</td>
<td>33,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>42,380</td>
<td>29,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Labor Relations Manager</td>
<td>40,820</td>
<td>29,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineer</td>
<td>40,820</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/ Computer Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


George Washington helped win the vote for fewer than 2,000,000 white males.
Abraham Lincoln helped win the vote for fewer than 1,000,000 black males.
Susan B. Anthony helped win the vote for fewer than 26,000,000 American women.

Susan B. Anthony's birthday is February 15th.

Female college graduates earn on the average roughly the same amount of money as male college dropouts:

College graduate, Woman: $20,000
College dropout, Man: $19,000

Source: The American Woman 1987-88 by the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.
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...from p. 16.

ask us out, they hold the doors, they pay for the meals, and they can throw off their minks to allow us to walk over the mud puddles. Of course, we would have our duties. We would have to spend a little more time with our hair, and we'd certainly have to learn more social graces. No man is so macho that he would turn down a free meal and be free from the hassle of being turned down.

This way, everyone would be happy. Once again, there would be one standard to follow, and the confusion would be eliminated. Women could prove to themselves and others that they are independent, and men can have a free ride when it comes to being picked up, or paying for meals. What red-blooded male would object to having two ladies dueling for his hand, or getting roses on his birthday. Some would say that this would emasculate the males, but remember, the standards would be changed and these things would not be seen as unmanly or womanly. So when I go on a date this weekend, I'm letting my date get the door, and she's paying for dinner. Ain't progression great guys?
To Bacchus* after
a long day's hike

I get drunk off the moon
and silly off the stars;
The fire intoxicates me.

Funny how
Cocktails and wine
Do much less
For my mind

Than the cliffs
and the woods
and the breeze.

-Karen Steadman

*Bacchus- The god of wine & song
Peering over the edge of Hoover Dam he saw only an endless surface of cement trailing into the deep blue of the Colorado. He would go out in grand style, a last show for this sick world. Sweaty tourists pressed up against him waiting for the tour of this modern engineering wonder. For now he would wait until the tourists had packed into the crowded elevators to be deposited at the foot of the dam. He didn’t need them and their damn opinions watching as he took a final ride on the board clutched in his scarred hand.

Soon they were headed down the slow way. He clambered up onto the dam in what he guessed to be the center. It was here in the center of Hoover that the borders of Arizona and Nevada crossed paths. Here also time-shifted by a single hour. There would be a date, but not a certain time. Clutching the board in a lasting grip he paid little attention to the voices screaming at his back. A vast expanse of concrete lay at his feet curved only at some tiny angle towards the base. Without allowing time to get lost in thought he leaped off the damn. Tucking his knees into his chest he slapped the board soundly against his worn out hightops. He hit the dam at an angle, the back of the board landing first forcing him to lean forward. Unfamiliar to the huge acceleration which was shooting him down the side of Hoover he soon stumbled and fell headlong onto terribly hard concrete. With a terrible snap a protecting arm gave way and his head rushed to the sharp, hot surface of the dam. He burned with pain – bare legs, hand and cheek scrubbed free of skin etching bloody graffiti on the face of Hoover. Harsh screeching of cement on bone filled the warm desert air. He had traveled into the numbness of death not able to feel the terrible friction which left his body in crimson tatters as it slammed into the base of Hoover a far from unusual tragedy.

Awakening came as a surprise. He had not expected an afterlife. The hot sand of the desert was beneath and around him. Taking it to be Hell he cursed his luck. He wished only for an end. He wanted not everlasting life. A long knife laid in front of him. Pulling it from the hot sand he sank it into his bitter heart. Again the blackness came.

Awakening, he stood at an open window. He was in a high building and from below came urban noises. A metallic taste grew in his mouth. Stepping up onto the lip of the window he stepped out to be killed once again by the horrible acceleration. Blackness came.

He woke behind the wheel of a totaled car. Seeing a can of gas in the seat next to him he grabbed it and stepped out of the car. It seemed that he had not parted ways with hope yet, for still he hoped that there might be some chance of escape. Ignoring the pain he sought the quickest way of suicide. Dousing himself in fuel. With a cigarette lighter found in the glove compartment he set himself alight. White heat faded into cool darkness.

Once again he stood on the concrete of Hoover strange tourists pressing their sweaty bodies against him. Slapping the board onto the pavement he skated away feeling strangely like a prisoner.
Walking along, I noticed on my left a row of small, leaf-bare trees. Their bodies were bisected, by the sunlight on their top half and the blue shade of a building on their bottoms. The tiny black branches criss-crossed in intricate patterns as my eyes shifted reference with my ranging body.

I stopped at one particular tree, and looked closely at a small segment of a branch - perhaps no more than one inch long. Sunlight browned the upper portion of this limb and blackness covered the bottom throughout. Sun and shade, separate and each encompassing within its respective domain.

At the side of the branch, at the margin between sun and shade, the limb itself expressed its individual existence. A jagged, peeling strip of bark reached toward, and caught, a stream of light. A concavity nearby was dark, where light would be upon a perfect cylinder. The intricate relations between the tree limb, the sunlight, and the shade; I observed them for a moment and in so doing these elements and I descended beneath the delicate but tightly woven fabric of all that is concretely human.

I yearned to get lost there. I said to myself that I would, someday soon. I will get lost. And I will have plenty of time to observe other intimacies. I'll get lost, and you'll hear from me.
Diary

i read your diary
and now the tears
fill my eyes
and the pain
fills my chest
and i feel
cheap
and i feel
cold
i read your diary
and now i
sympathize
every assumption
every preconception
every judgement
has melted
to salty tears
that spill
from my eyes
like the words
from your pen
that fill the page
i read
in your diary.

-Jilliane Babb

A son took over a filling station
about seven years ago
It was started by his grandfather
Long before the Interstate.

This humble little filling station sold gasoline
a certain brand of gasoline.
Plus smiles and chats over an ice-cold Coke.

Somebody, far far away, made a mistake.
A fledgling writer wrote about the mistake
and cried over spilt milk.
They cleaned and cleaned and cleaned
But the real dirt was not there.

Soon, no gasoline
no smiles
no Cokes were being sold at the filling station
Nobody wanted to buy from
the new Public Enemy Number One! (R)
or his chosen son.

The filling station was torn down (along with the smiles)
In its place grew bright lights
Ding Dongs
withered hot dogs
and *pay* before you pump

Nothing stayed the same except the name
that suddenly despised name.

But the smiles never grew again at the gas mart

Outside the gas mart
people
largely dressed in black
robotically chanted 'boycott! boycott!'
but the cashier
(happy to have his green card)
did not know what boycott means
(or who boycott was)

He was just happy
He had a job (at the gas mart)

Unlike the son

---Julian Brett Allen
This story will be printed in its entirety with the next two segments of *Fishwrap*. I wrote the thing last summer, usually starting around ten at night and working for a few hours or so. This comes to mind because of the conversations my roommate and I had that summer. They dealt with writing and creative processes in general. This is what happened. Enjoy.

Migration

Alex looked at the cars as they passed by on the interstate. He had found that the sound of wheels going upwards of sixty would even his moods and bring with them a brighter outlook. The sight of steel moving by effortlessly seemed to give him an excitement that he could not describe. Others would compare the intensity of these emotions to sex, but to him they were something more. Feeling vibrations from these movements would make him want a woman more passionately than any human since the advent of reason. Seeing a trailer reminded him of work, so he hurried to remember the purpose of his visit. Mike was waiting and he wouldn't wait long, for he loved to get lost in the streets for lack of better things to do. "I believe he said the bus station at noon, but I could be wrong," Alex said to his companion Albert. Alex thought about his relationship with Albert and why Albert was someone he could talk to in times of stress. "Hindsight? it could be. "Alex, you think this guy Mike minds that you always ramble on about things he doesn't care about?" Albert has never met Mike, he's trusting my opinions. Why?, I've never given him anything but words. Of course, most people don't even give him words. He looks like a criminal. "Could be, but he knows I'm right. Besides he could always leave." Alex thought that that was what Mike had planned, but he hoped not. He and Mike had grown closer in the past few months. Mike had given him the chance to show his emotions, something that Alex had always been afraid of doing.

Hanging my feet from this bridge makes me wonder what Albert is all about. Sometimes he just doesn't care. "What made you take to the road and try finding it on your own? You know, I've thought of the same thing, but I was always stopped by... something that makes me want to read." Albert was looking, with his arms over the rail at some girls walking underneath them. "You know, I've never answered that. But at the time it seemed like the thing to do. What an answer! I'm sure my folks would like that one. Seriously, living in old buildings brings back good memories sometimes, but mostly I feel safer." Albert looks a little sad now, but hopeful. It's good to know that someone who is thirty can look hopeful. "They look peaceful, and beautiful. Something about the interstate shoulder and girls walking on it that makes for a nice scene. Like, that's what it was made for." Yea, he agreed. And hoped I was right. "I gotta go find the wanderer now, it's almost eleven and it'll take some time to get downtown. I don't want him to leave."

As he walked down the bridge, Alex looked for his bus schedule and found it in his front pocket next to the cigarettes. The smoke lasted for what seemed an instant before going to the K&B for some more. A purple and white sign that was familiar to anyone who needed cigarettes or something was up ahead. Entering the store was always a treat. If you walked the aisles you could tell what was in need by the public. I'm sure that fat lady's kid needs a new Big Wheel. Some comic books and a coke maybe, but no plastic wheels for me, the bus will do fine. All this shit waiting to be sold makes me more sick than the kid and his fat mother. But I can't let it bother me. "Some Camels... oh yea, matches too. You know what time it is?" Bus comes in ten minutes. Good. Continued...
I've got time for a bite. Across the street was some burger joint and Alex made his way over. The cars coming by looked too fast to realize what the interstate now meant to Alex. He held the same contempt for the cars as for the buyer of the brand new Big Wheel. These feelings could now be forgotten as crossing Veterans Blvd. was always a joy. It was the first street he had ever loved. It came to his dreams as a long slender black road that ended in a bridge higher and steeper than any mountain could ever hope for. Time seemed to travel slower as he crossed the road and Alex didn't mind. However, hunger and Mike called, so the trip wasn't the pleasure the designers had hoped for.

Some of the people on buses are just my type. They're not too hurried. They appreciate time and let it take them where they want to go. This usually doesn't happen near rush hour though. That's the perfect name for it: rush hour. I never knew you could rush an hour, but I'm sure that fat lady has figured it out. That guy in the back with the bottle is just here for the ride. This seat looks fine, near a window...good. Ha! There's that fat lady and her kid with the new Big Wheel. And there driving her new big wheel: a Cadillac. How impressive. No wonder the kid got all snotty when his mom refused to buy the thing. He knew his fat mother would give in. She wants him to have that Big Wheel more than the kid does. I wonder how long it'll be before he realizes this and wants a bigger one. Probably this afternoon.

The more I think about it, the more it irritates me. At the time I didn't notice it, but Mrs. Fat instantly said no when the kid approached her about the wheels. She didn't care what he had in his hand; she just didn't want to buy it. The kid could have found a cure for cancer. That's just the point: the kid found the cure. She's not about to give her own kid any credit. I wonder if it was her not wanting to bother with the cure or her lack of faith in the kid. Either way Fat Jr. is going to feel like he's just in his mother's way. And it's not that hard to get in Mrs. Fat's way.

It's the same thing with Mike and Albert. No one ever gives Albert any credit. I think that's why he dropped out and decided to walk around for awhile. He's doing much better than Mrs. Fat and her kid. I'm sure that she gives her son support, but it's just the way she blows him off. It's like this certain age or level of understanding we all have to get past before anyone will listen. Right now Albert is trying to get over this stigmatism of the "real" world. He'll do alright because he's getting away from this "real" thing and back to himself where he belongs. The old buildings he lives in don't put any conditions on him. He can sleep where he wants to. I think everyone should spend time exploring abandoned buildings. Mike and I sure did in high school. It was better than going to class. Oops, slip of the mind, most of our trips were taken while the teachers were out on strike. Six months! What fun. Those afternoons spent down by the river were the best. I went more places in those six months than all of my eighteen years while living with my parents. Of course my dad would loudly and violently disagree, but he never showed me where to hide from the cops or told me how to break into a shipyard without being seen. Mike and I had the best times of our lives finding these things out. We got caught sometimes. Although not as fun as getting away, it was just as much of an experience.

There's something in Mike that loves to break rules. I think he just likes to risk his realizing that someone is more powerful that he. There's so much out there to see and I guess he thought he might not have the chance after school, although I could never picture him having a job. When he first told me, I thought it was the stupidest thing I had ever heard. Just imagine someone who liked to skip classes so that he could fail and go to summer school,
and that was Mike. He told me that classes were easier in the summer and that I should join him. It just hit me earlier this year what an incredible idea that was. Things were passing too fast for him to be wasting his time in class. The real world was going on and he wanted to see it. He could watch ships or spend the day at the zoo and make up his school during the summer. I always knew there were too many kids out during the summer and to do anything was too crowded, but Mike solved the problem. He would kick back in the air conditioned class room while everyone mobbed the parks or the theaters. Classes were easier because the teachers had to cut out all the bullshit they had time for during the year. There was no pop psychology on why we should learn. The kids in the classes were dropouts and the teacher knew it. However, they didn't know a genius was listening. The only thing that bothers me about all this is that I didn't give Mike any credit for his discovery. I don't know what to say.

by Scott Morris

LEAF BLOWER

...and the leaf blowers went off in my head as he droned on and on they cried their shrill cries and pulled me back to some place long ago and I closed my eyes and let the staccato whine pull me into myself and I felt the push from the leaf blower and I was herded into a pile by the side of the road and a garbage truck picked me up and I rotted.

-T. Hickman
Seashells

You curl up behind eyelids
rolling pupils seasick
on a garbage barge
cutting through seas
dark deep despairing...

As I walk along
an oilslick beach
with thirst I desire hunger,
cup my hands,
slip my tongue
along the waterscape...

As you draw away from land still
faster...must have distance
distance from land ho lights
that might capture your soul
cutting through seas
and thirst sets in on a lonely barge
hunger dries up
frail flesh flailing
swim and languish in this polluted ocean
so then take a sip...

As I slip my tongue,
gulping down
water bitter salt industrial
dry oil fish excretion brown
seaweed strands gritty sand...

and shells
keep us miles apart
cutting through oceans,
diving into seas,
washed ashore,
water heals but often wounds
and we may, wound
but hoping heal

time takes too much time takes too much time takes too much
zoo keeper says growl when you're hungry, yawn when you're tired,
its a wash pal, give it up, you'll be doing time when you're eighty...
if you're lucky,
so what d'ya say we go to my place, maybe listen to some tunes
i won't chooowwwwwwwwwwww gum in class
i won't choooowwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww gum in class
i won't choooowwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww gum in hell
mmmmbeep-beep
mmmmbeep-beep
by the power vested in me, i pronounce you husband and wife?
why not?
i won't, dammit, mmmbeep-beep, dooo-dah, choo-choo, dooo-dah, smack, smack
place the gum on your nose, bang-bang, wish upon a star, bang again,
yawn, grrrrrrr, tick-tock, tick-tock boom.

!!!

-NELSON
Pete A. Clark

Here's my shop, said with a sigh, and walked hurriedly to her volunteer job at the homeless shelter.

Remembered her grandmother: Grandma... removed from this place... she murmured in her soul. "Well,

stop. People roused in and out, yet this seemed not to disturb her concentration or inner peace. She

violet, caring but cold. She thought about how her day would progress as the train slowed to the next

stop. People roused in and out, yet this seemed not to disturb her concentration or inner peace. She

violet, caring but cold. She thought about how her day would progress as the train slowed to the next

any storm, her grey hair, a symbol of wisdom. In her eyes was a certain kind of humility, a certain

Garden, where time permitted. The winds in the Perth Hills, white screens and spinning windmill

poor, watching clothes by hand, picking cotton until dark, chopping wood. Her tire and lending her small

over the morning hours at a city busy at work. Her rough hands showed the many years of her hard

"...and I saw her approach the door and edge her seat beside that young fellow. Quietly she stood and looked

TAKE PLEA

What the matter, don't you like it, girle? We pay the roles that they assigned us...

Look! Look!

Betty! Betty! There!

I've got some skins.

God, look at that filth. I'm going to go out.

God, look at that filth. I'm going to go out.

Why can't I walk down a street...

The tape plays. The audience knows the performance will

SUGGESTED LISTENING: SUGGESTION: LISTENING SUGGESTION
Hanging Dream
by T. Hickman

Selling my wares for all to see
At the end of a rope in a public tree.
My dreams seem all too strange to me
Hanging like fruit in a public tree,
Dangling like fruit for all to see
A lynching performed by of for me.
My own hanging garden is what it would be
A modern day Babylon for all to see.

Wanting all the world to see
A rope no hope
Ripe fruit I'll be.

Hanging dead in a public tree.

---

FOREVER

Forever. Thinking of you, and all that had been. As I watch, a distant witness, finding the pain of the implications so great, denial could no longer withstand. Neither could I. A tear not brushed aside, but allowed to slowly find its salty way towards earth. The anger rose and subsided within me - waves of the sea crashing, tearing at my sanity. Why had I believed you? How can I forgive you? or even forget the anguish. But I could not remove my eyes.

Who am I, to expect more than is?
The world is far from the perfection in which it was created. The dismal truth, slowly sunken through the reality and into the past. Acceptance? Never.

Your touch, I will never forget. Now as you offer it, every inch of my skin cringes. The gentle caress is not for me. Fleeing. Back into the recesses of my consciousness, reality now seems as if only a dream, a nightmare. How could I have known? Trust has never seemed so foolish.

A soft kiss. More powerful than any weapon. Destroying. I cry out, but there is no one to hear. My mind, now suddenly broken from the entrenchment of my disbelief, races in circles, trying to find something firm to rest upon. Seeking a reason, an explanation. But there is none. The world just is. Realization. Understanding? None reaches me, so far from the earth upon which I stand. And watch.

Finally, I turn. No longer. But alas! You are still there! I can not escape, the images burned into my heart.

---

by Jonathan Babb
"Emas! We're getting something! We've locked into some kind of transmitter!" the small, feathered alien trilled in his high-pitched Ytialuqonian voice.

Emas scurried over to the control board where Etar-Ebil was nervously dialing dials and levering levers and switching switches. The long golden-feathered plume atop her head trembled with excitement.

"So, the little blue planet is inhabited!" she exclaimed anxiously, her shrill voice wobbling like a spinning top. She fidgeted with the captain's badge on the vest of her uniform as she eyed the flickering screen, which popped and hissed with silver and white static.

"Attention housewives! Try new Squeak, the all-purpose kitchen and bathroom disinfectant and cleanser. The bottle transforms into a robot for the little man of the house while the box can be made into a crib for your little girl's favorite doll! Use new Squeak only twice a week and you'll have all the leisure time you seek!"

Emas looked at Etar-Ebil and raised her eyebrows. Her tiny rust-colored eyes widened in astonishment.

"Here's something else," Etar-Ebil warbled as he turned the screen in onto a blurred image of a man and a woman in a bathroom. They were discussing a small cylinder the woman held.

"Strong enough for a man," the deep voice of the man droned.

"-but made for a woman!" the woman interrupted with a grin as she whirled out of the bathroom.

"Now back to The Young and the Useless," a man's voice announced as a new image filled the flickering screen.

"Oh, Seth, I love you and I'm going to have your baby! Your wife doesn't love you like I do! Please, please, leave her and stay with me!"

"I'm sorry, Sylvia. I have my position at Genesis and I'm running for Senator next week. Besides, what would the guys at the country club say?"

"But how will I support myself and the baby?"

"I'll send you a check every week."

Then the screen became white with static. Etar-Ebil anxiously turned knobs and flipped switches. Finally, the image of a woman in a flowing white dress emerged on the screen. She was walking along a beach at sunset. A soft voice in the background purred, "Because when men age, they become worldly and wise. When women age, they just become old. But not me. I'm going to fight those wrinkles all the way. I use Oil of Obee—every day."

The beach scene faded and was replaced by the image of a harried looking woman bustling about a kitchen. The phone rings.

"Honey, I'll be home from work late again," a man's voice says.

"Not again!" the woman sighs in desperation. Then the announcer's voice cuts in and tells the aproned housewife "Never fear! Heet-rap keeps..."
your meals warm for hours! Your husband will think you just cooked!"

Then the relieved housewife scene fades into the image of the husband, still in his business suit, eating dinner with the wife, who has curled her hair and is wearing a low cut dress. The husband smiles at her and says, "Honey, you did it again!"

"What do you think, Emas?" Etar-Ebil questioned the captain of the exploratory vessel from Ytilauqe as he turned down the volume on the receiver.

"The female of that species seems to be quite subservient to the male," Emas conjectured.

The two alien explorers watched satellite transmissions most of the day (38 hours - a typical Ytilauqonian day) and sent their findings back to Ytilauqe that evening.

"Earth seems to be run by the male with the females occupying positions as housewives, secretaries, and mistresses. Females take care of the young and clean the dwellings and cook the meals. From the information we've gathered, the female seems to enjoy this subjugation. Female Earthlings seem to be less intelligent, weaker, and inferior in all aspects to the male Earthlings."

Emas ended the message with a sigh. How upsetting that females would allow themselves to be treated in such a manner!

Etar-Ebil noticed the pensive look on Emas' feathered face and said, "I don't understand how sex could make someone inferior or superior. That just doesn't make sense."

"I know, Etar-Ebil," Emas breathed, "I know. It is very sad to find that any form of slavery still exists in this day and age."

Etar-Ebil nodded, his downy feathers swaying, and turned off the monitor. "Maybe life on Earth is not really that biased," he suggested, "Maybe we were picking up some kind of sexist propaganda."

"For the female's sake, I certainly hope so," Emas murmured sadly as she turned to leave the control room, "Goodnight, Etar-Ebil."

---

To My Beloved

What are you doing in my heart?
Don't you know,
Didn't they tell you it was wrong?
How did you get here?
Don't ever leave.

Poems by Morgan Reid

Going to Pieces

Your Destination's elsewhere.
Take me with you, Go away.
Love's gone, away/Awry

How?
Why?
TIES
Obligation, Pride, Hope
Last ties, braided tight
Between our souls.
Leash too long, Pressure,
unraveling
Yet don't run far, don't let go
The only STRAND saving us
holding me
From Falling alone.

-Karen Steadman

Touch of lips

Touch
& giggle.
Talk-laugh
whisper then Smile.
I want to Hug & hold,
feel/s so Good
--Sigh--
Our lips might
Touch.

-Morgan Reid
As a child did I climb into the tower of wide-eyed wonder, did I send the tower of Lucid Doubt into flight? What was I that knew of those dark deeds? Doubt, doubt, Langid, doubt.
Yip-e-ki-a-yo and down on the range a cow is giving birth to twins. All is not well. A biting wind is coming in from the north and the first calf is born dead, resin coats its half opened eyes. A tired mother nudges the young one with her nose, cleaning away the smells of birth and hoping to jump start the young un-life with her tongue. The bitter wind slams a range weed into her still heaving side where another waits to be born.

Sweat thickens as glazed white marbles roll to fill the sockets of her eyes. Her gentle tongue stiffens into a dagger. Her heaving sides shudder as another un-life punctures her poison womb. As if a switch were thrown, her heaving sides cease with a final shudder. Her tongue wicks blood into the swirling dust.

* 

Now, I am the cowboy... It is my duty to attend her now silent side. The wind slings the froth from her mouth and burnishes the glaze from her eyes. Two young bulls, one half buried in flesh and one kicked painfully to the side, lie exposed to a world they never knew. If I had been born on the range, I wonder if the same would have happened to me.

I bury the struggle under three feet of dust and stones, got to keep the dogs from following the herd. Time was nothing to these beasts. The moon casts swirling shadows in the dust as I place the final rocks on the common grave. Time was shadows to these beasts, always changing but never really there. The seasons meant endless pastures of heat and cold, driving rain and vanishing lakes. They meant birth and death, not really seasons but things that happen. Swirling shadows in the dust.

* 

I am the cowboy and I move the herd when its time, when the dust no longer swirls but rips across the plane. Where grass once grew and trapped the dust in eddies, there is only more dust. Dust that chisels stream channels in my aging face.

YA! MOVE COW!

We force the wheel of time to ratchet another notch. Loner, my horse, shovels strays with his powerful chest as we guide the herd through a pass.

* 

It's hot but a cowboy only wipes his brow and goes on. A clump of trees signal water ahead. Water is life out here. No water, no life. A cowboy's existence is an endless search for life. Death is the norm, the cowboy tries to outsmart it.

* CONTINUED...
Isn't it funny how good things can become bad when we get too much of them? I am the cowboy and it is raining. Most of the herd is huddled underneath a clump of trees. There is grass here and the stronger beasts are still grazing on the armored turf. Lightning strikes a nearby ridge.

The land out here is funny when it comes to rain, to water. This land craves water most of the time and can suck a thunderhead dry in minutes. So great is it's thirst that it won't even leave that lingering scent of rain. It takes that too. It's so fast that your lips can crack and blister from a fireball sun before you have even realized that it had rained. But like a man deprived of food, this land will puke if you give it more than a mouthful.

It is still raining and what once was good for filling canteens has become tragedy. What was once pasture is now rushing torrents of bile. Infant banks creep closer to the huddled herd. One by one, brush trees lose their grip in the sandy earth and swirl out to thirstier regions. The cattle stare blankly from beneath the trees. A few sip from the rushing waters lapping at their feet. To them it's just another season. Like mating time, this is time for froth and fury.

I am the cowboy... The rain has stopped... Time is still... The cattle now graze on leather blooms while I finish the work that the rain had started. A tragic mound, half buried, with a belly full of gravel stares blankly from beneath the sand. I wipe the dust from her swollen eyes and look into the seasons.

"Stare on... stare on, dear one." Time and the cowboy never sleep.
Second Wind

Amazing that a ball of fur senses fear,
a raspy tongue in a mouth that always smiles.
Creamy eyes that know freedom, and
ears that dance to show it.

I prefer the fiercer breed, loping
(much better than running)
through eternal forests,
aloof and alone- free.

They can sense my fear- can I?
It is not being bitten, or the bite,
for I feel the romance keenly, and
wish it were true.

Perhaps I fear not being bitten,
for then I have no chance.
Crushed teeth have power, power
I need, to run, to smile, to fear.

They can sense my fear, I fear
to walk, blind, through the
corridors of man, concrete burning my feet,
asphalt flaring my nostrils,
as he laughs, as always, his raspy tongue lolling as he runs.

-David Cater
Interview With Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael)  
by Jeff Cardille

Kwame Ture (formerly Stokely Carmichael) spoke at Georgia Tech on February 27, Mr. Ture played an important role as an activist and speaker in the civil rights movement: after graduating from Howard University in 1964 with a degree in philosophy, Carmichael became active full-time in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). SNCC, the most prominent student group demanding civil rights, organized multiracial "sit-ins" at segregated lunch counters throughout the South in the early 60's. In 1961 Carmichael was among the first group of "Freedom Riders," a multiracial group that repeatedly was attacked by white mobs as they rode buses throughout the South to test the federal government's resolve to desegregate state travel. As Carmichael's message against capitalism and racism intensified in the mid-60's, he rose to the chairmanship of SNCC in 1966. He helped to organize the Lowndes County (Mississippi) Freedom Organization, the black organization that first developed the Black Panther symbol.

In 1966 on a march with Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) to protest the shooting of James Meredith (called the Meredith March), Carmichael broke with King's message of integration and began to use his new phrase "Black Power." As Black Power's appeal grew, Carmichael left for Africa. During Carmichael's travels, the Black Panther Party (developed jointly by Bobby Seale and Huey Newton) grew in Oakland, CA and throughout the country. When he returned to America to speak for imprisoned Black Panther Party leader Huey Newton, Carmichael was asked by Panther leaders to become Prime Minister. He served as Prime Minister of the Black Panthers for about two years, then resigned.

After leaving America again for Africa, Carmichael changed his name to Kwame Ture to reflect his identification with the political philosophies of revolution developed by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah (leader of Ghana) and President Sekou Toure of Guinea. Kwame Toure and his wife Miriam Makeba (the exiled South African singer who toured with Paul Simon recently) moved to Guinea in 1970, where he has spent the last 20 years organizing the All-African People's Revolutionary Party.

We talked at length about Black Power, the history of SNCC, religion, Panama, racism, capitalism, African-American consciousness, and the need for organization.

Q: What do you think is the most important form of Black Power for people of color in the United States now? What should people be doing?

A: Organizations—mass organizations. The only legitimate source of power is the organized masses.

You can see the anomaly that exists for us. We have over three hundred mayors in this country [who are African-American], over five thousand six hundred elected officials. Most of them are in the Democratic Party, and we have no power, at all because the masses are not organized. The only form, of course, is the organized masses, and its highest form would be a Pan-African organization.

Q: I wanted to ask you about mayors because in a lot of your older speeches (1960's and early 1970's) you were saying that people need to vote, that people need to organize to take control of their governments. Who's got a little bit of power now [among black elected officials]? I think of [Virginia Governor] Wilder, [New York City Mayor] Dinkins.

A: No, none at all. The power belongs to the Democratic Party, and the Democratic Party is racist and capitalist. It's against the poor and against the nationalities.

Q: Is there any remedy for that within the Democratic Party?

A: I don't think there's any remedy... It's just too corrupt. As we tell Jesse Jackson, playfully, "We hope you're strong, but we're afraid that if Jesus Christ came into the Democratic Party even he'd come out corrupt."

Q: You said in 1970 that for the black community to come together that "we have to find a common ideology." What kind of ideology do we have to take now?

A: Nkrumism-Toureism. This problem is especially highlighted by leftist forces which kept saying that in order to be a revolutionary you had to be a Marxist-Leninist. We understand that the culture has to be the container of the ideology. Your ideology must come from your culture. When Marx and Engels and
Interview With Kwame Ture continued...
by Jeff Cardille

Even Lenin take a piece of Toureism they make it atheistic, to the point where Marx and Engels say in the Communist Manifesto that "religion is the opium of the masses." This is true for particular conditions in Europe, but it is not true outside of Europe. For example when you look at the Arab world, Islam was not the opium of the masses—it was a civilizing force. If you try to use the same ideology for a different culture you get different results. To tell people outside of Europe to be atheist in order to be revolutionary is a difficult task, almost an impossible one.

You have to have your own culture. Nkrumism-Toureism, representing the names of Kwame Nkrumah and Sekou Toure, comes from Africa. It represents the struggle of all Africans against all exploitation and maps out the path of their total liberation.

Q: You said in your speech that all religions were the same in essence but different in form. How did you come about that?

A: If you look at all religions their fundamental purpose is to impose moral obligation upon men and women. In essence they're all equal because they all come to impose moral obligation. Just the forms are different.

Q: Do you think the obligation is good or bad?

A: Oh, I would say it's necessary. Can you imagine if George Bush wasn't religious? If he didn't have some moral obligation? It's necessary, at this time at least.

Q: I wanted to ask you about Panama. In 1966 you wrote "For a century, this nation has been like an octopus of exploitation, its tentacles stretching from Mississippi and Harlem to South America, the Middle East, southern Africa, and Vietnam; the form of exploitation varies from area to area but the essential result has been the same—a powerful few have been exploited and enriched at the expense of the poor and voiceless colored masses." What does that say of Panama?

A: What it says is clear. You have two overt reasons for the invasion of Panama. One, Noriega once worked for Bush at the CIA and now thumbs his nose up at him. Bush cannot, of course, have this happen because others would feel they could repeat it. So clearly Noriega must be taught a lesson.

The second reason is that Noriega's position on the Canal [did not fit with] the oligarchy that has now replaced him. So it was really to kill two birds with one stone: Number one, to show any agent that we put in power that they cannot thumb their nose at us with impunity; and secondly, to bring back the oligarchy that can insure exploitation of the many by the few.

Q: You spoke about leaders in your speech. When you started your work you were of college age. Who in my generation should people look to?

A: I think they should look more to organizations, but people can look to Castro, they can look to Mandela. They can look to Geronimo Pratt [a Black Panther Party member serving time in jail in the US], or Assata Shakur [a leader of the military arm of the BPP living in Cuba]. There are people around it's just that they're not mentioned easily in the press.

Q: What do you think of Louis Farrakhan?

A: I think that he's a great man doing a great job. Not only that, but if you don't know the African community you may think that Jesse Jackson is the most popular leader. If Jesse Jackson with all the press he has to go, to any given city opens up an auditorium for free he won't be able to fill it. Farrakhan comes without press and charges people and they'll stand for hours to be searched and they'll fill the auditorium. The press doesn't make revolution—it's useless. It's clear that Farrakhan has the influence over the masses of the people. And Farrakhan is certainly pushing revolution. What Jesse Jackson's pushing is reform.

Q: Do you think that the political consciousness of African people is rising in this country now?

A: For every people, every people in America. The people are becoming more conscious. There's no one in America today, irrespective of race, creed, or color, who can tell me that they're not more conscious of the food they eat, not more conscious of ecology, not more conscious of the amenities necessary for the handicapped. In the 1960's Africans had no elected political officials; today they have so many thousands. This process alone by osmosis calls for higher political consciousness. There's no woman today, no man today in any country in the world who can say they're less aware of the oppression of women and the necessity to struggle against it today than they were in the Sixties. At every level the people are more conscious. Even the right wing—they're in power from activities today which they called communist in the Sixties!

America is more ripe for revolution today than it was in the Sixties because in the Sixties you just had the left wing calling for change. But today the left and the right are calling for change. It's not the same change, but since both are calling for change the possibility to have change becomes more strong.

Q: In 1970 you wrote that "the reason why drug use has reached the proportion it has today is that the political consciousness of our people is rising, and in order to dull the political consciousness of our people, the oppressor sends more drugs into the community."

A: It's more true today than than. People no longer judging the situation become confused. When I judge more drugs coming into the community, it means to me that the consciousness of the youth is rising. So while there's a negative effect I see a positive...
Racism Revisited

by David Wilens

I hear it everywhere. "Racism up on campuses!" "Racist incidents increase thirty percent since..." "New wave of racism sweeping America". "Reagan Administration's policies of greed and selfishness promoted renewal of racism". "Civil Rights is not over"...

All right, all of you slogan screamers, can you please stop for one second in order to define this "racism" that you condemn, with a definition that is both objectively definable and universally applicable to anyone? Most people have the same general idea of what racism is about, though I believe few can effectively define it.

Racism is the belief, according to Ayn Rand, that the contents of a person’s brain are not the product of his own thinking, but are the result of heredity. (I subscribe to this definition because I discovered it on my own, before I even knew who Ayn Rand was.)

Therefore, the statement ‘nigger die’ is not necessarily racist; it could simply be the mouthing of some thoughtless jerk who is looking for kicks. On the other hand, the statement ‘blood is thicker than water’ is a racist statement. I’ll illustrate this with an example. Suppose an affluent, well-groomed, extremely shrewd and successful black businessman suddenly decides to trash his apartment unit. A person who is not a racist would probably figure that he had a bad day, or that he broke up with his girlfriend, or that he lost money on a deal, et cetera. The racist, in contrast, would like to have people believe that, since the man was black, and that since his ancestors in Africa were supposedly brutes, he inherited such traits that would lead him to trash his apartment.

The racist is often the type of person who is basically unable, by his own mind, to provide a living for himself. Such a person would therefore have no wealth with which to pay back others who provide him with his means of survival, and thus would need a relationship with the producers of wealth in which payment is not required for services rendered. Such a relationship is slavery and the person who is not paid for his efforts is the slave, whether it be a black laborer in South Carolina or a scientist in Russia. Someone commented to me that John Locke defined a slave as a prisoner of war. I fully agree. A slave is indeed a prisoner of war—a war against the mind, for reasons I will soon explain.

Racism is a form of the ideology of collectivism, and those who practice it are collectivists. The central tenet of collectivism is the lives of individuals are for serving some other entity besides themselves (with the implication here that the ‘other entity’ is the collectivist, who, as already stated, cannot serve himself). Whom people are to serve (by force, if necessary) depends on the brand of collectivism in question. According to Communism, people are to serve the government; according to Fascism, people must do their duty to ‘society’; according to Feudalism, people are obligated to live according to the whims of supernatural entities (such as, but not restricted to, God); and according to Racism, men of inferior genetics must serve those of superior genetics.

In order to deceive people into allowing him to carry out his evil schemes, the collectivist must supress that which would blow his cover. A collectivist’s cover is effectively blown when a thinking person asks: why should I live my life for the sake of someone else? In order to minimize the possibility of this happening, the collectivist declares war on peoples’ abilities to think, by declaring war on their minds. Only the mind can expose the collectivist for what he is: a lazy, worthless social parasite. This is why the racist attacks the mind, by holding its judgements invalid because they are the product of heredity.

A possible hypothesis about how racism against blacks took root in America has its own roots in eighteenth century Africa. Because of the appearance of Africa and Africans to some Europeans as ‘brutal’ and ‘uncivilized’, black people were an easy target for persecution by collectivists, who could attempt to justify enslavement by fooling unwary Europeans into thinking that the Africans were not as genetically developed as they were, and therefore not able to live as civilized humans. Yet, time has shown that the collectivists’ hypotheses failed miserably. History is full of blacks who have beaten back the hatred of the collectivists while showing a civility and an intelligence to rival that of anyone. Examples include Jean Baptiste DeSable, George Washington Carver, Frederick Douglass, and Martin Luther King, Jr. All of these people created their wealth by using their minds to form good ideas by and for themselves (remember the line: “I have a dream...!”). Blacks have made names for themselves throughout America and the world in the fields of athletics, entertainment, finance, insurance, medicine, and politics. All of them were hated by the racist, not because of their skin or genes, of which the racists could really care less about. They were hated because of their intelligence, and thus their ability to publicly prove the racists wrong.

continued next page
Many misconceptions concerning Racism, and concerning what to do about it, abound among students. First, many young people on campuses today probably do not understand what Civil Rights was all about. Its purpose was not to annih-late racism, but to force the government to legally recognize blacks as equals to whites (which it was not doing). For the most part this has been accomplished. Many young people also do not understand that affirmative action is unadulterated racism. Yet it is, because it uses race as a qualifier. Racism is Racism, no matter whom it is used to subjugate; the black youth who screams for back pay for slavery at the expense of others is just as much of a racist as any hooded and robed white supremacist. Everyone should remember the message of Civil Rights: blacks are people, no less, and NO MORE. Everyone is entitled to justice, and equal protection under the law; nobody is entitled to violate the individual rights of others in the name of revenge. Converting collectivists by revenge, i.e., by giving them a 'taste of their own medicine', will not only be totally ineffective; it will also piss off many non-blacks who are not collectivists. In short, the answer to the problem of racism is not government relief, or legislation; in fact, these were the causes of the problem. And, by all means, everyone should stop screaming about the 'exploitation' of capitalism. This 'exploitation' is nothing but nonsense, propagated by collectivists for the purpose of destroying the only political system which rewards people for the quality of their achievements, regardless of what race they may be.

The answer to the problem of racism, as I hope one would have figured, is thinking by using the mind in order to produce wealth. This can be done by writing a book, by getting a degree at Tech, or by other means. People who produce wealth are hated, not for their race, but for their minds, by those brutes who have no mind of their own to hate. So, don't be fooled by racial slurs, which are a diversion; the real attack is on the brain—because only the brain can foil the curses of the collectivist lowlifes.

**Ture Interview continued from page 50...**

aspect. And since I know history I know that this is no problem. The Chinese fought an Opium War in the late 1800's and they whipped 'em. And crack is not opium.

Q: You also wrote (in 1967) "a capitalist system automatically includes racism, whether by design or not. Capitalism and racism go hand in hand. Capitalism, by its very nature, cannot create structures free from exploitation."

A: I don't know if you understood my comment [on the stage] that if a white man wants to lynch me that's his problem, but if he has the power to lynch me that's my problem. Racism is not an attitude. American bourgeois professors, scholars and writers make it appear as if racism is an attitude. You can't be racist until you have power. The power for racism comes from capitalism, a community wealth through exploitation. In order to continue the exploitation you define on any grounds—race, creed, religion, sex—anything is justified. So racism has bred into it all those efforts of dividing the mass of people for continued perpetual exploitation.

Q: [Laughing] That's nice...

A: It is!

Q: In the first couple pages of *Sickles Speaks* you asked children to think about What is Society and Who Makes the Rules for Society? Who makes the rules for this society right now?

A: The multi-capitalists, there's no question. You know, I laugh at what they call Democracy in this country. You take a movie actor; you take a CIA director, and you put 'em in there for four years. It takes them about three years to understand how to run the country, and in the fourth year they've got to spend time getting re-elected. Obviously they're not running the country. Obviously.

Q: You spoke today that some people write that African-American women never played a part in your movement in the Sixties, that...

Q: You spoke today that some people write that African-American women never played a part in your movement in the Sixties, that they...
Leadership Conference, the eternal; Frederick Douglass's Revolutionary Party, the Black Muslims, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Urban League, or the NAACP.) A serious organization must come to understand the need for permanent organization to battle for justice. The struggle for justice is eternal; Frederick Douglass said that where there is no struggle there is no progress. Progress is eternal; struggle is eternal, so we should look to organizations that look to the struggle.

James Walker is a White South African, who's been away from South Africa for the last five years. He's currently attending Kennesaw State College, where he's pursuing a degree geared towards a performing career.

Zed: Are you in favor of abolishing Apartheid?

James: Yes, I think it's something that really needs to be abolished as soon as possible.

Zed: What are your views on the recent actions taken by the racist Government of Mr. DeKlerk?

James: I think it's an encouraging sign and a step in the right direction. However, it's really a long way from what really needs to be done in order to bring about an end to Apartheid.

Zed: What are views on the ANC [African National Congress]?

James: I don't like the ANC because of the following reasons: (a) they embrace armed resistance as a means of ending Apartheid, (b) they pursue a semi-socialist (democratic) line which I don't agree with, since I firmly believe that capitalism is what will work best for South Africa, (c) I don't think that they [ANC] will adhere to their promise of a racially unified and equal South Africa after they get into power.

Zed: Since violence is officially perpetuated against black South Africans due to the laws of Apartheid, isn't it justifiable that they continue the armed struggle?

James: I don't think that anybody has a right to violence. Neither the ANC nor the Government. Also their plea for international support will be negated if they [ANC] continue to use violence. I think they should resort to non-violent protest.

Zed: You said that capitalism is what will work best for South Africa. But isn't capitalism the basis of this racist philosophy which has brought South Africa to its present dilemma?

James: Yes, I agree. However, what I'm saying is that once the government reforms to a one-man-one-vote system, given the tremendous amount of wealth and natural resources that South Africa has, a capitalist economy will be best suited for its development.

Zed: Tell me! How can capitalism, a system which is not based...
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on equi-distribution of wealth, right the wrong of great economic disparities between whites and blacks that has been created over all these decades?

James: Well...well...I think black South Africans should be given things like free education, free healthcare, and have social programs supported by the government.

Zed: But aren't these measures socialist in principle, and thereby imply that a socialist democracy is what will work best for South Africa?

James: Well...yes, you are right. However, what I mean is that at the beginning they should implement something like what England has [socialist] and after the economic disparities have been reduced they move fully into a capitalist economy.

Zed: What are your impressions of comrade Mandela?

James: I have mixed feelings about Mr Mandela. You see, before he went to prison there were some violent actions that he condoned, subsequently these actions resulted in fatalities and this I am totally against. On the other hand, the statements and actions that he has said and taken towards unifying South Africa, and especially towards ending the tribal violence are very positive and commendable actions. However, he's with the ANC so I don't really trust him.

Zed: What is your stand on the question of sanctions?

James: I don't support sanctions. While it is true that they do hurt the government, the effect reaches every South African, whether white or black.

Zed: What advice would you give to people in America, about what they can do to bring about a change in South Africa?

James: My advice is to stay out of South Africa's business. Let South Africans take care of their internal affairs and put an end to foreign intervention.

Zed: Thank you. Long live the struggle to end Apartheid.

James: Thank you. It was nice talking to you.

Interview with Leonard Zeskind of the Center for Democratic Renewal

by: Charles Boyer

Racism is a problem that affects our society and every one of its members; yet very few of us are actively involved in alleviating the problem. I recently had a chance to speak with Leonard Zeskind, the research director for the Center for Democratic Renewal. He is involved directly with the problem of racism and offers some interesting insights as to what the racist movement is like today and where it's heading.

Could you describe your organization and its purpose?

The Center for Democratic Renewal is a national clearinghouse for community efforts to counter hate group activity and we have a program of helping communities respond through training, education and victim's assistance. We pursue making sure that the criminal justice system works adequately to handle incidents of bigoted violence and we also monitor the activities of hate groups and try to educate people to their impact on society.

Could you describe your work for the Center?

My work as the research director is to monitor the activities of white supremacist organizations and to develop an analysis of what's actually going on out there. I pay particular attention to the trends that are going on in this movement and one of the trends that I've noticed is an increasing level of cooperation between white supremacists in the United States and their counterparts in Europe.

How has the movement changed over, say, the past 10 years?

Well, I think that one of the changes that has occurred is, what I would call, a growing nazification of the movement. I think the days of the 'Jim Crowe' Klan are pretty much over and what you have now is a movement that wants to create an all-white, in their own words, Aryan-Christian republic and they want to either circumscribe the rights of everyone else or actually kick them out and create just a white country.

Do you feel that the movement is growing?

Well, it grows in spurts and it grows in different sectors so that, for instance, I think today what we have is a fairly significant kind of growth among young people that are joining these groups and engaging in bigoted violence. That goes all the way from the skinheads on the streets that attack people (the neo-Nazi skinheads that are violent) to the college campuses where racist student groups have gotten together and formed either a white student union or engaged in activities like tearing down shanty-towns and those kinds of things.

Where do you feel is the strongest concentration of organized racists?

Well, it exists all over the country but we're doing a lot of work right now in the southeast because we think that the Klan and the neo-Nazi groups have made a recommitment to the southeast. We're doing a lot of work in the northwest around some of these so-called constitutional groups and of course we're concerned about the skinheads in southern California.
Interview with Leonard Zeskind

Regarding skinheads, do you feel that most of them are serious of just going through a ‘phase’?

I think that what you have is both pieces of that in the skinheads. You have both people who commit for a short period of time because they’re experimenting with different things and then you also have the people that stay along and get real hard-core.

What are your thoughts on David Duke’s rise in Louisiana politics?

That’s another part of the trend that we’ve seen. It’s the mainstreaming of this movement, or an attempt by some parts, because I think there’s different tendencies and one of the tendencies is to try and mainstream the movement through getting involved in the electoral process. The most significant success that has occurred has been David Duke in Louisiana, where Duke (who was the man who put the Klan back on the map in the 1970’s and then throughout the 1980’s led a neo-Nazi organization that was misnamed the National Association for the Advancement of White People) got hooked up with a thing called the Populist party in 1987-88 and then ran for state representative and won in Louisiana.

Do you follow any black racist activities?

We’re focused on the connection between these organized white supremacist groups and the fact that society as a whole is racist. I think that it’s important to keep in mind that even when there are organizations that might emerge that people might have questions about their outlook, black people are not connected to the levers of power in this society the same way that white people are.

Could you tell us some of the accomplishments of the Center?

Well, I think the most significant accomplishment that we’ve had is in sparking local-communities to respond to the presence of hate groups in their own area and I think that goes all the way from the Committee Against Bigotry in Gainesville, Florida (which was composed of students and others who came together after some skinhead attacks on some students there) to grassroots groups in Montana that are concerned about the Aryan Nation’s presence in Montana, to the passage of some decent legislation in the pursuit of racial justice in the state of Washington. So I think that we’ve had a lot of different kinds of successes.

What do you see in the future?

Well, we hope that things will get better but we’re not very hopeful. We’re not confident that things are going to get better.

Greased Lightning

The Story of Wendell Scott

by Andrew Robinson

Back in the 1950’s, Wendell Scott dared to invade that bastion of society that was second only to the KKK in being male and white; Wendell Scott was a black man participating in southern stock car racing. Back then, stock car racing was still a low budget operation using genuinely stock cars. Get an old ‘39 Ford, take out the interior, shave the head, and you were ready to race. The races were held on dirt tracks or the fairgrounds and the purses were small, if not nonexistent.

At first Scott was just a curiosity and nobody paid him much attention; mostly they just laughed and said, “Hey look, that nigger thinks he’s a race car driver!” The real problem was that Scott was a race car driver and a good mechanic.

The plain truth is that Scott was a damn good driver and could drive as well as the Petty’s, Buddy Baker, or Cale Yarborough. The trouble began when Scott won his first race. Scott won by a clear margin, but the race officials awarded the checkered flag and the money to the first white man across the line. The “official ruling” was that Scott was one lap down. Several hours later, after everyone had left, the race officials decided that Scott had won and gave him some money; the trophy and the headline, belonged to the white man.

This brand of Jim Crow racing got worse. When it became apparent that Scott was a competitive threat, the other drivers used a “booger man”. The drivers all drew straws an the loser was designated as the booger man; his job was to wreck into Wendell and take him out of the race. All the other drivers would chip in to pay the booger man. This clever bit of work allowed Scott to race, but never win.

Scott also had to face the additional problems of overt bigotry from drivers and fans who threatened to kill or injure Scott and his family. Stolen tools and cars falling off jacks were an everyday part of his life. Throughout it all Scott hung tough and continued to race, convinced that eventually NASCAR and the Rules-of-Fair-Play would let him win. He was wrong.

Already woefully underfunded, Scott was eventually squeezed out of racing by economics. He is still alive and runs a salvage yard somewhere here in the south. I wish I could give more details, but Scott is missing from all my racing books. Most of what you have read here is from the movie “Greased Lightning” (with Richard Pryor in an excellent portrayal of Scott) and from a magazine article I read two years ago (which I cannot find). Please forgive me if I have any details wrong or have misspelled his first name.

Not all the drivers were hostile to Scott while he was racing. At continued on page 56...
first, some would offer help in preparing Scott's car or loan him a part, but (as with any driver, black or white) this quickly ended once Scott became competitive. Once a driver jumped on Scott's running board as he was leaving a race, and Wendell thought that he was being attacked. Instead, the man handed Scott a handful of money and told him that he deserved it. The man also added that it would be bad if the other driver's knew of his generosity. This occurred fairly often, but never overtly.

It is a curious phenomenon that still occurs today: many people will accept and respect others in a one-on-one basis, but with your peers it is not cool to acknowledge that you like or accept other races, religions, etc. (This phenomenon is one of the main themes of "Driving Miss Daisy"; excellent film.) So, black and white, Jew and Gentile, we still continue to hide behind our veils, even now.

Wendell Scott's story is very important to me; I also want to be a race car driver. My limitation is my age and lack of funds; Scott's limitation was more fundamental and unassailable. I can grow up and make money; Scott couldn't change his skin color.

I did not know much about racism until late in high school. It was not a factor in my life and I just didn't think much about it. Sure, I had read about slavery and Jim Crow, but this was ancient history to me; surely Things Were Different in the 1980's. I came from Chattanooga to Atlanta and became more aware of racism while I was at Tech, but the full impact of it still had not hit me. Not until I saw "Greased Lightning" did I realize what kind of evil hell that racism is.

Here was a man who shared the same dreams and aspirations that I did: he just wanted to race cars, but he was black. My denial of racing is temporary; Scott's denial of racing was permanent, and he almost died for it. I cried at the end of the movie. Wendell Scott's story is just one small excerpt from Black history, but it has made this white man realize the true senseless hate that is racism.

[Note: The few articles about Scott were features that came about because a second black man entered the racing world some twenty years later. Willy T. Ribbs drives GT Prototype cars in the IMSA racing series. Currently Ribbs drives a Toyota GTP car for Dan Gurney's All-American racers; he is a jerk in person (I've met him), but he can sure drive a race car. As far as I know, Ribbs is still the only black currently racing professionally, and Wendell Scott is still the only black NASCAR driver. Ex-Chicago Bear Walter Payton races as an amateur and funds himself.]

What can be done to increase the number of black drivers? Not much. There are only three ways into pro racing: be born into it (like Kyle Petty or Michael Andretti), have the money to buy your own way (John Paul, Jr. or Walter Payton), or get lucky and have someone notice you as an amateur. Most of today's drivers were born into racing or paid their own way through the lower ranks of racing before moving up. (This holds true just as much for whites as anyone else. I do not know how Ribbs broke into racing or of any other Blacks currently trying to break into racing.)

Think | Thought | Thank...
--- | --- | ---
The man we see in each other do not give us the image and likeness of man. They are harried, wrinkled, anxious. They all seem the marks of some invisible rod... —Emerson
If your morals make you dearly, depend upon it, they are wrong. —Robert Louis Stevenson

God is Tolerant, Man is not tolerant; Omiscience Paradox, Fairly is iniorable. —Sydney Smith

Oscar
Notes

Dr. Van Nostrand (of whom I’ve heard nothing but good things) and Dr. Rauch (of whom I’ve heard nothing) are offering English 4303L this Spring: Analysis of Scientific Discourse. The course is restricted in a couple of ways: It is open only to classes 3, 4, and 6, and it is restricted to only students with a grade-point average of 3.2 or better on a scale of 4.0.

I assume that the instructors want to restrict the course to serious students who will make the necessary efforts to succeed in the course. If this is the course I think it is, it requires a great deal of self-motivated work outside the classroom. It is certainly the right of the professors to restrict any class if they think it is
necessary. I object to the criterion of this restriction. I don’t accept the assumption that “only and all students with GPA’s of 3.2 or better are capable of doing the level and quality of work needed for this class.” My objections are several:

GPA’s at Tech indicate a student’s ability to perform well in their chosen field of study. A 3.2 in Electrical Engineering suggests that one is capable of quality work in Electrical Engineering; not English. Stated quantitatively, “The restriction based upon GPA assumes a high degree of correlation between good overall GPA’s and good performance in a particular English class.” An assumption like that in a research-design class would emphatically not lead to a positive contribution to one’s GPA.

Poor GPA’s don’t indicate an inability to perform well in English classes. When I first saw the course listing and began thinking of the people excluded, I realized that most of the talented and interesting people I know (humbly including myself) would not be able to take that class. I’d like to take the course and will probably be able to “get in” after I talk to the professors. That’s demeaning to me. I’m not proud of my 2.4 GPA but, given my situation, I think it’s more than adequate. I shouldn’t have to make a special plea to get into a class for which I’m well-suited (my English GPA is 3.7).

I’d like to suggest that a better way to limit the class to students who are willing to do the required amounts of work would be to restrict the class to “with permission of the instructor.” This requires each student to visit and convince the professor that the course is something they are truly interested in.

I’ve learned that the on-line version of the class is no longer restricted by GPA. That takes the wind out of this article in one sense. It is still important to realize the fallacy of equating GPA’s with performance in any specific area.
Several years ago, a young lady named Nancy Beth Cruzan suffered irreparable brain damage as a result of a car accident. Although she can maintain consciousness, her doctors say that she is completely unresponsive: eye and muscle movements are few and completely random. Now her family is asking to end her life by removing the tube that feeds her through the wall of her stomach. The case is now before the federal courts.

This is a highly difficult issue, and I am equivocal about the conclusions that I reach at the end of this article; yet the debate interests me primarily because of the arguments typically presented for the plaintiff in this case. Here are the statements:

Argument #1: The state has no right to restrict families as they try to make the painful decision whether to terminate the life of a loved one who is comatose with no chance of recovery.

This is objectionable as extreme familialism. The state has a general obligation to protect the lives and health of its citizens. While I would be the first to argue that families should be granted wide discretion in such matters as the education and discipline of children, the power of families is not absolute even in internal matters. The state enforces laws against incest, child abuse, spouse abuse, and infanticide, to name only a few. Few people would argue against the government's role in protecting people from these horrible crimes committed at the hands of other family members. However, the plaintiffs insist that:

Argument #2: People have a right to die.

This is a highly debateable proposition. If we take seriously Thomas Jefferson's statement that our right to life is truly inalienable, then we must recognize that it should not be destroyed even by ourselves. But even if there were a "right to suicide," we would run the risk of corrupting our language with imprecise definitions were we to apply it to this particular case. Although we can spend hours talking about how "little Nancy wouldn't want to live like this," the cold, hard fact of the matter is that little Nancy is incapable of arriving at that judgment in her present condition. It is technically impossible for her to communicate her wishes to the rest of the world. Therefore, she is not the plaintiff in the case. The plaintiffs are her family members who want to make this decision for her. Thus, this case distinguishes itself from previous "right to die" cases because what is technically being requested is a right to kill. The family members will be exercising this right without the expressed consent of the patient. But the plaintiffs insist that:

Argument #3: We are not killing the patient but are merely allowing her to die by removing unnatural life-sustaining measures.

It is here that we enter the gray area that serves as a bridge between ethics and science. Ethicists divide euthanasia or "mercy killing" into two types. Active euthanasia is deliberately killing the old or infirm via lethal injection or other direct measures. Passive euthanasia is allowing a person to die naturally by removing artificial life-support mechanisms, heretofore thought limited to respirators and heart machines. While finding the latter morally acceptable, ethicists almost unanimously reject the former as cruel and barbaric. As we attempt to decide the present case, the question we must therefore ask is: by removing the feeding tube, are we allowing her to die a natural death, or are we actively killing her through starvation?

Some things to consider on this question. Several years ago, the family of a comatose patient decided to remove the respirator that kept her alive. When they did, lo, the patient began to breathe on her own. The "heroic measure" of the respirator turned out to be superfluous, and the patient lingered for another seven years.

Such a discovery would not be made if Miss Cruzan's feeding tube were removed. Such an action would, with 100% certainty, result in a slow death by dehydration and starvation, a process which would cause intense suffering without the extensive use of painkillers. Furthermore, it would end her life in the same manner as would the denial of food and water to a healthy person. The final result would be the same in both cases. The sole difference is that in this case the patient is unable to eat and drink for herself.

The distinction between starving the brain damaged and starving the merely infirm is not sufficiently clear to me that I could endorse the former while conscientiously avoiding the latter. We must have a more exacting standard than the one currently proposed: May we starve to death all brain damaged people? Only those incapable of feeding themselves? Better, I think, not to starve anybody.
AIDS on Campus

by Jeff Cardille

The Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), the virus that causes AIDS, has penetrated the college community. A study of college students by the US government's Center for Disease Control during the 1988-89 school year showed that 1 in 500 college students are infected with HIV. As a straight male, I think it's time to speak up about AIDS and try to help others to stop thinking of AIDS as an exclusively "gay disease" and more as a largely avoidable human disease.

How to be safer:
The safest method of preventing AIDS is, of course, abstinence. For those who choose to have sex, the next safest method of AIDS prevention is using, every time, a latex condom in conjunction with a birth control foam or jelly. It's important to use only a foam that contains "nonoxynol-9." Nonoxynol-9 kills the AIDS virus; products that contain it say so right on the box. A little inconvenient, maybe—but better inconvenienced than dead.

1) Safe acts:
Abstinence
Intercourse when a condom is used properly
Oral sex when a condom is used.
Mutual masturbation
Hugging, caressing, fondling, cuddling
Kissing (while the virus has been found in saliva, kissing doesn't spread AIDS
Fantasy, movies, pictures
Sex toys such as vibrators and dildoes that are not shared or that are used with condoms

2) Maybe safe, Maybe not:
Oral sex without a condom
Oral contact with vaginal secretions

Intercourse with spermicidal jelly containing nonoxynol-9

3) Dangerous Acts:
Any kind of unprotected intercourse, whether or not the man withdraws
Sharing sex toys such as dildoes and vibrators
Any oral contact with blood or semen

(Information from "Safe Sex for Men and Women Concerned about AIDS", distributed by HERO, Baltimore MD)

People are more likely to be infected if they
1) have many sex partners
2) have sex with female or male prostitutes
3) have sex with homosexual males, bisexual males or any IV drug users
4) shoot drugs and share needles
5) have been ill with other sexually transmitted diseases (syphilis, gonorrhea, etc)
6) have had a blood transfusion between 1978 and March 1985
7) have sex with someone who has done any of the above

(Information from "Should You Be Tested?", a pamphlet by the Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Public Health, Office of Infectious Disease)

The stigma attached to AIDS testing has largely diminished over the last few years, so anyone who feels she or he may be in one of the groups listed above should strongly consider getting an AIDS test. Couples who are at the stage of sexual intimacy should also consider being tested to avoid spreading infection. AIDS tests and counseling are given for free at the Georgia Tech infirmary. They are painless and can relieve a great deal of mental agony.

HEADSPIN

1E. Place head to ground with body weight on extended arms.
2E. Lift legs off the ground, placing body in headstand position.
3E. Twist legs to the left, preparing to spin the right.
4E. Whip legs to the right lifting the hands off the ground and straightening legs, spinning the body to the right on the head.
"It just isn’t fair," pleaded Granny M. The prosecutor could tell it was going to be a very long day.

"Now Granny M you must realize that selling crack is illegal. Not only is it illegal in Reno, Nevada, but in the entire nation as well. Now where did you acquire the crack cocaine you were distributing?"

"Well I just went down to the high school and met some nice long haired lads in back of the gym. They seemed pretty surprised, thinking their business is only for the young. Still none of that stopped them from charging me these outlandish prices, but they assured me I could still clear a profit. Seemed like nice boys on the whole.”

"Now Granny M tell us what you did with the crack you purchased."

"Well I’d heard about the powerful addictive qualities of crack on the news a whole lot, so I thought it’d be a real nice way to sell a whole bunch of my cream soda, Granny M’s Cream Soda that is. I knew I’d have to raise the price a lot, but I figured I could make it up in return customers.”

"Now Granny, didn’t you know crack is illegal?"

"Well I’d tell you the truth I think some big corporations and companies have a monopoly on this drug thing. How can you sell alcohol, tobacco, and coffee, but you can’t sell crack. I come up with a great little plan to make myself some money to retire on, and those big beer and tobacco companies just don’t want to share the wealth. I tell you they have a monopoly. All those scientists come out with results that show things like the nicotine in cigarettes to be addictive. Gives you kind of a captive market after you try it just once, and how can that be fair in the business world. Other companies can only hope to capture a share of the market with a good product and advertising. They can’t force you to buy it through some addictive process. Nobody else can compete with addictive products. Then when I try to start my own little cream soda monopoly you slap handcuffs on me. It’s just not fair I tell you!"

"Well Granny M, the drugs in liquor, tobacco, and coffee are all natural.”

"So are the drugs in marijuana, cocaine, and opium. So obviously there’s an unfair discrimination between ‘illegal’ drugs and the legal ones.

"But Granny M, surely you can see the harmful effects of crack.”

"So, it has some bad side effects. Drinking and smoking cause thousands if not millions of deaths, cost the country billions of dollars, and not to mention the effects of millions of alcoholics. They cause all these problems and they’re still on the market. Could crack be much worse? Heck if all these ‘illegal’ drugs were legalized you’d end most of the violent crimes they cause. If alcohol and smoking are so destructive why not stick them with the other ‘illegal’ drugs like crack. There’s just no justice in this drug thing. It’s a double standard. It’s a monopoly, a god damn monopoly."

Well in the end Granny M only got probation and America went on as before with crack still illegal much to Granny’s displeasure. Shortly after her cream soda business went bust Granny M was quoted as saying, "Well, if I can’t sell cream soda at least I can sell my body. I know that’s legal in this state."
April 22, 1970: the U.S. was embroiled in the war in Vietnam, there were race riots in the nation’s cities, upheavals on college campuses, hippies, drop-outs, disillusionment and discontent everywhere. But while many were focusing on America’s social ills, there were some who began to draw attention to the ills we were imposing upon Mother Nature. DDT was threatening wildlife, the Great Lakes were said to be dying, urban smog was becoming commonplace, and phrases like “The Population Bomb” and “The Late, Great Planet Earth” were being invoked. What had started out in the sixties as just another radical movement was beginning to enlist more of the mainstream establishment.

It was in this context that Denis Hayes, then a 25-year-old student at Harvard Law School, took to heart a suggestion made in a speech by Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin that there be a national one-day demonstration of concern about the environment. Hayes dropped out of school and began to organize for Earth Day. The result was April 22, 1970, a day in which teach-ins and demonstrations were held all over the country. An ecofair at Union Station in Washington, D.C. attracted 100,000 people, Congress adjourned for the day, New York City banned automobile traffic from Fifth Avenue, and in all 20 million people participated. Politicians took a cue from this and immediately ushered in the Clean Water Act, tough amendments to the Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, a ban on DDT and the use of mutagenic defoliants in Southeast Asia, a federal occupational health and safety law, and the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency.

After Earth Day, Hayes went on to earn his law degree at Stanford University, then founded the lobbying group Environmental Action. During the 1970s, he conducted energy and environmental research at the Smithsonian Institution, served as director of the Illinois State Energy Office, authored over one hundred publications while a senior fellow at the Worldwatch Institute, and was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to direct the Solar Energy Research Institute. In 1978, Hayes chaired Sun Day, an international event to promote a new era of alternative energy development. He is also the author of the book Rays of Hope: The Transition to a Post-Petroleum World, which has been translated into six languages. In 1979, he received the Thomas Jefferson Medal, the highest honor reserved for a public servant under the age of 35, and he has also received the John Muir Award, Sierra Club’s highest honor for lifetime contributions to the environment.

Last year, Hayes took a leave of absence from his California law firm to organize again, this time for Earth Day 1990. This is not just a nostalgic commemoration of Earth Day’s twentieth anniversary. Hayes believes, and most environmentalists agree, that there is an even greater need now for Earth Day than there was in 1970. The 1980s saw an incredible attack by government and industry on the environmental gains made in the 1970s. In particular, many of the promising alternative energy initiatives that Hayes and others helped to bring about were ignored or cancelled outright by the Reagan administration. Also, the Superfund program, which was optimistically announced in 1980 as the solution to cleaning up the nation’s hazardous waste sites, has since floundered amid bureaucratic ineptitude and lack of funding.

Another factor that points out the need for another Earth Day is the tremendously increased awareness and concern among the general public about environmental issues. Polls indicate that most people view destruction of the environment as one of the most important crises facing us today, even above the threat of nuclear war, and most express a willingness to pay higher taxes if the extra money goes to bettering the health of the environment. As Denis Hayes said several months ago at an Earth Day organizing meeting in Atlanta, everyone is concerned about the environment and ready to help, now all they need is to be told how.

Earth Day 1990 is not meant to be a one-day event, soon to be forgotten when it’s over. It will instead be the kick-off for a new environmental consciousness that will continue into the decade and beyond. Toward this end, a lesson plan for kindergarten through twelfth grade, which emphasizes environmental education, is being distributed to schools across the country. The National Science Teachers Association and the National Education Association have both en-
Human Rights Quiz

A simple quiz about the political facts of life concerning homosexuality and AIDS in the United States. From the Human Rights Campaign Fund, a congressional lobbying organization.

You won't be asked to turn this in—just test your knowledge on these issues...

1. Existing federal laws protect lesbians and gay men from job discrimination simply because of their sexual orientation.

2. Lesbians and gay men can be denied custody of, or visitation rights with, their children simply because of their sexual orientation.

3. It is illegal to be a lesbian or gay man in the U.S.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. It varies from state to state.

4. Largely because of media attention, the funds allocated to AIDS patient care, research, and education have escalated far more rapidly than the patient load.

5. An estimated 25% of people with AIDS are people of color.

6. Many members of Congress justify their opposition to fairness for lesbians and gay men—or their unwillingness to speak out against discrimination—by claiming that they don't have any lesbian or gay constituents.

Answers: 1) False; 2) True; 3) b; 4) False; 5) False (40-45%); 6) True

Theft of Recycling Barrels

To those of you who are yet unfamiliar with the Environmental Forum’s recent recycling effort, here's the poop: Student efforts over the last few quarters have paid off in the form of large plastic barrels lent to our group to collect recyclable materials. The nine barrels were lent by a local recycling company and were placed at the Student Center (parking deck side) for daily collection. On Tuesday February 27 someone apparently stole these barrels. This theft will cost the Environmental Forum $300. If you have any information on the theft, please contact Eric Meyer at 881-8402. Thank you.
Earth Day continued...

endorsed this plan. Children are being taught how to audit their own households for energy efficiency and waste reduction, thereby educating themselves and their parents. A similar program is being distributed to workplaces. There is also a computerized database being established containing all environmental groups and concerned citizens, to facilitate and encourage future cooperative efforts to shape environmental policy. Local recycling programs are also being set up in thousands of neighborhoods.

Monitoring corporate behavior is big on the Earth Day agenda, embodied in the 10-point Valdez Principles, named after the Exxon Valdez oil spill last March. Endorsed by the Social Investment Forum and the National Council of Churches, this code of conduct calls on companies to address the effects of both products and production processes on employees, communities, and the environment. Companies complying with the principles will be duly noted, while those not complying will be targeted for potential action such as boycotts. As a result, Exxon has already agreed to name an environmental expert to its board of directors. A related campaign is being planned to urge college students to consider which companies are complying with the principles when deciding which job offers to accept.

Another important feature of Earth Day 1990 is that it is international in scope. Over eighty countries will participate in some way. The International Board of Sponsors includes Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway, anthropologist Richard Leakey of the Kenya Wildlife Service, and President Óscar Arias Sanchez of Costa Rica. In the U.S., the National Board of Directors includes such notables as biologist Barry Commoner, New York Governor Mario Cuomo, musician Jimmy Buffett, actors Eddie Albert and Ted Danson, United Auto Workers President Owen Bieber, Reverend Jesse Jackson, and Atlanta's own Ted Turner and Congressman John Lewis. On Earth Day, trees will be planted, teach-ins will be sponsored, religious groups will be asked to deliver sermons on the environment, Congress will be asked to adjourn, and the media will be enlisted to spread the word. In all, it is expected that over 100 million people will celebrate Earth Day.

In Atlanta, environmentalists will gather in Piedmont Park for an "EcoVillage" display, to coincide with the Dogwood Festival. The Environmental Forum at Georgia Tech will be a part of this, as a culmination of a week of events it is sponsoring on campus. During Earth Week (April 16-20), speakers, movies, music, theater, and displays will be featured on campus. Professors will be asked to lecture on how their discipline relates to the environment, President Crecine will deliver an address on Georgia Tech and the environment, and a design contest for technological innovations pertaining to global warming will be sponsored.

April 22, 1990: where will you be? Join the Environmental Forum to find out how you can get involved. Meetings are every Thursday, 11 AM, on the Student Center 3rd floor.