

Tickets

Parking committee, legislature pass proposal for fee increases

The parking battle at USC is quickly making enemies of faculty and students, and the latest developments are no exception.

Thursday, the state legislature passed a \$1 increase to USC-issued parking tickets that will go into effect next semester. Except for students who amass wallet-crunching amounts of tickets through the year, a \$1 increase is not going to do anyone's finances too much damage. However, this bill was sent through the University Parking Committee during the summer, when there was no student representation on their board.

The parking committee is comprised of eight faculty members and two students. All issues concerning parking at the university must be voted on by the committee before it takes its next step down legislative lane. Considering that the parking directly affects students, it seems rather presumptuous of the committee members to assume that we wouldn't mind if they go ahead and vote without us.

We have a right to representation in any decisions that affect students. Granted, this decision only cost us a dollar, but what if they pushed a proposal to turn a student lot into a faculty lot through one summer. Students would really make noise then. Then, however, might be too late, so we need to make noise now when injustices such as this one arise.

Here's another thing to think about. With over 27,000 students at USC and only a little over 1,000 faculty members, why are there eight faculty members on the parking committee and only two students. Doesn't the logic behind that system of representation seem slightly flawed?

And while tuition rates keep rising, these same eight faculty members voted Thursday for gates to keep students out of two faculty lots that will cost over \$16,000 each, plus the cost of labor. The two students representatives voted against the proposal. That \$32,000 will be taken out of students' tuition and the extra dollars we will all be paying next semester for parking tickets.



True racial equality still a long way off

Some time ago (April 20, 1990), I read with much interest a ventriloquistic column by W.E. Rone Jr. in *The State* newspaper. It has been on my mind from time to time ever since. As Mr. Rone sees it, the central question today is, "Why, after 25 years of equal rights — indeed of special remedial treatment under the law — do so many African-Americans remain outside the bounds of middle class society? Why do even educated blacks seem increasingly remote, hostile and paranoid? In a society besotted with quick fixes and easy answers to every problem, is this the one that will prove insoluble?"

I thought about Mr. Rone's column as I listened to President George Bush at the USC Commencement last May. He talked about the injuries "beneath the surface... The deep scars on the spirit left by four decades of communist rule (in Eastern Europe)." As I listened to him talk about believers persecuted, churches and cemeteries razed, citizens turned against one another, etc., my mind wandered back to the centuries of oppression here at home. We should not be surprised if it takes a long time to undo the infrastructure that it took centuries to construct. Just one example: isn't it ironic that today, eleven o'clock on Sunday morning remains the most segregated hours in America? The issues we are discussing are matters of conscience and the spirit; the churches are the primary institution of leadership in those areas.

But this is no reason for despair. No matter how long the distance, history will record that we in our time took a giant step. The strides we made in our time should be a source of pride and inspiration. It clearly demonstrates that we can and have changed. We must keep the faith and move steadfastly forward with vigor.

The claim that we have had 25 years of "equal rights" is wholly illusory. First, even if we assume that our society has 25 years ago. There is no doubt that Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 established a policy of equal treatment under law. However, it is likewise true that translating that policy into reality required numerous court decisions, presidential orders and actions, legislative hearings, conferences, etc., over many years. Therefore, as a statement

O'NEAL SMALLS

Guest Columnist

of legal reality, it is incorrect to say that we have had 25 years of "equal rights."

Secondly, Mr. Rone's statement implies that 25 years ago, the people in power — people who dispense privileges, ended racial discrimination and started treating people equally. That is simply not true. When viewed against the background of some three centuries of deliberate and effective efforts to turn the races against each other and to dehumanize African-Americans, 25 years is a very short period of time. There is simply no way to dismantle and eradicate all of the trappings of racism in such a short period of time. The legal, social, religious, political, economic and psychological infrastructures of racism and racial separation have been carefully and systematically constructed over the centuries. Attitudes and stereotypes were set in cement on both sides of the racial wall.

There is another reason why the notion of 25 years of equal treatment is misleading. That reason is reflected in an important maxim that rings down through the ages, and should not be forgotten. It must influence out thinking about those "twenty-five years of equal rights." That proverb says that "to treat unequal equities equally is also a great injustice."

I am reminded of the old fable in which milk was offered to a fox and a stork on a flat plate. In a superficial sense, there was equality in that both could drink from the plate. But can anyone seriously doubt the need for different serving utensils if the stork is to enjoy the milk? So it is with race relations. It is like having two runners, one having been bound and chained for a long time while the other was exercising and running. To release the former and expect him to immediately compete in a race with the latter, is wholly unrealistic.

Knowledge is both cultural and cumulative.

What a student knows depends to an important degree upon what her grandparents taught her parents, and upon what the parents taught the student. The characteristics, traits habits, etc. of any ethnic or discrete insular group can only be truly understood in a culturally historic context. For good or ill, our minds and behavior are shaped in fundamental ways by the dreams and fears of our parents and forebearers. To an important extent, they influence us from their graves. I am told that in the fall of 1989, 54 percent of African-American freshmen in the nation came from homes where the parents were either divorced, separated or deceased (as compared to 25 percent of the white freshmen). The disparity between income was also great: 38 percent of the African-American freshmen came from home with income under \$20,000 as compared to 12 percent of the white freshmen grew up in homes where the mother was not a high school graduate as compared to 6 percent of the white freshmen; 20 percent of the fathers of African-American freshmen did not have a high school education as compared to 9 percent of the white freshmen.

These realities affect the quality and nature of education young people receive. Home education is just as important, if not more important, as school education. Most importantly, the education received in the homes of Black and White students is simply different.

So when we bring discrete groups together, one group should not insist on measuring everybody by its old measuring stick. When we bring the races together, we must fashion a new order if there is to be mutual respect and equality. Neither group should insist on having the other abandon its values and wholly adopt the other's way of life. Rather we should take from both to create a new unity and a new society. Intersecting values, cultural eclecticism; this is the challenge at USC in the 1990's. With a good will, this task can renew and electrify our alma-mater.

O'Neal Smalls is a professor at the USC Law School and chairman of the USC ad hoc committee on race relations.



©1990 HERBLOCK

The Gamecock

News: 777-7726

Advertising: 777-4249

JEFF WILSON
Editor in Chief

SHARON WILLAMSON
Managing Editor/Copy Desk Chief

LYNN GIBSON
News Editor
DOUG AUBE
Sports Editor

ELIZABETH LYNCH
Carolina Life Editor
RENEE MEYER
Photography Editor

KELLY C. THOMAS
Viewpoints Editor

ELIZABETH FOX
Assistant News Editor

SHERRI TILLMAN
Assistant News Editor

DAVID BOWDEN
Assistant Carolina Life Editor

KATHY HEBERGER
Assistant Carolina Life Editor

BRANT LONG
Assistant Sports Editor

JULIE BOUCHILLON
Assistant Photography Editor

SARA VERNE
Assistant Copy Desk Chief

OCTAVIA WRIGHT
Assistant to the Editors

KRISTIN FRANCIS
Graduate Assistant

ERIK COLLINS
Faculty Adviser

ED BONZA
Director of Student Media

LAURA S. DAY
Production Manager

RAY BURGOS
Assistant Production Manager

RENEE GIBSON
Advertising Manager

KYLE BERRY
Assistant Advertising Manager

CAROLYN GRIFFIN
Business Manager

Letters Policy: The Gamecock will try to print all letters received. Letters should be, at maximum, 250 to 300 words long. The writer must include full name, professional title if a USC employee or South Carolina resident, or year and major if a student. An address and phone number are required with all letters sent. The Gamecock reserves the right to edit letters for style, possible libel or in case of space limitations. The newspaper will not withhold names under any circumstance.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sex dilemmas face everyone

To the editor:

I would like to respond to Mr. Burkholder (Nov. 5) in a very simple manner. The definition of bisexuality is not a person who has had sex with people of both sexes, but a person who is sexually attracted to both sexes. Ideally, a bisexual person can choose from either sex for a life partner. Fidelity does not even enter into the situation at this point. This is a question that couples have to answer for themselves.

Again, I would like to remind everyone that hetero-, homo-, or bisexuals (that means everybody) have a choice. To have sex or to not have sex is everyone's "moral dilemma." If you want to have sex with everyone who you are attracted to, go to it. As long as both parties consent and are of legal age, who cares? Those who prefer

limited sexual activity within the confines of special relationships — that's great. Those who wish to remain celibate until finding a life partner — congratulations and best wishes.

But fidelity, like sexual orientation, is a very personal decision that each of us has the right to make for ourselves. There is no perfect way for everyone. As long as each of us differs in any way, there will be different lifestyles. Who can say what is right for whom?

Oh, and by the way, Mr. Burkholder, one would hope that such problems as you describe would not happen in a permanent relationship. A good way to insure against such would be to communicate openly with one's partner on all subjects, especially the sexual and "moral code" that each partner has. Once those codes are known it is up to the partners as a whole to decide what constitutes fidelity for their relationship.

One other thing: just because a

couple has a "Christian marriage" does not automatically mean that each will be faithful to the other.

Hypocrisy runs rampant in all religions and belief systems, and surface looks do not always reveal the truth. Be careful what words you bandy around, Mr. Burkholder, or one day you may find that someone has a clearer view of a situation than you do, and you may be forced to eat the words that you have spoken.

Dorene M. Boltz
Thomas Cooper Librarian

Ethnic words are insulting

To the editor:

This letter is in response to Rich Taylor's Nov. 5 article, "Seminole scalp USC, send fans home early." It is bad enough that the Florida State campus perpetuates the racist objectification of American Indians through their name-

sake "the Seminoles." In fact, the existence of national sports teams such as the Washington Redskins and the Kansas City Chiefs ought to be considered a shameful reflection of our treatment of the American Indian as an ethnic group.

Of course, most viewers of Monday Night Football are hardly phased. Rich Taylor's reference to the football team's successes as "scalpings" is irritating for two reasons: 1) it is yet one more example of an insensitivity to American Indians as an ethnic minority group, except this time made by a university student (who should know better?); and 2) it is such an obvious and overused metaphor that it highlights Taylor's obliviousness to this issue, as well as his lack of headline creativity. Next time, why not cut right to the quick: "Redman Tomahawk Squash-um Chickenhead." Or better yet, why not show some respect and stop using these insulting cliches.

Peter J. Ferbel
anthropology graduate student