

Saint Mary's College

900 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1689

The Belles Staff

- Editor: Alison Nanninga
- Assistant
- Editors: Elizabeth Denning
Kim Goines
- Writers: Lisa Gorman
Cary Hodges
Elizabeth Holscher
Ellie Jarman
Jenny Schmidt
Katherine Scholl
Lisa Svendsgaard
Amy Augustine
Kathryn McRee
Carolyn Bullock
Suzanne Nordan
Sissy Overbeck
- Advisor: Beth Proctor

By Donna King

You all know that sinking feeling as you drive around the back campus parking lot, five minutes before class or curfew, only to find no spaces available. You develop an instant hatred for that person who has parked at an angle, taking up a space and a half. How many times have you wanted to park in the middle of the grove and just consider it a \$50 parking space? Nothing ruins a student's day quite like having to park several blocks away.

Parking Problems, Solutions Debated

While it seems that our protests to this problem have been in vain, that is not so. Our voices are being heard. The administration has been racking its collective brain trying to come up with an affordable and reasonable solution that will solve the problem without tearing down trees or drastically changing the campus. Students, faculty, and construction experts have been consulted in forming a long-term plan for tackling this problem. Many ideas have been offered and shot down. Meanwhile, the students have been growing restless, insisting that their cries are not being heard.

One of the many ideas suggested is to not allow students who are on academic probation to bring cars on campus. An argument against this idea has been that girls in this situation are going to park their cars along College Place street and that they may be made to feel that, because they do not perform well in the classroom, they are not entitled to safe parking. As we all know, many cars have been vandalized on this street. While this may appear to be a valid argument, there are other considera-

tions. First, if a girl is not allowed to park on campus, but chooses to have a car here anyway, she is making that decision on her own, and the college should not be responsible for that. Second, some students must earn the right to have a car on campus by earning a minimum grade point average. Shouldn't that right be taken away if they fail to maintain certain standards? Only fifteen spaces will become available if this plan is passed, but it is fifteen more spaces than we have now.

I am sure you are wondering why we cannot just build another parking lot. First and foremost, a new parking lot will cost in excess of \$110,000. There is no way that this immense cost can be worked into the budget within the next several years. Ultimately, it is part of the master plan to add two more parking lots on the campus. But, for the time being, we must be creative with less costly solutions. For example, could eleventh graders and freshmen be required to earn a space on campus? After all, freshmen cannot park on most campuses across the country, regardless of their grades. And perhaps we all need to remember that there is a dirt parking lot by

the 1903 building (the old infirmary) that is free for all students to use.

While it does seem frustrating and inconvenient to be without adequate parking, we need to bear in mind that our cries are being heard, and that the administration is trying to find an answer. We need to be patient or rack our own brains to find a solution. It also would not hurt to keep in mind that next year many of us will have to walk a lot further to be a part of a school that is not as concerned about us as Saint Mary's is.

The Memling Trio Gives Stellar Performance

One of the highlights of April was the Memling Trio's performance in Smedes Parlor. Pamela Whitlow, Phyllis Wiens, and Anita Burroughs-Price chose 20th-century numbers for viola, flute, and harp, and each selection was beautifully executed. Soprano Judith Bruno joined them for a stirring rendition of Maurice Ravel's Five Popular Greek Melodies. The concert drew community-wide attention and attendance, and we are proud that SMC was able to sponsor such a quality performance.

Animal Experiments Raise Ethical Rights Questions

By Kristy Lawson

As a consumer, there is one thing you can always count on when you browse through the aisles of a grocery store, wander in and out of shops, or even negotiate with a salesman at a car dealership: the final decision on the purchase is always made by you. Therefore, it is up to you to educate yourself on the quality, design, and craftsmanship of products available. As everyone knows, what you see is not always what you get. Such is the case with cosmetics,—many of which are cruelly tested on animals who seem to care little about the appearance of human beings. Many large corporations are the homes of cosmetic testing areas where beauty is, literally, in the eyes of the beholder (and on the skin and in the stomach). It is estimated that fourteen million animals are tortured and killed each year in these testing areas. The most common of these tests are for toxicity, eye irritation, and skin irritation. In testing for toxicity, a number of animals are force-fed large amounts of a product until half of them are dead. The Draize Eye Test is widely used in testing for irritation. The victims happen to be rabbits because their tear ducts cannot rid themselves of outside substances in the eye. They are secured in stocks and the product is continually forced into their eyes for several days to measure the extent of the damage. Rabbits, as well as other creatures such as hamsters, are also the victims of skin irritation testing. In this process the ani-



"It probably never saw superior life forms before."

mal's skin is peeled raw and the product is taped onto the area to test the reaction. How do these companies justify the cruelty they impose on so many living creatures? The answer, in their eyes, is a fully justifiable one—human safety. They want to make sure that their products will be safe for consumers, as well as for the factory workers who handle the cosmetics on a daily basis. These companies condone their behavior on the basis that animals can be used in testing because they do not have the capacity to reason. But should animals suffer at the expense of human vanity? If animals are unlike or "lesser" beings than humans, they should not be contradictorily considered so close to humans that humans may test products on them. The simple fact is that there are many

alternatives to animal testing. Well over one hundred companies are now using alternative methods to test their products. One of the most simple of these methods is using ingredients that have been used by people for hundreds of years, such as aloe vera. Other effective methods include bacterial tests, in vitro tests (culture dish testing), and computer analysis; as computers can now analyze data and predict results. The cosmetics you buy are chosen by you, so keep in mind that many product results have been achieved through the unnecessary suffering of animals. Most cosmetic products can be effectively tested without harm to any living being. Using violent tests, such as the Draize Eye Test, on innocent animals is wrong; using cruel testing meth-

ods when there are alternatives available is inexcusable. In the words of eighteenth-century philosopher Jeremy Bentham on animals, "The question is not, can they reason? Nor, can they talk? But, can they suffer?" Animals can suffer, and it is unethical to force them to suffer.



"Would you like to be my school's science fair project?"

Indecision

Is hell heaven,
and heaven hell?
The well sick,
and the sick well?
If every thing
is the opposite we think,
then drink is food,
and food is drink.
White is black
and black is white,
night day
and day night.
When your vision turns blind
and the blind can see,
then my love for you
will be your love for me.

—Jill Grahek